

The Primacy of What?

The Revolution of Networks and the shaping of real *utopias* for the twenty-first century

By Matías Meza-Lopehandía G.*

'Communism is for us not a state of affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality will have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premisses now in existence. '

-Marx and Engels, 2000[1845-6]:187-

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
I. A Revisionist Account of Historical Materialism.....	2
II. Real Utopias: the Revolution of Networks.....	3
The Network's Constitution.....	4
An unexpected protagonist: the consumer.....	5
Uncertainties of the liberation project.....	6
Conclusion: The primacy of what? Economics as politics.....	8
References & Bibliography.....	10

Introduction

As Susan Marks (2008) has pointed out, the intellectual legacy of Karl Marx has been appreciated in the last years, both by the public and the scholarship. This essay is part of this re-valorization of Marx's work. It asserts that a radical social change is still possible, and that the best way to understand how that could be possible is through the theoretical framework of historical materialism firstly developed by Marx.

This essay has to parts. The first one is an assessment of three central aspects of Marx' historical materialism: (1) social change is a product of the development of forces of production; (2) capitalism will eventually disappear; and (3) the possibility of the rise of new (and higher) relations of production depends on the development of certain conditions in the womb of the older social formation. The outcome of this evaluation is that the possibility of a progressive social change relies not only in reaching a certain level of development of forces of production, but also in the conscious political effort of fostering new modes of production which are in formation in nowadays capitalism.

The second part of this work presents some productive practices as a possible embryo of new modes of production, that could give rise to a new historical bloc capable of overcoming capitalism. Following Euclides Mance's idea of a network that links all this practices in an *autopoietic* whole, this essay will show the strengths that makes these proposal to deserve special attention. Then it will address some of the criticisms and uncertainties that can be posed to it and tries to draft some answers for them. The

* This essay was submitted for Marx and Marxism course in MSc's human rights programme (2013) at LSE.

essay concludes with a reflection on the necessity of shifting the emphasis of revolutionary practice from (state) politics to economics, albeit without abandoning the former.

I. A Revisionist Account of Historical Materialism

The first of the central ideas of Marx's theory of history in which this essay relies is that social change is an outcome of the development of forces of production. Indeed, it is hardly refutable that those forces have been developing from the rudimentary tools inherited from the ancestors of the *homo sapiens*, to today's advanced technology. However, the core of the theory is the assumption that at a certain point of productive forces' development, the relations of production prevalent in the correspondent mode of production becomes an obstacle for further development of those forces of production, forcing the former to change.

Albeit this last statement is more controversial, it seems that indeed capitalist relations of production are now fettering human productivity, as it is obvious regarding the challenge posed by replicability in the culture industry, and more generally, in what Hardt and Negri (2009) have called *biopolitical* production, which is displacing industrial production from its hegemonic place.¹ On the other hand, it can hardly be contested that capitalist relations of production expands profit rather than leisure time, obstructing the very possibility of rational action, understood as improvement of human condition (Levine and Wright, 1980). Thus, these two issues make social change a requirement for human flourishing.

The second materialist assumption is that that capitalism will eventually disappear. Indeed, Marx claimed that the collapse of capitalism was inevitable, based on its insoluble internal contradictions.² He also predicted its substitution for a higher (more rational) mode of production. One can easily agree with the first assertion, as any historical formation seems to be finite. However, the second one has a teleological sound that makes it difficult to swallow.

The direction of social change is not automatically determined neither by working class insubordination, as suggested by Hardt and Negri (2000), neither by technological development alone nor by an automatic option for the functionally optimal relation of production, as Cohen (2000) seems to suggest. Any mode of production has its own groups of interests, some of them interested in keeping the *statu quo*, and others interested in replacing it, and at the end the outcome depends on class capacities, which are not necessarily aligned with class interests (Levine and Wright, 1980). Social change is a task that is carried out by humans, and as any historical effort, its outcome is uncertain. Thus, the new social order is not simply a higher order as Marx thought, there is no such a guarantee as it is conclusively shown through the history of modernity. There is no certitude about when, why or how the demise of capitalism will happen, neither how the new society that will replace it will look like.

