

Globalization, Russia and the Left*

TAKIS FOTOPoulos

(27.11.2014)

Abstract: *This article examines the stand of the Left with respect to globalization and shows why it was its intellectual failure to grasp the real significance of a new systemic phenomenon, the rise of the Transnational Corporation and the consequent emergence of the globalization era, as well as its corresponding political bankruptcy, which was the ultimate cause of the rise of the nationalist Right in Europe. This new nationalist right is embraced by most of the victims of globalization all over Europe, particularly the working class that used to support the Left, whilst the latter has effectively embraced not just economic globalization but also political, ideological and cultural globalization and has been fully integrated into the New World Order.*

Globalization, together with the parallel collapse of “actually existing socialism,” defined the New World Order (NWO), which has been established in the last thirty years or so, following the rise of globalization and the parallel collapse of the ex-soviet bloc. Furthermore, it can be shown that the globalization of a capitalist market economy, founded on the mass expansion of Transnational Corporations, (TNCs) can only be neoliberal.¹ In this sense, neoliberalism represents not just a policy change, or a sinister dogma (if not a conspiracy!), as most of the Left asserts today, but a structural change marking the shift to a new form of modernity that was necessary for the efficient functioning of TNCs.

Here, however, we have to distinguish between the antisystemic Left and the reformist Left. The former (mainly of Marxist origin), is characterized by a strategy and tactics based on the aim to overthrow the capitalist system and therefore the World Order as a whole, whereas the latter’s strategy and tactics are based on the aim to reform, or improve, the existing system, even though

* The article is also [published simultaneously in Pravda](#). It was edited by Jonathan Rutherford.

¹ See Takis Fotopoulos, *Ukraine, the Attack on Russia and the Eurasian Union* (published shortly by Progressive Press), ch. 1.

their rhetoric may sometimes refer to the ultimate replacement of the capitalist system and its World Order.

The antisystemic Left, particularly the old Marxist Left (apart from a few enlightened exceptions²) sticks to theoretical tools developed a century ago, and, as a result, failed even to grasp the meaning of globalization itself and the tremendous significance of the rise of a new phenomenon, namely, the transnational corporation, seeing it, instead, as nothing more than the cartels described in Lenin's *Imperialism!* It is not therefore surprising that the same Left never understood the economic reasons motivating the Transnational Elite — i.e. the network of transnational elites running the NWO which are mainly based in the G7 countries. That is, its aim to fully integrate the peripheral countries (apart from their obvious need to control the energy-rich countries of the Middle East that were still run by non-client regimes) into the New World Order defined by neoliberal globalization. It is clear, therefore, that today's antisystemic Left in general, including post-modern "anarchism," which has nothing to do with traditional anti-systemic anarchism and of course the Greens, who today are fully integrated into the NWO (as their full support to all the wars of the Transnational Elite has shown), does not have a clue of these seismic global processes.

However, if the antisystemic Left, despite its outdated theoretical tools, at least questions the capitalist system and also its main economic institutions like the EU, the WTO etc, the reformist Left does not even dare to question such institutions! All they usually do is to question the austerity policies, in an effort to differentiate themselves from the old social democratic parties, which are now fully integrated into the NWO in the form of social liberal parties. Such parties, together with the traditional conservative parties (Christian Democrats, British Conservatives etc.) have formed a solid block for instance in the European Parliament which rules out any significant change in the present neoliberal policies imposed by the TNCs and the NWO for any foreseeable future. This sort of "Left" obviously cannot offer any real alternative to the victims of globalization for two basic reasons.

