

THE STRUGGLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

BENJAMIN SELWYN



N300

THE STRUGGLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

BENJAMIN SELWYN

*(B.Selwyn@sussex.ac.uk), professor of International Development,
University of Sussex, UK.*

Published by **Iva Valley Books**

2nd Floor, Labour House

Central Area-Abuja.

07037163465

Iva Valley Books

2ND FLOOR, LABOUR HOUSE, NLC

BUILDING, CENTRAL AREA , ABUJA

BOOKS FOR CHANGING THE WORLD



OPEN
MON-FRI
9AM - 4PM



Chapter One: The Political Economy of Development; Statism or Marxism?

Introduction

The central objective of human development should be to alleviate the condition of the world's poor. The dominant economic ideas of the last 30 years, Neoliberalism, have failed in this regard. State led development appears as the natural and obvious alternative to neoliberalism. Many socialists think that we should use the state to guide economic growth and development in the hope that some of the benefits of this growth will trickle down to the poor masses. The economic growth and industrialisation of formerly underdeveloped areas, in particular China, increases the attraction of state led over free market models of development. However, state led development, like neoliberalism, sees the objective as being economic growth and industrialisation.

Even where this has been particularly successful, in the Asian Tiger countries and China, it has certainly created wealth, but this has been concentrated in the hands of a few. It has not fundamentally changed the lives of the majority of the population and poverty is still common place. There are many other examples where a neoliberal rather than state led development approach has actually achieved economic growth, but this has also not led to significant benefits for the majority of the population. I will consider a case study of Nigeria in this regard.

I want to discuss the merits and demerits of state led development compared with labour led development. From the 1960s onwards, the governments of the East Asian states of South Korea and Taiwan, and now increasingly China, have been able to transform the economies of their countries from predominantly poor, agricultural economies to developed industrialised economies. State led development is represented in much contemporary development studies as constituting an anti-imperialist, pro-poor strategy that enables nations of the Global South to pursue meaningful socio-economic development. For example, according to Ha-Joon Chang, most countries will be better off in the long run with a more activist development strategy than with the bankrupt Washington orthodoxy. However, in many cases the results, even if economic growth is achieved, as in the examples of China and Nigeria, is economic growth that results in rich countries with poor people.

Despite the attractions of state led development to opponents of neoliberalism, I want to argue that state led development, does not represent a genuine developmental alternative to neoliberalism, because it rests upon and requires the repression and exploitation of labour. This represents a fundamental contradiction within state led development – that while it advocates state action to achieve economic growth - which, it is claimed, will improve the lot of the

poor majority - doing so requires the exploitation and repression of these same poor people to compete with other countries.

I also want to argue that Marxism provides an alternative, political economy of development – the political economy of labour or labour led development. This holds that the uplifting and development of the poor – from poverty elimination, to improvements in human development indicators (health, life expectancy, literacy), to participation in, influence and control within and over the economy and the democratic process – must be fought for and can only be achieved by the collective action of the poor themselves.

The fundamental differences between state led development and the labour led development are that the former represents a top-down political economy, in which state authorities in conjunction with capitalist entrepreneurs are identified as the key developmental actors. Their policies are to be achieved through manipulating the labouring classes, with the latter denied any developmental role apart from the provision of their labour power as cheaply as possible – in the so called national interest.

In contrast, labour led development represents a bottom-up political economy, in which the labouring classes are the key developmental actors, and their actions take the form of struggles against capitalist classes and states. State led development has historically been associated with imperialist expansion, while labour led development requires anti-imperialist and internationalist solidarity between labouring classes of different countries. While state led development seeks to establish competitive capitalist economies under the auspices of strong, centralised national states, labour led development seeks to win developmental gains for the labouring classes and the wider poor under capitalism, while generating the movements and institutions capable of overthrowing capitalism nationally and internationally.

Following this introduction, I will discuss the contemporary application of state led development. I will then provide a critique of state led development giving a case study of China. I will then present the alternative of labour led development with the example of labour struggles in Nigeria over the last two decades. This alternative is rooted in Marx's conception of the political economy of labour.

State Led Development: Contemporary Applications

Ha-Joon Chang's *Kicking Away the Ladder: Development Strategy in Historical Perspective* (2002) did much to popularise labour led development. He shows how, in order to accelerate development, developed countries used the same infant industry strategies that they now deny to today's developing countries. Robert Wade, Chang (2002) and Alice Amsden (1990) provide empirical

accounts of how the East Asian state governments of Japan, South Korea and Taiwan purposively managed and facilitated industrialisation and economic growth. These authors demonstrate how the governments of these countries tightly managed foreign trade and foreign direct investment, and how they regulated domestic firms – subjecting them to performance requirements as well as providing supportive subsidies.

In their accounts, these authors dismantle neoliberal explanations of ‘market friendly’ East Asian growth (as argued by the World Bank in its 1991 report). All of these states benefited from preferential incorporation into the United States’ imperial structure. The US assisted their state authorities to combat internal labour opposition and through generous trade agreements, contracts for the US army in the Vietnam War, and military ‘protection’ against the Chinese Communist threat facilitated their national economic development.

Derived from their analysis of successful late industrialising countries, Chang and Grabel (2004: 66–188) propose a set of policies that contemporary developing countries could use to facilitate economic development. These include:

- protection of strategic industries to ensure long-term national growth
- prioritising organisational reforms over privatisation
- prioritising the education of the population and specifically the workforce as a means of stimulating intellectual advance (as opposed to supporting rigorous intellectual property rights)
- tying foreign direct investment (FDI) to a national development strategy, rather than allowing it free rein
- subordinating the financial sector to national development needs via, for example, currency and capital controls and state-directed lending
- using monetary policy to pursue growth rather than (as under the contemporary orthodoxy) to reduce inflation.

State led development provides a more plausible strategy for successful development and industrialisation than neoliberalism. However, state led development also conceives workers’ labour power as just an input for production. In each case, labour is used to generate as much value as possible at the lowest cost. This can only be achieved through labour repression and exploitation.

Atul Kohli (2004) explains that disciplining the labour force, through keeping wages down and precluding or at least minimising the political independence of labour organisations, is necessary for successful industrialisation. This approach both increases capital’s profits, hence enabling further accumulation, and prevents the organised working class from diverting state resources away from

capital accumulation to public health and education, for example. He observes how states such as South Korea successfully combined ‘repression and profits’ where the former “was a key component in enabling private investors... to have a ready supply of cheap, “flexible” and disciplined labour” (Kohli, 2004: 13). In a similar vein, Alice Amsden recognises how “high profits in Korea’s mass-production industries have been derived not merely from investments in machinery and modern work methods ... but also from the world’s longest working week” (1990: 13–14, 18).

These examples of heightened labour exploitation illustrate the uncomfortable disjuncture between the political regimes that state led development aspires to (democratic and liberal) and those they assert are required for industrialisation (authoritarian). Kohli concludes his study by stating that authoritarian regimes are a necessary component of industrialisation, and summarises their core characteristics:

Generally right-wing authoritarian states, they prioritize rapid industrialization as a national goal, are staffed competently, work closely with industrialists, systematically discipline and repress labour, penetrate and control the rural society, and use economic nationalism as a tool of political mobilisation. (Kohli 2004: 381)

Given the unsatisfactory nature of these cases I now want to turn to the really progressive socialist alternative of labour led development.