Leaving aside Marx's optimistic teleological view, the idea that the old order carries in its womb the

1 The logic of scarcity that underpins the property regime (public and private) is not applicable to immaterial goods, which are essentially reproducible and which productivity is enlarged when they are treated as common and are reduced when treated as property. *Biopolitical* production requires free access to the common bases of production, autonomous disposition of working time, and workers mobility to foster its productivity. However, these requirements are hindered respectively by property regime, precarization of labour, and migratory regulations.

2 Li (2008) has claimed the inevitability of capitalism collapse based on the law of decreasing rate of profit without appealing to Marx's theory of value, which have been massively criticized. Following Wallerstein (2003), he argues that profit declines because wages tend to raise, environmental costs tend to be internalized, and taxation tends to increase, pressing the rate of profit. Hitherto, geographic expansions have been a major mechanism for lowering costs and moderate the tendency that affects profitability. With the conquest of China by capitalism, this strategy have reach its limits.

embryos of the new one -which might be progressive, regressive or even destructive- seems very appealing. As Sassen (2006) has shown, the capabilities that characterize a certain epoch have always been first developed under the old scheme before being part of the new organizational logic. And the historical trajectory that they take depends more on historical conditions than on their intrinsic features.

Marx (2000 [1859]:426) states that 'new, *higher* relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society itself' (*emphasis added*). Until now, this 'material conditions' required for the rise of new (and higher) relations of production have been understood as a certain level of development of forces of production which allows humanity to face the task of overcoming scarcity. Albeit this seems to be a *sine qua non* condition for progressive social change, it is far from being enough. The decisive step is the creation of new mode of production from this level of development, capable of benefit from all the advantages of collaboration, addressed to satisfy truly human needs, and governed by the producers/consumers themselves. The problem here is the extent in which is possible to move in that direction before the demise of capitalism. If it is possible to built communism from capitalism, some samples of the capabilities required for it should be find in the interstices of actual capitalism (Holloway, 2005). Thus, those 'material conditions' should be understood both as a level of development of material conditions, *and* as modes of production that are in formation in the womb of nowadays capitalism.

Wright (2009) calls this samples real *utopias*. In contrast with classic utopianism, real *utopias* are neither blueprints nor ready-made visions of the new society (Leopold, 2007). Instead, they are ongoing practices and actual institutional designs from which one can project human potentials, and finds paths to follow in order to shape and foster the possibility of a new social order capable of allowing human flourishing. They are the embryos of a possible new society that are growing in the old one.

II. Real *Utopias*: the Revolution of Networks

One of this real *utopias* lies on those practices that have been identified as social economy.³ Some of these practices can be regarded as the potential basis of non-capitalistic economic, that is going to be called solidarity-based economy. Three actual or potential features makes this practices particularly relevant. The first one is that they are not driven by profit making but to serve the members of its community. The second one, that they are more or less autonomous form the state (albeit not yet autonomous from the market). The third one is that they are (or could be) governed by democratic means.

Several ongoing activities can be qualified as solidarity-based practices, from fair-trade movement,⁴ to Local Exchange Trading Systems (LETS) and the own credit and currency system that it gave birth to,⁵

³ The broad concept of social economy refers to 'all forms of organizations or enterprises involved in the production of goods or services (i.e., having an economic activity) that are not private, for profit or public' (Neamtam, 2005:71).

⁴ Fair trade connects conscious consumers from the first world with artisan producers from the third world based on notions like the Aristotelian concept of *just price* rather than neoclassic notion of *equilibrium price*, or fair productive practices certified by fair-trade labelling standards (e.g. FLO).

⁵ LETS were originally conceived to foster local production and consumption within a given community. Now they have developed information services that records transactions of members giving birth to a kind of social currency (LETS credits) with international scope. More information about Community Exchange System (CES) can be find at online: *New complementary currency brings out trading talents of locals*. Independent Online. October 30, 2006. Available on line: <http://www.iol.co.za/business/opinion/new-complementary-currency-brings-out-trading-talents-of-locals-1.739068>

and Alternative Banks (micro-credit systems, popular banks, ethical banks, e.g. Schweiz) and Cooperative Banks (e.g. OP-Pohjola Group), Boycott Movements, Free Software, among others (Mance, 1999; Wright, 2009). It worth noting that these practices are not fully solidarity-based, and as such do not have a subversive effect. However, they could become complete, specially under the influence of the synergy of the *autopoietic* network operating, as it will be explained later.

The main problem of this kind of initiatives is that -albeit they strive not to reproduce exploitative relations by direct means- they are articulated through the market. This means that they are subjected to the rules of capitalist economy, which press them to compete against capitalist production and among themselves in order to survive (Wright, 2009). Moreover, the wealth produced by them circulates through capitalist circuits sucking up any of their subversive potential. More generally, their products become commodities, separating the producers from their products and from their means of production (Holloway, 2005).

Then one may asks what would be the revolutionary scope -even within a long term perspective- of these kinds of practices. In other words, can they form the basis for a new solidarity-based economy that could compete with -and eventually overcome- capitalism?

Following Mance's (1999) Solidarity-Based Cooperation Network proposal (SBCN), its possibility depends on the capacity of articulating the solidarity-based production, commercialization, financing and consumption in an organic autonomous system of production and circulation. In other words, it depends on the creation of a worldwide network that connects all these practices outside the market (and the state), giving birth to an entirely new chain of production based in solidarity, social and environmental sustainability, and democratic control over production.

As the system is conceived as a network, the consumption actions performed within it spur not only the productive unit that directly produce it, but all the operators that supply an input in the respective chain of production (Mance, 2003b). And further, the network is enhanced by the distribution of wealth made by the remuneration perceived by the workers, which in turn are solidarity-based consumers, this is, people that consumes solidarity-based products (Mance, 2003a). This relative closure of the *autopoietic* system in which this practices are to be articulated is what gives them a subversive potential that they do not have in isolation.

The Network's Constitution

The SBCN can co-exist and interact with capitalism. At first sight this seems to be a problem, as it has been state above, because it has to inject its value into the capitalist circulation. However, it could become a strength when what can be called the SBCN's Constitution is taken into consideration.

The first clause of this Constitution is the commitment to produce without economic, political or cultural oppression, and to protect ecological sustainability, as it has been described above. Despite its utopian sound, this commitment is grounded in those ongoing solidarity-based practices of grass root organizations of producers around the world, from food to software production. This distinguishes SBCN from a mere theoretical model of a non-market participatory democratic economy, as Albert (2003) has presented, which have been fairly qualified as a utopian vision (Wright, 2009).

The second clause of SBCN's Constitution is that the surplus generated within the network would be distributed for the expansion of the network, through reinvestment in new ventures capable of produce

[Accessed 18 April 2013].

final goods and services not yet provided within the net, or in inputs required for the productive process (Mance, 2003a). In this way, the network grows completing its productive chains in order to close the circuit, maintaining all the value produced circulating and reproducing within it (Mance, 2003).

This recursive logic has a resemblance to the way in which free/open software (FOS) actually operates. The source code of any piece of FOS is open to being adapted, modified and re-used by anyone, under the condition that the resulting product stays as FOS. In the same way, every good and profit produced within the solidarity-based chains of production should be kept in it. Of course, a complete separation from the capitalist circuits of production is not possible at the early stages of development of the SBCN, just as it is almost impossible to stay 100% within the realm of FOS. Some inputs should be purchased in the capitalist market, diverting resources from the social economy, but addressed to strengthening the network. Vice versa, some SBCN products will be sold at the capitalistic market, readdressing value from the capitalistic circuit to the SBCN but without the fully multiplying effect of a product produced and consumed within the network.

A historical example of the feasibility of this *autopoietic* movement can be found in *Mondragón Cooperative Corporation* (MCC). Albeit limited by different constraints, the key of its initial success was its ability to create a coordinated network as 'a social infrastructure for the reproduction and expansion of the cooperative ownership' controlled by the workers (Wright, 2009:170).

The third clause of the Constitution is entirely political. The network and each of its productive units are governed by its members, including not only the producers (workers), but also the consumers. The inclusion of consumers in decision making makes the difference with previous attempts as the cooperative movement. In any case, this model has the advantages of direct democracy over representative democracy. Any wrong decision becomes a learning. Self-determination and self-education goes hand in hand.