Labour Led Development

In his analysis of the English industrial working class, Marx developed his conception of the political economy of labour, which had been introduced in his 1864 Inaugural Address to the First International. Here he revealed a rival political economy to that of capital and the state. He began his address by criticising the then (and now) commonly held assumption of the causal relationship between economic growth and enhanced human well-being. Speaking about the English experience, he argued that:

It is a great fact that the misery of the working masses has not diminished from 1848 to 1864, and yet this period is unrivalled for the development of its industry and the growth of commerce. (Marx, 1974a [1864]: 73)

This could also be a good summary of the last 20 years since the military era in Nigeria. There has been massive economic growth, but the majority of poor people are now no better off than they were two decades ago. Rather than capital accumulation generating trickle-down mechanisms leading to distribution of

wealth amongst workers, Marx presented an altogether different picture. In an ideal world for fast-expanding capital:

What the lot of the labouring population would be if everything were left to isolated, individual bargaining, may be easily foreseen. The iron rule of supply and demand, if left unchecked, would speedily reduce the producers of all wealth to a starvation diet. (Marx, 1974b [1867]: 137)

However, workers' organisations contradict these rules and potentially represent an alternative political economy. Collective gains against capital are won through engaging in planned cooperation in order to negate the laws of supply and demand.

Marx's conception of labour-centred development embraced struggles by diverse labouring classes around the world, and their interconnections, for the amelioration of their conditions. For example, he understood the struggles in situations as diverse as colonial Australia, rural Russia, urban Paris (in the form of the Paris Commune), and industrial England as all containing the potential to enhance the livelihoods of these countries' labouring classes under capitalism, but also potentially contributing to struggles that would generate a post-capitalist future (Selwyn, 2013).

In his analysis Marx identified how labouring-class struggles could generate shorter and longer-term developmental gains – where the former entailed better conditions under capitalism and the latter entailed the overthrowing and moving beyond of capitalism. These struggles were, for Marx, inextricably interlinked and united. They unified labouring classes against capital and capitalist states, in the process illuminating the possibilities and the strategies necessary for immediate and longer-term gains. Put differently, these struggles generated the conditions where labouring classes were able to understand their potentially active role in the development process, rather than the passive role allocated to them by both liberal conceptions of development and also by state led development.

The political economy of labour embodies a conception of development that is fundamentally different from, and opposed to, state led development. Marx demonstrated how workers do not need to wait for an unspecified time in the future for benefits to trickle down to them. Moreover, the political economy of labour is one based upon international solidarity, rather than the international competitive accumulation that rests at the heart of state led development. Such solidarity took the form of the support of European working classes for the abolition of slavery, and also the spread of labouring-class organisational forms, such as trade unions and political parties which were then potentially able to

articulate further labouring-class objectives and strategies in other parts of the world.

China – the impact of state led development

Contemporary China illustrates a vivid clash between state led development, in conjunction with private capital, and the conditions of the labouring masses. On the one hand Chinese industrialisation has been based upon the intense exploitation and repression of its vast industrial working class as a source of business profits. China's workers experienced mass lay-offs during the reform of the state-owned enterprises (SOEs) in the 1990s (China Labour Bulletin, 2018) and the ending of the 'iron rice bowl' that guaranteed jobs, housing and health care. In addition, rural migration to the urban areas provides a mass reserve army of labour.

State led development in China is also leading to terrible environmental results. "Seven of the ten most polluted cities in the world are located in China. About 60 percent of the water in China's major river systems is classified as not suitable for human contact. Due to soil erosion and pollution, 40 percent of China's arable land is degraded." (Piovani & Li 2013: 454).

On the other hand Chinese workers are attempting to ameliorate their conditions through direct struggles against private firms and Chinese state agencies with the growth and geographic spread of strikes and other mass actions (China Labour Bulletin 2018).

While China's one-party system leaves little room for dissenting political expression and strikes are formally illegal, Chinese workers have engaged in mass struggles and have been able to defend, and in many cases, improve their conditions. The nature of these struggles had started to change before the recent economic slowdown (China Labour Bulletin, 2012). While the majority of actions are defensive (seeking to retain established rights), offensive actions – seeking to establish new rights, better conditions and better pay – increased, from between 9 and 17 per cent of mass incidents prior to 2010, to around 30 per cent of 'mass incidents' in 2010. One consequence of these struggles is that, as the *Economist* (29 June 2010) reported, manufacturing wages increased by 17 per cent between 2009 and 2010.

As economic growth has slowed down in recent years, strikes have unfortunately become more defensive. Although the number of worker strikes and protests again increased from 1,250 in 2017 to more than 1,700 in 2018, about 80 per cent of these protests were over unpaid wages, with nearly 20 per cent related to factory closures (Shelton and Fang, 2019).

Anthony Phillips (2017) appears to provide a sound argument over the class nature of China. The claim that it is not capitalist is that more than 50% of the economy is controlled by the state and the fact that the tentacles of the Communist Party reach deep into every area of society including private industry. On this basis, a wide range of societies that would certainly have been widely regarded as capitalist during the 20th century would not have been capitalist either.

State led development was a common phenomenon in the developing world in the decades after World War Two. In states that did not necessarily call themselves socialist or non-capitalist, for example, South Korea, the state played a leading role in building up strategic industries with the aim of replacing imports and increasing exports in the same way that the Chinese state is operating today.

The Chinese Communist Party claims to be building socialism with Chinese characteristics. This is like the fine words in the US or Nigerian constitutions, this is propaganda, not the reality of everyday life for most of the citizens. The Chinese Communist Party has not been a workers' party since the defeat of the 1925-27 revolution. It then became a party of peasants led by the urban intelligentsia and its aim became national liberation not socialism. The 1949 revolution was not a socialist or workers' revolution as the working class played little or no role in it.

The new, so called, Peoples' Republic was a bureaucratic state capitalist regime whose aim was rapid primitive accumulation along the lines pioneered by Stalinist Russia with the aim of catching up with the West. Since 1978 the ruling class has opened China up to the market and encouraged foreign development while keeping control of the key levers of the economy. Chinese society today can still be categorised as a form of bureaucratic state capitalism but one in which the ruling class has adapted its strategy for growth as the economy has developed beyond the primitive accumulation stage of the 1950s and 1960s and the international economic environment has changed.

The role of the Chinese Communist Party, while very important, does not on its own tell us what sort of society China is. The key question we must ask is the aim of production the satisfaction of human need or is for profit and accumulation in the interests of the ruling class? In China today, it is clearly the latter, so Chinese society is therefore a variant of capitalism (Phillips, 2017).

Labouring-class struggles are beginning to transform China's political economic landscape. At the moment, state led development is delivering industrialisation and economic growth, but according to the China Labour Bulletin, "the gap between rich and poor keeps on getting wider and wider and even people you

would consider to be middle class in China are struggling to make ends meet" (Shelton and Fang, 2019).

The balance of class power, between labouring-class organisations, the state, and foreign and domestic capital, will determine whether Chinese workers are able to continue to improve their living standards, or whether they will be continually subordinated to the needs of profit maximisation and international competitiveness.