The way in which this principle is to be implemented depends on the local conditions and the stage of development of the SBCN, but what it means is that the investment decisions are taken by the producers/consumers, in accordance with the commitments of their membership. This gives the SBCN its definitive character as a source for a new historical bloc based in its own mode of production, oriented to satisfy human necessities as are defined by the producers/consumers themselves, and which carries its own political culture.

An unexpected protagonist: the consumer

Hitherto Marxism has always focuses its attention in the (class of) the producers rather than in consumers. The latter have been regarded as the economic version of the (alienated) subjectivity produced by capitalism (Marcuse, 1991). However, here the consumer has a central role, that goes beyond the liberal image of the consumer as a subject of rights.

Bearing in mind the critical approaches to consumption as a device of social control (Kellner, 1983), and Luhmann's (1997) distinction between the integrated and the excluded- one can find different kinds of consumption, from *alienated consumption* to *critical consumption*. The latter is the mode of consumption of those that understand that consumption is the final link of the whole chain of production, and consequently, that their individual consumption options are relevant for other people, and at the end, their consumption choices could shape the offer and the way in which it is produced. In other words, the critical consumer understood consumption as 'an exercise of power', and as such, is not

driven only by the consumer's own well-being but also by the collective well-being (Mance, 1999). In Mance's (2003a:4) words the act of consumption 'is not merely economic but also ethical and political'.

This might sound utopian, but one should recall that the ongoing practices of solidarity-based production are already depending on acts of *good living consumption*,⁶ if not directly on acts of *critical consumption*. Indeed, Fairtrade International (FLO) provides certifications related to social, economic and labour standards. The pace of its growing shows that an increasing number of consumers are concerned of the conditions under what they are going to purchase were produced.⁷ However, it worth noting that FLO does not provide (yet) a certification of SBCN production, which is critical. The subversive potential of critical consumption relies on the very existence of a SBCN through which value can circulate within an *autopoietic* chain of production. Is this what makes critical or conscious consumers become solidarity-based consumers. Otherwise, as Zizek (2011) warns, their actions of consumption would perform only as conscious-cleaners, but will not effectively challenge capitalism.

The central role given to the consumer has a powerful appeal. It empowers people in a more feasible way than the notion of a professional revolutionaries. A conscious worker has a lot to lose by performing a subversive action. In contrast, a conscious consumer has very little to lose when she purchases in a subversive manner through the SBCN. In this way, becoming a revolutionary becomes a real possibility for ordinary men and women, and the very action of consumption is politicized.

Uncertainties of the liberation project

This essay will address three main criticisms that can be made to this proposal: (1) the problem of integrated consumers; (2) the problem of competition with the capitalist economy; and (3) the problem of financial resources. Several answers can be provided to these problems, but neither of them are definitive. As it has been stated above, the outcome of the social change is a matter of social and political struggle, and is not guaranteed.

The first problem is the participation in the network of those who are included in capitalist consumption. This is key for the development of the network, since they have more (human and financial) resources to inject into it. But then, how and why will they address their actions of consumption to the solidarity network? As the critical theorist of the Frankfurt School has shown, needs are produced within the capitalist mode of production, which in turn 'creates a consciousness that accepts and conforms to the system' (Kellner, 1983:67).

However, it is worth to note two ways in which the integrated consumers could be persuaded to become solidarity consumers. The first one is social consciousness, which is something that actually exists as the above referred growing of FLO shows. Thus, it seems that a new type of subjectivity is emerging, that of the critical consumer, which could become a solidarity-based consumer, provided her inclusion into the SBCN.

The second way in which new consumers may be attracted to the SBCN could be the quality of solidarity production, as far as solidarity production involves strict standards (labour conditions, environmental sustainability, etc.), including aspects that directly or indirectly have impact in their

⁶ This is the mode of consumption of those integrated to the consumer society that are concerned with their own well-being, and are not directly subjected to the needs produced within the productive apparatus.