A similar struggle is taking place across the Global South. I now want to consider how this fight is playing out in Nigeria, the largest economy in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mass struggles against Neoliberalism in Nigeria

Nigeria provides another example of economic growth that does not provide any significant benefit for the mass of the population. Some "Marxists" or socialists argue that the state should do more to facilitate the growth of the economy, but distribution of wealth rather than the size of the economy appears to be the key problem. Even without effective state led development the Nigerian economy has grown massively this century.

"Nigeria's economic growth in the 21st century is one of the drivers of the 'Africa Rising' narrative. In the early 2000s, economic growth averaged 7 percent per annum, offsetting economic stagnation of less than 3 percent per annum in the 1990s. In April 2014, Nigeria became Africa's largest economy, and the world's 26th largest economy" (Usman, 2019, page 8).

According to the figures Usman (2019) provides (derived from Nigerian Bureau of Statistics and Central Bank of Nigeria data), the economy tripled in size between 1999 and 2015. This is confirmed by figures from the World Bank based on constant 2010 dollars (<https://tinyurl.com/wgjvjst>). But as importantly, this growth was based on other sectors other than oil so the value of manufacturing output increased by three and a half times and services by four times. As a result, the oil sector as a percentage of the GDP reduced from between a third and a half around 2000 to well less than 10 per cent by 2015 (Usman, 2019).

As a result, the rich elite have become rich beyond their wildest dreams. Aliko Dangoti, the richest person in Nigeria, is also the richest person in Africa, but also richer than anyone in Britain. The ten richest Nigerians are richer than the ten richest South Africans. The rich elite of Nigeria are in the top 30 countries of the world in terms of executive jets. 26 of these turned up at Minna airport for the wedding of a daughter of a former military dictator, Babangida, in May 2017.

The poor majority saw little if any of the benefits from this economic growth. The proportion of the population who were extremely poor actually increased. According to the *National Bureau of Statistics* (2010) the rate of poverty in Nigeria increased from less than 30% in 1980 to almost 70% by 2010, resulting in the number of poor people almost doubling between 1996 and 2010. The Brookings's Institute says that 87 million people in Nigeria are now living in extreme poverty of only a dollar a day. In February 2018, the African Development Bank said 80% Nigerians survive on \$2 a day or less (N720).

Since the end of the last century Nigeria has also benefited from a major wave of working class strikes, with around a dozen general strikes and historically high levels of other strike action. The most successful general strike was in June 2007, when after only four days most of the demands were won. A 15 percent fuel price increase was halted along with a doubling of the rate of VAT (which is only being increased from five percent to 7.5 per cent in 2020). The privatization of two oil refineries was stopped and civil servants gained a 15 percent pay increase. The January 2012 general strike and near national insurrection was the high point of recent working class struggles. Over the course of eight days, the general strike developed into the largest social movement in Nigeria's history. Millions struck and mass protests were held in every major urban centre, from Lagos in the south, to Kano in the north. As result, the planned increase in fuel prices was halved, although more could have been won if the strike had not been suddenly called off by the trade union leadership.

But this history of working class militancy has not been enough, the strikes have not been active enough to really frighten the ruling elite and the trade union leaders have been too ready to compromise before major gains have been won.

The struggles over the minimum wage confirm this problem. After a national strike in 1981, a minimum wage of the equivalent of \$1.28 an hour was implemented. After years of negotiation and at least one short general strike, a minimum wage of only \$0.50 an hour was agreed in 2019. The trade unions have accepted increases in the minimum wage only every five years, although the last increase was made nearly eight years ago, in 2011. After years of negotiation, the trade union leadership were not prepared to lead effective strike action in the run up to the general election in 2019. As a result, a compromise increase was agreed. This will mean a real cut in the value of the minimum wage of around a third compared with the last increase in 2011 and at least two thirds compared to the level won in 1981.

The history of strikes in the university sector also indicates a similar problem. University lecturers have held a serious of often annual strikes since 1999 and in

total they have been on strike for around three years over this period. But the strikes have not been active enough nor have they called for solidarity from other trade unions and the general public. During the three month strike to February 2019, the ASUU leadership did call for weekly general meetings in each university to brief their members and intensify efforts to educate the public. Unfortunately, this did not happen in many, if any, universities and the three month strike was called off in the days before the general election held in March 2019. Yet another agreement was signed between the union and the government, although the sector has a history of governments not implementing such agreements.

Even Oxfam agrees that the problem in Nigeria is inequality rather than the size of the national cake. They show that the Nigerian government is doing less than almost any other government in the world to address this problem. We have had massive economic growth in Nigeria and a well organised working class that has been prepared to flex its muscles. What is needed is a consistent use and strengthening of this approach through the effective application of labour led development.

Conclusion

We have outlined the roots and contemporary applications of state led development. Far from benefiting the majority of the population, state led development is based on labour repression and exploitation. We have shown that state led development suffers from a fundamental contradiction – that an elite few (whether statist political economists, state bureaucrats or private sector companies) want and claim to be able to improve the lot of the poor, but can only do so by exploiting and repressing them.

We have proposed an alternative labour-centred political economy of development, rooted in labour led development based on the day to day struggles for better pay and working conditions for the organised working class and their allies. This is based on the self-activity of labouring classes in their resistance to attempts by states and private capital to increase the level of their exploitation. In contrast, labour led development has the objective of improving workers' lives through improving their wages, shortening the working day, improving the conditions of work, and increasing the democratic control of workers over their labour.

Such objectives directly contradict the objectives of states and private capital who view workers only as inputs to the production process, to be utilised most efficiently at lowest cost. So it is no surprise that open class struggles are particularly visible in the situation of attempted industrialisation whether in

China (state led), Nigeria (private sector led) or other countries of the Global South.

It might be objected that arguing for labouring-class organisations to ameliorate their conditions through class struggles against capital presupposes an already accumulated sum of wealth (held by capital and the state) which can be partly or fully expropriated by labour. If this is correct, then labouring-class organisations in poor countries must bide their time until such wealth has been generated, before struggling to get hold of it.

Such arguments ignore the fact that the establishment of capitalist social relations was and is itself a process and outcome of (successful) class struggles from above, by states and private capital. Within state led development these struggles from above are interpreted as developmental strategies. They are, but only for the state and private capital. They are not developmental for the disposed peasantries or for the 'disciplined' labouring classes. While state led development invites students of development to support such struggles from above, a political economy of labour perspective argues that the peasants and workers who resist their dispossession and subjection to discipline are, in fact, articulating an alternative developmental vision and process.

Just as proponents of capitalist development are clear about their support for the creation of structures which facilitate capital accumulation, so a labour centred conception of development supports labouring-class attempts to extract as many concessions as possible from private capital and the state within capitalism, and their attempts to challenge and supersede capitalism.

The argument that the labouring classes should wait for, or actively assist in, large-scale capital accumulation before pressing their claims upon the state and private capital is one designed (often purposefully) to demobilise workers and to transform them into a commodity-input within the accumulation process. In stark opposition to state led development, the political economy of labour identifies a way of organising the generation, distribution and consumption of social wealth from the perspective of labouring classes, within and potentially beyond capitalism.

Chapter Two: A Manifesto for Socialist Development in the 21st Century

What might a socialist development strategy look like? Mainstream ideas of economic development see capital accumulation as the way to achieve human development. These strategies just see the labouring classes as fuel for the development motor, which in turn justifies their exploitation and oppression. In contrast, what would a non-exploitative socialist development strategy look like? This chapter advances a 10-point plan for sustainable socialist transformation.

Introduction

In early 2017, it was revealed that eight men owned as much wealth as half the world's population (Oxfam 2017). This is in a world where, according to the most conservative figures, around one in three workers live in poverty. More realistic calculations show that the majority of the world's population suffers from poverty of one form or another.¹ These inequalities and deprivations are only one symptom of capitalist development. Others include environmental destruction, systematic racism and gender discrimination.

Whether in Augusto Pinochet's Chile (the laboratory for free-market development in South America) or in Park Chung-hee's South Korea (the most celebrated case of state-led development), capitalist development is founded upon the exploitation and political oppression of labour.² Moreover, capitalist development is based upon environmental ruin and the (re)production of various forms of discrimination.

Theories of capitalist development are united by a common conception of labour as a resource, or as an input into the development process. This is equally the case for the self-stated free-market followers of Neoliberalism as it is for the statist followers of State Led Development. Such approaches are united in viewing the world from the point of view of capital, and they perform a major ideological role in fortifying capitalist development by encouraging the world's poor to do so.

Such capital-centred development perspectives provide support for capitalism in at least four ways:

- (i) they identify capital accumulation as the basis for improvement of the lives of the poor;
- (ii) they identify elites (corporations and/or states) as drivers of capital accumulation;
- (iii) the actions, movements and struggles of the poor are disregarded (that is, not considered developmental), and are often considered to be hindrances to development; and

- (iv) as a consequence of point (iii), elite repression and exploitation of the poor is legitimised, especially when the latter contest capital-centred development.

Is it possible to think of human development as a process that, rather than deepening capitalist exploitation, is based upon its transcendence or elimination? What might such an alternative, socialist, development strategy and agenda look like? Could it also solve problems of environmental destruction and overcome various forms of discrimination? This chapter's aim is to contribute to such a conversation. It does so on the basis of a thought experiment.

Imagine that, in the near future, a labouring class movement, with support from the small farmer/peasant sector, conquers political and economic power in a poor country. This conquest occurs through a combination of parliamentary victories and mass, extra-parliamentary social struggles. Once such a conquest of power has been achieved, how might the previous capitalist economy be transformed into a labouring class economy? What kind of institutions might be established to channel, protect and expand labouring class power? Where would the resources come from to pursue socialist development in a poor country? And what would the socialist development policies look like?

This chapter argues that we need to think about socialist development strategies as beginning in a single country, one that exists within a global capitalist economic system. A socialist development strategy in a poor state must contribute to (i) immediately improving the conditions of the labouring classes within that state; (ii) establishing the foundations for the reproduction and expansion of labouring class power through a newly established state; and (iii) increasing the possibilities for other socialist states to emerge, and to collaborate within (but ultimately beyond) the dominant capitalist system.

This chapter also argues that sufficient material resources to improve the conditions of the labouring classes already exist in poor countries. It is often argued, even within socialist circles, that for socialist development to occur, a strong (capitalist) economic base must first be established. Such arguments are wrong. Strategically, they help to legitimise capitalism and the continued subjection of labour to capital. Analytically, they fail to recognise the very significant amounts of already established wealth which are generated even in poor countries.

The core issue is not the generation of more wealth with which to build a future socialist society. It is, rather, the use of existing wealth to ensure real human development for labouring classes. It is not wealth itself, but the social relations

through which the wealth is generated and distributed that determines the feasibility of socialist development.

What follows advances a vision of development that can be thought of as a minimum utopia- "a form of society which could generally provide for its members the material and social bases of a contented existence from which the gravest social and political evils familiar to us have been removed" (Geras 1999: 44). As will be argued - from the possibilities of widespread wealth redistribution to the 10-point plan for socialist transformation - such a society can be constructed using already existing resources and practices.

The key, however, is to deploy these resources in the context of, and contributing to, new and evolving social relations. The utopian elements in this article are not the policies, tools or practices necessary to generate the social basis for a contented existence. Rather, it is the prospect of new, non-capitalist social relations, that will allow such measures will be pursued. Given the myriad social relations that have existed throughout time and across humanity, it seems worthy to consider the merits of attempting to construct new ones, if they appear more likely to contribute to the establishment of such a contented society.

Intermittent Revolution³

The initial conquest of political power by the labouring classes will not mean the end of capitalism. Rather, it will represent a new, heightened, phase of the struggle for a transition to socialism. It will be undertaken using tools inherited from the past:

It must be kept in mind that the new forces of production and relations of production do not develop out of nothing, nor drop from the sky, nor from the womb of the self-positing Idea; but from within an antithesis to the existing development of production and the inherited, traditional relations of property. (Marx 1993: 278)

There will be numerous companies where capital-labour relations still exist. Large numbers of unemployed workers will be seeking work and incomes. Many households will still, in all probability, be women-led, dependent upon work-based incomes, and orientated towards (re)producing current and future generations of workers. The majority of land will probably be held by a small minority of capitalist farmers and/or landowners. Foreign trade will be taking place on capitalist terms. Financial institutions and their power within the economy will remain highly concentrated. Gender, racial and ethnic discriminations will continue to exist. Democratic institutions will be dysfunctional from the perspective of establishing a genuinely participatory society.

Under such circumstances, the policies and strategies of the new socialist state will need to simultaneously expand and enhance labouring class power, whilst trying to reduce the power of capital. Much time will be required to subordinate capitalist social relations to socialist relations. Precisely because of this drawn-out, contradiction-laden process, it is doubly necessary to consider how an emerging labouring class state can maintain the initial enthusiasm and energy of the classes that have created it, facilitate their enhanced social reproduction, and contribute, at an unknown time in the future, to the global expansion of socialist human development.

The process of enhancing labouring class power can be conceptualised as an intermittent revolution (Tugal 2016). Such transformations will occur over the short, medium and long term, and will take many forms, including the construction of: alternative institutions (cooperatives and communes); alternative means of securing and expanding the means of survival (the production and distribution of food and other basic needs); new systems of participatory education, and the medium and longer-term accumulation of political experience (of defending and extending labouring class power). An outward-looking foreign policy can complement the domestic extension of labouring class power, through collaborating with international social movements to construct solidarity for the new regime (and crucially, to defend it from hostile intervention) and, when opportunities arise, to extend the process internationally of the labouring classes taking power in other countries.

The initial emergence and establishment of a democratic labouring class state in one country is the precondition for the emergence of other such states. And, the global spread of such workers' states is necessary in order to preserve the gains of the first successful workers revolutions over the long run. In all likelihood, there will be a significant time lag between the emergence of the first such state, and its global multiplication. It is within this time lag that a socialist development strategy must be formulated and pursued.

Reabsorption of the State by Society

After studying the experience of the Paris Commune in nineteenth century France, Karl Marx argued that it was "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labour," as it would "serve as a lever for uprooting the economical foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class rule" (Marx 1966 [1871]). He characterised the radical process of changing social relations, and in particular of the relation of state to society as "the reabsorption of the state power by society as its own living forces instead of as forces controlling and subduing it, by the popular masses themselves, forming their own force instead of the organised force of

their suppression-the political form of their social emancipation” (Marx 1966 [1871]).