⁷ According to Fairtrade International, '[t]he sales of Fairtrade certified products grew 15% between 2008-2009. In 2009, Fairtrade certified sales amounted to approximately €3.4 billion worldwide'. Information available online at http://www.fairtrade.net/facts_and_figures.html [Accessed 7 May 2013]:

quality. A striking example of the superiority of collaborative production is FOS. While privative software still dominate the market of personal computers' operative systems (Mac, Microsoft), all the top ten of world's supercomputers are actually running on Linux.⁸ A similar pattern can be traced in the web server's market. The biggest privative servers (Microsoft and Google) manage 23,45% of the market, while the FOS servers (Apache and NGIX) control the 65,82% of it.⁹ Another impressive way of producing and spread knowledge under a logic of horizontal collaboration based on openness, voluntary work, participatory and predominant non-hierarchical control is Wikipedia (Wright, 2009).

In both cases -FOS and Wikipedia- is not just a matter quality or gratuity, as Mance's seems to conceive them (2003a)- but a whole distinctive way of production based on collaboration, openness, and sharing. In sharp contrast to privative modes of software production, FOS implies a reorientation of knowledge and power in contemporary society. This reorientation is manifested in the recursive character of the software community, namely, the commitment of its members with the maintenance and modification 'of the technical, legal, practical, and conceptual means of its own existence as a public' (Kelty, 2008:3). In other words, FOS is an example of sovereign producers.

The two reminding problems -the question of competition and the issue of financial resources- are closely related and pose three main issues. First, that the SBCN would have problems to provide goods and services of high costs, because its initial lack of capital or access to credit. Second, the capitalist firms do not have to internalize the cost of those positive externalities to which SBCN is committed, and in some cases, not even the negative externalities. And third, more broadly, if SBCN's ventures are forced to acquire credit from capitalist banks, it would be soon forced to make decisions based in the rate of profit rather than in human welfare in order to repay its debts.¹⁰ As Holloway (2005:206) posed regarding cooperatives, in order to survive, they have to subordinate 'themselves to the discipline of the market, by integrating themselves into the forms of behaviour from which they have fled'.

The first response would be that as far as SBCN has some capacity for investment (based on its own surplus making), in the long run and through good management, it could be able to accumulate enough savings to invest them in high capital production.¹¹ However, since the management of the network is democratic, this policy of saving would have to convince the workers to refrain their actual (wage) aspirations in order to make these investments possible in a remote future. Thus, this possibility seems to depend too much on a massive ideological commitment of the solidarity-based producers, a weak ground as the experience of MCC have shown.¹² However, it should be stressed that MCC's democratic organization only includes workers and not consumers. This is a limitation that the SBCN does not have, and which allows it to counter-balance the short term interests of the workers with the long-term ideological commitment (and material interests) of the consumers.¹³

A second and complementary way of facing this weakness is to engage with state politics. This is a relevant and contested issue. The former efforts of progressive social change fails precisely because both, reformists and revolutionaries misunderstood the degree of 'integration of the state into the network of capitalist social relations' (Holloway, 2005:13).

8 See November 2012's ranking at <http://www.top500.org/lists/2012/11/> [Accessed 19 April, 2013]

9 See April Web Survey at <http://news.netcraft.com/archives/category/web-server-survey/> [Accessed 19 April, 2013]

10 In order to compete under capitalist and globalized conditions, MMC has had to extend its own operations overseas through subsidiaries, which are far from being cooperative. Even further, some of them have shown anti-unionist behaviour (Wright, 2009)

11 It should be recalled that as far as SBCN is a complete chain of production, it has its own currency and financial system.

12 See above note N° 10.

13 In any case, a relevant amount of commitment is a requirement of every revolutionary project that does not rely on technological determinism.

One of the powerful appeals of the SBCN is that it depends essentially on the will and labour of their affiliates and not in state policies. However, the network can be decisively fostered or fettered by public policies. Depending on the local (or global) conditions different goals can be reached. For example, forcing the government to provide soft loans, subsidies to enhance the SBCN productive capacities, or the implementation of an unconditional basic income¹⁴. The latter, as a massive subsidy to the SBCN, it would allow people within the network to provide their labour to it (Wright, 2009). Competition can be also matched by imposing through (state) political activity strict rules of internalization of negative externalities (e.g. environmental cost) and even by imposing them high standards of production regarding the labour force. Another way to foster the network would be to pass legislation to force the state to prefer solidarity-based production when available, making it to become a solidarity-base consumer with all its purchase power. Finally, expropriation can provide a fast track which under the adequate social and political conditions could be used to transfer capital from the capitalist mode of production to the SBCN.