Societal reabsorption of the state is required to subordinate and transform capitalist social relations. The following three organisational principles can contribute to thinking through how such a transformative process might occur (Lebowitz 2015):

Social ownership of the means of production: Capitalist "[c]ommodity production has been the social form under which the most completely developed system of social interdependence in human history has been achieved" (Barker 1998: 3). However, the means of production are directed autocratically, in accordance with market imperatives of competitive capital accumulation. Such ownership structures deprive workers of any say over how and to what end production is orientated and reduces them to "objects" to be manipulated by managerial "subjects." Social ownership of the means of production, by contrast, would reconstitute decision-making as a collective democratic process.

Labour-led social production: The social ownership of the means of production facilitates the social direction of production through worker-community cooperation. Such cooperation is an essential property of an emergent socialist society for two reasons. First, because it limits, reduces and eventually eliminates production based on autocratic and anarchic competition. Second, because the lifeblood of socialist development is democratic cooperation (within and beyond workplaces).

Identification and satisfaction of communal needs and purposes: Under capitalism rival firms vie to secure competitive advantage. Individual members of the labouring class compete against each other to secure the best jobs. Communally based organisations, within and beyond workplaces represent an alternative logic of social reproduction. The identification and satisfaction of communal needs and purposes will be predicated upon cooperation within and between workplaces and communities. This will also contribute to the transformation of families – by removing their dependence on unpaid women’s labour.

How might these organisational principles be put into practice? A process of decentralised, local-level participatory planning represents one possible method (Harnecker 2014). Under such a system, the social energy generated by planning (drawing up and enacting a plan) flows upwards-from the local to the national level-rather than only downwards by firms and states, as under capitalism. A principle informing such a process is that "everything that can be done at the lower level should be decentralised to this level" (Harnecker 2014). The national

economy will be reorganised towards achieving these objectives. Needs and objectives that cannot be met at the local level will be transmitted upwards, to higher planning bodies, which can be incorporated into more general resource generation and allocation strategies.

The establishment and transmission upwards of democratic planning impulses require appropriate scales of participatory planning. Such different but interdependent scales can be constituted by neighbourhood communities, communes, city/municipality councils national state bodies and ultimately global co-operation (Lebowitz 2015).

Within a neighbourhood community, neighbours can meet regularly to discuss with each other what kind of community they want to live in, and then to identify and coordinate the communities' needs and capabilities of fulfilling those needs. The likelihood of a precise match between community needs and the ability to fulfil those needs is small. The purpose of local-level planning is, in part, therefore, to identify and communicate upwards what additional resources are required and what surplus capacities are available.

The commune combines various neighbourhoods and workplaces. Information from the communities is assembled and discussed within workplaces. Can workers satisfy the needs of the communities which comprise the commune? Under capitalism, where production is orientation towards the generation of exchange values (for profitable sale onto markets) such considerations are secondary (if at all) to those of profit-maximisation. Under an emergent socialist society, the identification of, and attempts to meet, local needs begin the process of substituting use values (goods produced to satisfy labouring class needs) for exchange values. Through communal meetings the councils can generate data on: (i) Needs that can be and are satisfied by and within the community and commune; (ii) needs that cannot be satisfied by the community (which need further assistance from the commune and beyond); (iii) workplaces' surplus capacity (that can contribute to meeting needs of other communities and communes).

Surplus capacity and unmet needs are communicated further up the participatory planning chain to larger-scale units—from communal cities to the national state and ultimately to the global level. As communes draw up their list of needs, their (in)abilities to meet them and their surplus capacities, the national-level state commune can assess how to generate and allocate resources. Where there are excess needs, discussions will revolve around mechanisms to increase output, the (regional or social) reallocation of resources, and/or possibilities for reducing the satisfaction of some needs.

Through decentralised participatory planning participants attain knowledge about resource availability, production and allocation. In her distillation of the experiences of decentralised participatory planning in Brazil, Venezuela and India, Marta Harneker (2014) writes how it represents a double process:

[F]irst the plan, which has been elaborated in a participatory manner; and a second the transformation of people through their practice [It] is an educational process in which those that participate learn to enquire about the causes of things, to respect the opinion of others, to understand that the problems they face are not exclusive to their street or neighbourhood but are related to the overall situation of the economy, the national social situation, and even the international situation. Through this, new relations of solidarity and complementarity are created that place the emphasis on the collective rather than the individual.

Decentralised participatory planning will require some central coordination, and ultimately the power to determine resource allocation. Its extent cannot be determined in the abstract, and would depend on considerations ranging from variations in different communes' abilities to meet their needs, to changing global circumstances.

Reclaiming Social Wealth

The core argument in this section is that the redistribution of wealth through the transformation of social relations represents the fastest means to alleviate poverty, and, in so doing, establishes genuinely progressive possibilities and processes of human development. It is often objected that while such redistribution would contribute to meaningful human development in already-wealthy countries (where the pie to be redistributed is relatively large), it is unlikely to do so in relatively poor countries. These countries, rather, need to accumulate wealth prior to redistributing it, and consequently, they must undergo a process of rapid capitalist development. Non-capitalist development, it is claimed, is thus precluded for one, or many, generations.

Such arguments often take for granted, or simply ignore, ways in which capitalist classes in poor countries are able to accumulate wealth, often offshore, and shield it from national taxation and potentially democratically determined use. For example, a recent study by Ndikumana and Boyce (2011) show how:

[S]ub-Saharan Africa experienced an exodus of more than \$700 billion in capital flight since 1970... Africa is a net creditor to the rest of the world in the sense that its foreign assets exceed its foreign liabilities. But there is a key difference between the two: the assets are in the hands of private Africans, while the liabilities are public, owed by the African people at large through their governments.

This is compared to Africa's \$177 billion in external debts (Ndikumana and Boyce 2011). The Tax Justice Network in 2012 provided data for 139 "mostly low-middle income countries" and noted that

[T]raditional data shows aggregate external debts of \$4.1 trillion at the end of 2010. But take their foreign reserves and unrecorded offshore private wealth into account, and the picture reverses: they had aggregate net debts of minus \$10.1-13.1 trillion... [T]hese countries are big net creditors, not debtors. [However], their assets are held by a few wealthy individuals, while their debts are shouldered by their ordinary people through their governments.⁵

Deborah Rogers and Balint Balazs (2016) demonstrate that in very poor countries, a relatively small distribution of wealth from rich to poor could eliminate poverty:

Using numbers which approximate those of Bangladesh in 1995-96, a redistribution of 3% of the income from the top quintile (reduced from 40.2% to 37.2%) to the bottom quintile (raised from 9.3% to 12.3%) results in a reduction in extreme poverty from 20% to 0%.

In contrast, the dominant view of reducing poverty through economic growth would require enormous growth over the long term:

Attempting to reduce poverty by a similar amount through growth of the economy requires an expansion of total income of approximately 45%. (Rogers and Balazs 2016: 62)

It would also take many generations. Ending global poverty through economic growth alone would take more than 200 years (based on the World Bank's inhumanly low poverty line of \$1.90 a day) and up to 500 years (at a more generous poverty line of \$10 a day) (Hoy and Sumner 2016).

In a similar vein, Chris Hoy and Andy Sumner show how very limited wealth redistribution (through, for example, redirection of fuel subsidies away from their relatively well-off beneficiaries to the poor) can have significant effects: "most developing countries have the financial capacity to end poverty at the \$1.90, or a slightly higher line of \$2.50 and potentially \$5 a day" (Hoy and Sumner 2016: 3).