Conclusion: The primacy of what? Economics as politics

This essay has defended an understanding of historical materialism in which the demise of capitalism is inevitable, albeit the direction of social change is not certain. The possibility of a progressive social change relies on both, the development of forces of production and the conscious political effort of fostering new modes of production. Moreover, if communism as social self-determination is possible, the practices in which it would be based should be found in nowadays capitalism. These embryos have been identified as those collaborative practices performed within social economy.

The SBCN proposed by Euclides Mance, has the advantages of projecting these practices in a global scope, and those provided by the synergy produced through the coordination those practices within a network. It also shows a way in which the negative moment of politics regain its subversive scope. In other words, it allows to move from cathartic protest to building alternatives.

At the beginning, the network would be economically, politically and culturally marginal (as indeed is). However, in the process of strengthening its own productive capacities, the SBCN could become an alternative mode of production in which social self-determination can be realized.

Crucial for this possibility is the democratic organization of producers *with* consumers, through which the investment decisions would be made, giving a real basis for the project of dispersing power. Here lies the subversive character of this proposal. A new political culture would be associated to the new mode of production, giving the conditions for the emergence of a new historical bloc.

Marx (2000[1865][1894]) stated that both capital and capitalism itself are human products. Moreover, 'what is called world history is nothing but the creation of man by human labour' (Marx, 2000[1844]:104). As capitalism develops, it pervades all spheres of human activities, and it encompasses the social production of ways of life, and also, the production of life itself (Hardt and Negri, 2009). Consequently, the main tasks of any revolutionary practice are the achievement of producers' self-consciousness and the promotion of productive practices that could become the basis for reorganising the production of social totality towards social self-determination. In this way, the focus subversive praxis is shifted from politics to economics, honouring the core of Marx's historical

¹⁴ 'The idea of an unconditional basic income (UBI) is quite simple: Every legal resident in a country receives a monthly living stipend sufficient to live above the "poverty line." [...] The grant is unconditional on the performance of any labor or other form of contribution, and it is universal – everyone receives the grant, rich and poor alike' (Wright, 2009:3).

materialism, which is that the key for understanding and changing the world is in material life.

The twentieth-century experience was the history of the failure of both, revolutionaries' high modernist faith in social engineering (Scott, 1998), and reformist's faith in capitalism progressive force and its institutions. Despite the obvious differences between both realms, they shared their understanding of the primacy of politics, and centred their struggle in the capitalist state, without seeing the constraints that it posed for a deep social change. Moreover, globalization has reached a new stage in the last decades (Sassen, 2006), that could be characterize as the passage to a new form of (imperial) sovereignty (Hardt and Negri, 2000), making the seizure of state power even less appealing.

Consequently, the question of state power shifts now to how to manage the compulsory relations with the state under capitalism, and when and how engage in voluntary relations (Holloway, 2005). The revolution of networks gives a powerful guidance for answering this issues from a *trans-capitalist* strategy.

Policies like unconditional basic income, and less radical ones, like subsidies, can contribute to foster it. On the contrary, a hostile government could even criminalize solidarity-based practices, for example, by accusing those engage on it of evading taxes. This shows that even though this strategy is not based in controlling the capitalist state, those who are willing to change the world still have to engage in state politics. Since SBCN implies peoples' control over production in a full sense, which includes a democratic organization of decision making, the chances of not being co-opted by state institutionalisation are better than other ways of engagement whose prophylaxis lies merely in consciousness rather than in socio-economic self-determination.

Paraphrasing Marx's (2000[1864]:580) assessment of cooperatives, modern production 'may be carried on without the existence of a class of masters employing a class of hands', but the need to develop solidarity-based economy in a transnational dimension, and given the decision of the class of the owners to give their privileges, engaging with state political power is still required. However, the question of the state is not any more posed as a decisive conquest. Instead, it should be regarded as a tactical move oriented to feed the economic base of a new (and higher) order.