Our conception of socialist development entails a broader, social, conception of wealth. It includes not just income and money, but the means of producing social wealth itself—from land and workplaces, to the natural environment. Under capitalism, this wealth is socially produced but privately owned. Our objectives

are to transform, radically, the production of society's wealth through socialising its ownership and its democratic direction.

The re-distribution of money wealth represents a necessary first step to eliminating poverty. However, such measures have their limits as wealth distribution requires its prior production. How might a socialist organisation and distribution of the production of social wealth contribute to further improving the conditions of a poor country's population?

A 10-Point Plan

The following discussion comprises a 10-point plan for socialist development. Every case of socialist development will be different, depending on resource base (including poverty levels), the particular constitution (including political alliances) of labouring class power, and crucially, whether they are earlier or later developers (with the latter probably finding themselves in a more favourable international situation due to assistance from earlier socialist developers).

While each form of socialist development will be historically, geographically and socially specific, given the global extent of capitalism they will confront similar challenges. The power of capital will have to be dismantled. The challenge will be to use what is available (inherited from the capitalist past) to construct something new (a socialist future) that addresses the collective needs and aspirations of the labouring classes.

Many of the proposals suggested below are, in the absence of broader social transformation, compatible with capitalism. Some of them have been implemented already . If these policies are compatible with contemporary capitalist development, then why and how could they contribute to socialist development? Whether a policy contributes to capitalist or socialist development depends upon the social relations within which it occurs and the objectives which it serves. Policies can help engender socialist development if they contribute to the radical transformation of social relations. Progressive policies in the absence of social transformation will leave capitalist power intact, ready and able to undermine labouring class gains.

Banks, Money and Economic Democracy

Money and private banks do not represent natural means and institutions for financial intermediation. On the contrary, they contribute directly to capitalism's growth dynamic, to class and regional differentiation, and to the concentration of capitalist power. Money and banks are social resources that can be held publicly or privately. They can serve either democratic or autocratic needs. The global financial system is not simply a mechanism through which money is allocated.

Rather, it is a system of power which guarantees continued flows of global resources towards the Dollar-Wall Street Regime (Gowan 1999).

The first objective will be to cancel what we consider to be odious debts (debts incurred by the previous administration for the benefits of capitalist rather than labouring classes). We will introduce capital controls. Such controls, determined and implemented by a labouring class state will regulate the movement of capital in and out of the country, and are necessary for engendering socialist development strategies (Crotty and Epstein 1996). Such controls will regulate the export of money and finance (to prevent capital flight and subject domestic capital to domestic democratic imperatives). They will also serve to guide foreign investment towards socially dynamic and beneficial ventures, potentially in collaboration with local firms. As capital's exit options (which it uses to extract concessions from labour) are closed down, domestically generated resources which are still held in private hands will be invested domestically, under increasingly democratically determined conditions.

Under capitalism, banks effectively create money through loans (so-called "sight money") (Mellor 2005). These accounts require growth to repay interest (which are typically lower for those who already have accumulated large stocks of money and higher for those without money). Central banks and states enforce the power of private banks by regulating the money supply to ensure that workers can only obtain money through selling their labour power, through (interest-based) loans, or by very limited welfare provision. Under capitalism scarcity is a consequence of class relations-of workers' lack of control over means of producing social wealth. An increasingly democratic society can begin to eliminate this scarcity by socialising finance-by integrating it into emergent cooperative structures, and by gradually replacing money derived from wages with a universal basic income/grant (Standing 2017).

Money will increasingly be conceptualised and function as a public resource, and as an instrument of socialist development (Mellor 2012). A new accounting system-encompassing local- and national-level associations-will calculate (i) the population's basic and extended needs (ranging from food consumption to infrastructure development requirements), and (ii) the nation's available resources. Money will be distributed through state bank accounts to individuals and associations, in order to match societies' resources (from raw material to labour) with its democratically-determined requirements/needs.

Rather than the state relying on taxation to raise and invest money, money will be invested based on calculations of democratically determined need and resource availability. Where too much money is distributed (potentially leading to inflation), public taxation will be used to reduce the money supply. Remaining

commercial banks will be transformed into intermediaries (between depositors and borrowers) and their operating costs will be met by user fees.

A Universal Basic Income

Capitalist exploitation occurs because labouring classes lack the resources (such as money and land) to sustain themselves, and are compelled to sell their labour power for wages. A universal basic income (UBI) can contribute to eliminating this compulsion, the construction of a solidarity-based political economy, and to the socialisation of reproductive labour. It will also, immediately, alleviate many forms of deprivation and poverty.

Cash transfers in poor countries have helped combat poverty. For example, in the 2000s cash transfer programmes in Malawi helped raise school attendance among girls by 40%, and in Namibia, they cut malnutrition (from 42% to 10%) and truancy (from 40% to almost 0%).

The UBIs are affordable even for states with initially limited budgets and large poor populations. Cutting and/or eliminating subsidies to firms that do not produce for the (democratically determined) social good, and to better-off sections of the population can fund such grants initially (Bardhan 2016).

The UBI will have one condition attached to it. Every able-bodied adult recipient will have a duty to carry out some unpaid household work within their communities to support and care for those who are unable to take care of themselves. Only those who already do so will be exempt from the condition. Existing wealth and resources will, through redistribution, generate the increasingly free public provision of caring activities (such as nurseries, old people's homes, communal dining facilities, and basic health facilities).

The UBI will complement such caring arrangements and will contribute to the restructuring of gender- relations by socially recognising and distributing this work amongst the male population, and by reducing the amount of women's domestic reproductive work (Elson 1988).

Industrial Policy for a Green Transformation

The social ownership and direction of industry will contribute to establish socialist development. The radical socialist National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa (NUMSA) argues that the most effective way to democratise the South African economy is by nationalising the lucrative mining sector. It draws on the 1955 Freedom Charter:

The people shall share in the country's wealth! The national wealth of our country, the heritage of South Africans, shall be restored to the people; the mineral wealth beneath the soil, the banks and monopoly industry shall be transferred to the ownership of the people as a whole; all other industry and trade shall be controlled to assist the well-being of the people; all people shall have equal rights to trade where they choose, to manufacture and to enter all trades, crafts and professions. (SAHO 2011)

A socialist industrial policy aims to shift manufacturing away from exchange value (for profit) towards the production of use values (to serve workers' and the wider communities' needs). The transformation will be managed to maintain some foreign exchange earnings to purchase essential goods that cannot be produced locally. It will also aim to shift manufacturing away from fossil fuels and towards renewable energy- based production through investments in the latter. Export-orientated industries will be run by workers' councils, integrated into decentralised planning organisations.

Our industrial policy will seek to generate an appropriate mix of high- and low-tech activities orientated towards the satisfaction of basic (and extended) needs. Large-scale investments will be orientated towards generating a national green-energy generation system-comprising a mix of small-scale solar technology and larger-scale wind turbines connected to a national grid.

Relatively low-tech industrial research and development (R&D) and expansion will focus on areas such as the production and widespread distribution of stove heaters (such as rocket stoves), ceramic water purifiers, solar-powered desalination devices, toilet systems, lighting (for example, gravity-powered lights), solar-heated showers, solar-powered light bulbs, pot-in-pot refrigeration systems, bike-powered water-pumps.