References & Bibliography

Albert, M., 2003. *Parecon. Life After Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Berman, S. 2006. *The Primacy of Politics. Social Democracy and the Making of Europe's Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, G. A., 2001. *Karl Marx's Theory of History. A Defence*. First expanded edition. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A., 1999. *Empire*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

– 2009. *Commonwealth*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Holloway, J. 2005. *Change the World Without Taking Power*. 2nd edition. London: Pluto Press.

Holloway, J. and Picciotto, S., 1978. Introduction: Towards a Materialist Theory of the State. In John Holloway and Sol Picciotto (eds.). *State and Capital. A Marxist Debate*. London: Edward Arnold (Publishers), pp. 1-31.

Jones, G. S., 2007. Radicalism and the extra-European world: the case of Karl Marx. In Duncan Bell

(ed.), *Victorian Visions of Global Order. Empire and International Relations IN Nineteenth-Century Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 186-214.

Kellner, D. 1983. Critical Theory, Commodities and the Consumer Society . In: *Theory Culture Society*, 1 (3), pp. 66 -83

Kelty, C. 2008. *Two Bits. The Cultural Significance of Free Software*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Levine, A. and Wright E. O., 1980. Rationality and Class Struggle. In: *New Left Review*, I/123, September-October 1980, pp. 47-68.

Leopold, D., 2007. *The Young Karl Marx. German philosophy, modern politics, and human flourishing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, M. 2008. *The Rise of China and the Demise of the Capitalist World-Economy*. London: Pluto Press

Luhman, N. 1997. Globalization of World Society: How to Conceive of Modern Society? In: *International Review of Sociology*, Vol 7 (1), pp. 67-79.

Mance, E., 1999. *La Colaboración Solidaria como una Alternativa al a Globalización Capitalista*. [html] Available on line: <http://solidarius.com.br/mance/biblioteca/alternativa.htm> [Accessed 18 April 2013].

– 2003a. *Solidarity-Based Cooperation Networks*, [pdf]. Available at: http://www.socioeco.org/bdf/en/corpus_document/fiche-document-1133.html [Accessed

– 2003b. *Solidarity-Based Productive Chains*. [pdf] Available online: http://www.socioeco.org/bdf/en/corpus_document/fiche-document-1105.html [Accessed 19 April 2012]

Marcuse, H. 1991. *One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society* . 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.

Marks, S., 2008. Introduction. In: Susan Marks (ed.). *International Law on the Left. Re-examining Marxist Legacies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-29.

Marx, K. . 2000 [1845]. Theses on Feuerbach. In David McLellan. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

– 1859. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. Translated from German by S.W. Ryazanskaya . [pdf] Available on line: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/> [Accessed 29 March 2013].

– 1862. Marx-Engels Correspondence 1862. Marx To Ludwig Kugelmann In Hanover. Available on line: http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1862/letters/62_12_28.htm [Accessed 2 April, 2013].

– 2000 [1864]. *Inaugural Address to the First International*. In: David McLellan. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 575-582.

– 2000 [1867]. *Capital*. Volume 1. In David McLellan. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

– 2000 [1894]. *Capital*. Volume 3. In David McLellan. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marx, K. and Engels, F., 2000 [1845-6]. The German Ideology. In David McLellan. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 2000 [1848]. The Communist Manifesto. In David McLellan, 2000. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neamtam, N., 2005. The Social Economy: Finding a way between the Market and the State. In: *Policy Options*, July/August 2005, pp 71-76.

Roth, B., 2008. Marxian Insights for the human rights project. In: Susan Marks (ed.). *International Law on the Left. Re-examining Marxist Legacies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 220-251.

Sassen, S., 2006. *Territory, Authority and Rights*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Scout, J., 1998. *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve Human Condition Have Failed*. New Heaven: Yale University Press.

Wallerstein, I., 2003. *The Decline of American Power: The U. S. in a Chaotic World*. New York: New Press.

Wright, E. O., 2009. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. [pdf] Draft available online: <http://bookos.org/dl/1285616/394a5b> [Accessed 20 April 2013].

Zizek, S., 2011. *Catastrophic But Not Serious*. The Graduate Center, CUNY. New York, NY, 4 April 2011. Available on line: http://fora.tv/2011/04/04/Slavoj_Zizek_Catastrophic_But_Not_Serious [Accessed 8 June, 2013].