Higher-end technological shifts will include transforming auto-plants into factories producing bicycles, buses and trains; beauty products into health-orientated pharmaceuticals; advertising into popular education, and arms into domestic appliances.

Intersectoral articulation between industry and agriculture will raise productivity in agriculture and establish a dynamic, innovative and adaptive industrial sub-sector. Agricultural-industrial producer forums will be established to identify challenges and ways of meeting them, for example, through yield-enhancing investments in biotechnology.

The state will invest in establishing small-scale workshops in local communities; where possible these workshops will be fitted with 3D printers. Such investments

will make possible the expansion of neighbourhood economies based on appropriate technologies. Community workshops would enable local-level production of many things that were previously only accessible through purchase. They would also serve as recycling centres, locations for surplus exchange, and information exchange (Trainer 1996). A shift away from fossil fuel-powered cars will be stimulated by the mass production and distribution of bicycles, and the construction of cycle paths throughout urban and rural spaces.

State investments in R&D will facilitate technology and knowledge transfers. These will be facilitated and encouraged by non-market forms of exchange, such as open-access and peer-to-peer relations (contemporary examples include Wikipedia, copyleft and various forms of open-sourced softwares).

Agrarian Reform

The global concentration of land is a product of imperialism, capitalist-market imperatives and state support for land-based capital (Akram-Lodhi 2015). This concentration and the prevailing export-orientated agro-industrial "model" of agriculture denies workers access to the land and underpins the existence and expansion of a surplus, unemployed, population. It is also a causal factor in the "paradox" of scarcity (lack of food for large segments of the worlds' poor) within abundance (global overproduction) (McMichael 1994).

The objectives of an agrarian reform are to (i) contribute to the achievement of national food security (where enough food is produced to satisfy the populations' needs), and (ii) to generate high-quality employment. In contrast to the prior examples of pro-capitalist agrarian reform, these objectives serve the goal of de-commodifying land, food and natural resources, and, in so doing, establishing a society where adequate food consumption becomes a real human right.

Such objectives and goals do exist within a system of constraints. In particular, export agriculture often generates foreign exchange for necessary imports that cannot yet be produced domestically. Like the industrial strategy, therefore, the proposals for agrarian reform are based on a conception of a mixed agrarian system. Immediate reforms will include the transformation of ownership of large export-orientated estates-from capitalist owners to workers' cooperatives. These cooperatives will, in conjunction with national objectives, combine export-production for foreign exchange with nationally orientated production for consumption.

The small-scale family farming sector will be preserved, but land would cease to be a (vendible) commodity. The universal basic income would provide social security for workers and family farmers (at times when they cannot produce). Common lands would be preserved and expanded.

The objective of achieving de-commodified food security, where food is a basic human right independent of purchasing power, will be sought through multilevel (from local communities to national state) investments to enhance sustainable, low-input agricultural productivity, and through low- and high-tech R&D.; Low-tech R&D includes facilitating, building and conserving soil fertility, using biological controls for diseases, insects and weeds, intercropping, seed saving and selection, smaller-scale multiple harvesting cycles, and the integration of small-scale pasturing and grazing (Weis 2010: 334). High-tech R&D includes raising productivity through developing new plant varieties. As Kloppenburg (2010: 379) suggests,

"[p]articipatory plant breeding offers a modality through which the labour power of millions of farmers can be synergistically combined with the skills of a much smaller set of plant breeders."

Agrarian reform would extend into urban centres. Unused buildings can be transformed into greenhouses, flat roofs can be used as new growing spaces, unnecessary roads can be transformed into fields, allotments and parks, home gardening will be encouraged and facilitated through provision of inputs, technologies and permaculture education. As Ted Trainer (1996: 139) puts it [m]ost of this urban space can be developed into permaculture forest-gardens, densely packed with mostly perennial plants so that settlements have permanent self-maintaining sources of food and many inputs for small craft producers.

Protecting and Learning from Indigenous Peoples

From "the discovery" of America in 1492 to contemporary globalisation, land-grabbing, dispossession of indigenous peoples and the despoliation of natural environments have underpinned capitalism's geographical expansion (Clarke and Foster 2009). Indigenous peoples have, however, often been at the forefront of opposing capitalist expansion and depredation, and attempting alternative ways to live in conjunction with the natural environment. Joan Martinez-Alier (2003) refers to these struggles as the environmentalism of the poor. Whilst preserving their land and cultural rights, an emergent socialist state will also establish forums to share knowledge and practice between communities. The protection and preservation of indigenous people's right to live according to their practices can potentially inform our conception of socialist development.

In parts of Latin America, the discourse and practice of *sumak kawsay* or *buen vivir* (living well) represents an alternative, potentially anti-capitalist conception of human development. It advocates "living in plenitude, knowing how to live in harmony with cycles of mother Earth, of the cosmos, of life and of history, and in

balance with every form of existence in the state of permanent respect" (Mamani 2010: 32).

Foreign Policy

The foreign policy will be founded upon a dual approach. On the one hand, the guiding principle of external relations is non-aggression and the search for peaceful coexistence with capitalist powers. And on the other, we will establish links with social movements around the globe that strive to transform their societies. The assistance to these movements will consist of the demonstration effect. Information and practical knowledge about short-term successes will be disseminated and will assist social movements and interpret them in the context of longer-term social-transformative objectives.

There will be an attempt to participate in international debates about alternative development strategies, to promote experience, and explain its possibility and the extent of its applicability elsewhere. The objectives will be to (i) strengthen global transformative social movements to help them achieve their objectives, (ii) generate labouring class pressures upon progressive capitalist states (that is, states "governed" by progressive parties) to provide us with development assistance, and (iii) to facilitate similar pressures from below to preclude interventions by hostile capitalist states designed to undermine transformative agenda.

The aim is to raise and promote the cause for a global living wage, form political alliances with movements, organisations and institutions as a means of maintaining pressure for this and related policies, and generating collaborative global networks.

It is also hoped that in the medium-long term other states will undergo a complementary process of social transformation, and these states will be integrated into a global social commonwealth, and knowledge and resources will be constructed and transferred between progressive states.

Economic Foreign Policy

As part of the economic foreign policy, there will be a demand that the international community generates a collective agenda to combat environmental destruction. The perspective will be adopted, in the first instance, from the Climate Justice Now! (CJN!) movement. (The latter was established as a counter- movement to the rich-world-dominated Kyoto Protocol and global environmental agenda of carbon trading, designed to legitimate continued fossil fuel-based industrial expansion.) The CJN! proposes the following, which we believe can contribute to a genuinely progressive global development: (i) Leaving fossil fuels in the ground and investing instead in appropriate energy-

efficiency and safe, clean and community-led renewable energy; (ii) radically reducing wasteful consumption, first and foremost in the north, but also by southern elites; (iii) huge financial transfers from north to south, based on the repayment of climate debts and subject to democratic control. The costs of adaptation and mitigation should be paid for by redirecting military budgets, innovative taxes and debt cancellation; and (iv) rights-based resource conservation that enforces indigenous land rights and promotes peoples' sovereignty over energy, forests, land and water.⁶

The foreign economic policy will be based on the concept of a transitional period of socialist development in a sea of autocratic capitalism. We will, therefore, seek to continue to engage in trade in order to raise foreign exchange to fund the purchase of necessary imports. As noted in point (i) above, capital controls will facilitate a progressive as opposed to competitive integration into the world economy. Development finance from progressive source will be attracted and trade unions, progressive municipalities and states (that is, those led and governed by left-wing forces), and seek to persuade them to invest funds (such as their pension funds) in activities that will further the transformative agenda.⁷ Once other states and regions begin to undertake progressive social transformation, the endeavour should be to generate close cooperative relations with them. Such relations will be determined by the human developmental needs and capacities of this emerging international collectivity (ALBA-TCP 2010).⁸

(i) Foreign trade and investment will be directed by domestic democratic bodies; (ii) special and different treatment: Nations with greater developmental needs and lesser capacities will be granted preferential forms of access to the markets of nations that have greater developmental capacities; (iii) cooperation and solidarity as development cooperation: The collective struggle to raise populations' literacy and quality of health; (iv) establishment of a social emergency fund to assist emergent progressive nations transcend (the inevitable) transitional crises of contested reproduction; and (v) use of collective capacities to enhance our global negotiating positions in areas effecting our future development, including trade and investment rules and environmental and labour standards.

Sharing and Reducing Work

Capitalism is founded on a fundamental paradox. Technological advances have created a situation where only a tiny fraction of most societies' labour is required to fulfil its (basic and advanced) needs. However, private property, competitive capital accumulation and labour's exploitation by capital disable this potential. Proposals one to eight are designed to transform labouring class control over work through (i) transferring control over the means of production to labouring

class organisations, and (ii) changing the content and meaning of work through democratisation.

Initial objectives are to establish full employment for those who can work through the spreading and sharing of work tasks. Longer-term objectives are to use the democratic control over, and social direction of, the means of production to reduce the working day. Through the identification of needs of individual communities and of the nation as a whole, it will become increasingly possible to identify wasteful and/or unnecessary activities and phase them out. Identification of necessary/socially desirable activities will contribute to the direction of our industrial policy. The R&D will be used to establish ways of increasing the efficiency and productivity of socially necessary/desirable activities with the objective of reducing the total working time required to create them.

Gender Equality, Nationalism and Racism

Attempts to generate socialist development will fail unless gender, ethnic and racial discrimination is overcome. In the endeavours to transcend these inequities, the Kurdish independence movement has inspired attempts to create a novel solidarity-based autonomous state in Rojava. The Rojavan Kurds reject the nation state model which, since its foundation has been based on the "othering" of non-native ethnic minorities:

In Rojava, many different religious and ethnic groups-Christians, Yazidis, Arabs, Turkmens, Chechens, Armenians-live together with the large Kurdish majority. By officially and insistently denying the nation state, and by trying to create administrative structures that incorporate these different elements, the Rojava model gives to minorities a participatory role unprecedented in the Middle East-a role as equals in the management of the polis. (Aretaios 2015)

The Rojova autonomous region has established gender equality as an organising principle. Every institution and organisation has a 40% quota for representation of women, 40% for men and the remaining 20% for whichever sex receives the higher number of votes.

From the smallest local organisation to the parliament and government, this 40% quota is imposed and in many cases there is an obligation to have women as co-presidents or vice-presidents. (Aretaios 2015)

Culture as Development

Cultural production and participation under capitalism are based on a dual process of degradation (of indigenous and working class cultures), and then its repackaging and commodification for sale for profit. Under capitalism, culture is established as a separate sphere (of leisure activity) divorced from social

reproductive activities. Through commodification culture becomes a mark of distinction and class differentiation (Bourdieu 1984), whereas prior to degradation/commodification, it represented a form of, and forum for (community) participation. Cultural development will fortify the social ownership and control of the means of production and the democratic identification of needs.

Cultural development will be facilitated, in part, through advanced education for all, based on a radical pedagogy of the oppressed and conscientisation. Conscientisation is the process in which [wo]men, not as recipients, but as knowing subjects achieve a deepening awareness both of the sociocultural reality that shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality. (Freire 1972: 15)

This pedagogy will facilitate the transformation of developmental objects into developmental subjects. State and local investments will support the integration of Conscientisation-based education into the functioning of community-level participatory planning. Indigenous, local, historical cultural traditions will be used to construct new educational traditions. These traditions will contribute to cultural renewal through the de-alienation, defragmentation, and reintegration of social life. New television, radio, print and digital media will be established in order to engender the dissemination of the indigenous and emergent labouring class culture.

Conclusions

Capitalism has established enough wealth on a global scale for a world free of poverty but it can never realise this potential. It is a system of endless competitive capital accumulation, exploitation, oppression, and environmental destruction. These social relations will more certainly wreck the planet, create new forms of mass poverty, and reproduce mega-inequalities than deliver the dream of well-being for all.

Mainstream theories of development may differ on the weight they allocate to markets and states in the development process. They concur, however, that labour exploitation (and repression) are necessary ingredients of capitalist development. In this way, they are based on a fundamental paradox-that while they proclaim their wish for the amelioration of the conditions of the world's poor, they do so by advancing theories and practices that legitimate and facilitate the exploitation of the world's poor.

Socialist approaches must be founded upon the recognition that labour exploitation is anathema to real human development. From this starting point, the question arises of how can a non-exploitative society be constructed? In this

article, I have argued that constructing such a society will be tension-laden, including the very significant difficulty of building a new society using tools from the past. Nevertheless, recognising this tension represents part of the mental preparation required for conceiving of the possibilities of socialist development in the 21st century.

Notes

1 According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), in 2010 there were approximately 942 million working poor (almost one in three workers globally living on under \$2 a day) (ILO 2013). The ILO calculates poverty levels using the World Bank's extremely conservative nominal poverty lines of \$1 and \$2 (purchasing power parity) a day. Many experts on poverty argue that the World Bank's poverty line is much too low, and they recommend that it be raised significantly, so that it is between four and 10 times higher (Edward 2006; Sumner 2016). At these levels, the majority of the world's population lives in poverty.

2 For the Chilean developmental experience under Pinochet, see Taylor (2006) and for South Korea's development experience under Park, see Chang (2002).

3 The term intermittent revolution is derived from Tugal (2016).

4 This section draws heavily from Lebowitz (2015: 183-84) and Harnecker (2014).

5 For report, see Henry (2012); Shaxson et al (2012); Boyce (2011).

6

[http://www.carbontradewatch.org/index.php?option=com_content&task;=view&id=227&Itemid;=95](http://www.carbontradewatch.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=227&Itemid;=95).

7 For example, we will seek to work with movements such as Divest London (<http://divestlondon.org/>) to reorient divested finances into new, progressive activities.

8 These principles are adapted from those established by the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America. See ALBA-TCP (2010).

This pamphlet is based on:

Chapter One: Selwyn, Benjamin (2015) The Political Economy of Development: Statism or Marxism? in Pradella, Lucia and Marois, Thomas (eds) (2015) Polarising Development: Alternatives to Neoliberalism and the Crisis (London: Pluto Press.

Chapter Two: A manifesto for Socialist Development in The 21st Century. Economic and Political Weekly, 53(36).pp. 47-55. ISSN 00129976

This version is available from Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/78868/>

To read more of Ben's ideas see:

Selwyn, Benjamin (2017) The Struggle for Development, Polity Press