First, because they are unable to abolish the austerity policies, which are imposed not just by some "baddies" (i.e. neoliberal politicians and economists), but by the logic and the dynamics of an internationalized capitalist market economy in which any significant social controls on markets will undermine

² A very significant neo-Marxist like Leslie Sklair (see his *The Transnational CapitalistClass* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), who attempted to interpret the rise of the new phenomenon of TNCs in terms of a renewed Marxist theory, was largely ignored by the hard core of the Marxist Left, which preferred to stick to the Old Testament, perhaps because this could justify its complete lack of activity against globalization.

competitiveness — the yardstick of success in attracting capital. In such a framework, countries have to compete with each other to attract capital investment, mainly from abroad, through open and liberalized markets that secure the eventual homogenization of real wages and working conditions. It is not therefore surprising that no social democratic or Left government in Europe has managed to discard neoliberal policies in the NWO and therefore Keynesian and post-Keynesian policies are by definition ruled out. This is why the reformist Left is dead in Europe (apart from the exceptional cases of Spain and Greece we shall see below) and the only reason why social democratic parties still survive in various European countries is because they have become social-liberal parties, i.e. a kind of hybrid parties of “socialist” rhetoric and neoliberal practice which, in power, they implement the same policies with some inessential variations, — sometimes even in coalition with conservative parties. It is the same solid bloc of conservative and social liberal parties, which control the EU and the Eurozone and rule out any alternative policies to the current economic policies. Such policies have brought about either mass open unemployment even in peripheral European countries like Spain and Greece reaching a quarter of the population and over half the young population, or disguised unemployment in various forms: zero contract hours, mass part-time or occasional employment, frozen real wages for those “lucky” to have something looking like full employment, as in Britain and US, etc.

Second, because even if they were able to abolish the austerity policies, as long as they continue to be members of economic organizations like the EU, they will still be bounded by catastrophic neoliberal commitments. Even more so if they are also members of the Eurozone, when they do not control even their own currency, which is controlled instead directly by the Transnational Elite, through its European members and mainly the German elite. This is because as EU members they are bounded by the Maastricht Treaty, and subsequent Treaties that complement it, to adopt all structural reforms institutionalizing neoliberal globalization and in particular the opening and liberalization of the “four markets,” i.e. the markets for capital, labor, goods and services. These are the policies implemented at the moment all over the EU and, of course — through the Transnational Elite — all over the world, as far as countries integrated into the NWO of neoliberal globalization is concerned, including those supposedly aiming at creating an alternative pole to it, like the G20, which have just signed a communiqué celebrating the same principles.³

In this sense, the supposed resurgence of the reformist Left in countries like Spain and Greece, through the rising parties of Podemos and Syriza respectively, is in effect another political bubble due to burst as soon as they

³ “Russia at the crossroads”, *Pravda.ru* (20/11/2014).

come to power. Not surprisingly this kind of Left was promoted even by one of the main organs of Transnational Elite, the *Financial Times*, which presented it as “radical” Left.⁴ Of course, there is nothing radical about these two parties, which not only never questioned the EU itself but also never dared to commit themselves unequivocally to an exit from the Eurozone — although an exit from the Eurozone that is not accompanied by an exit from the EU is almost equally catastrophic. It is therefore clear that this kind of Left plays an obviously disorienting role when it just attacks the austerity policies, which, however, are simply the inevitable side effect of integration into the NWO and the consequent adoption of neoliberal globalization. It should not be forgotten anyway that significant social democrats before them, representing important core countries like France and Germany, had also tried to reverse neoliberal policies and either had been forced to a quick about turn (Francois Mitterrand, Francois Hollande) or were even thrown out of the government (Oscar Lafontaine). Neither of course does the argument of Podemos and Syriza that now the Euro-elites will have to reverse neoliberal policies — as they face the risk of real anti-EU parties coming into power — have any validity. In fact, no government in power in any country fully integrated into the NWO has any choice but to implement the present neoliberal policies. Therefore, no Podemos or Syriza will ever be able to implement strict social controls on markets, despite their deceiving rhetoric and all they can secure is a kind of growth like the present one in Britain, where open mass unemployment has simply been replaced with disguised unemployment and frozen wages.⁵

The inevitable result of this dismal failure of the Left was the emergence of a new nationalist Right in Europe that is fighting for the exit from the EU. This, apart, of course, from the strange case of Ukrainian neo-Nazis, who claim to be nationalists opposing the EU, and yet have been fully backed and financed by the EU and the US in fighting the Russians and the Eurasian Union—i.e. the only potential real alternative global power centre to the present monopoly of power of the Transnational Elite! In other words, the nationalist Right, (everywhere else apart from Ukraine!) simply filled the huge gap left by this bankrupt Left which, instead of placing itself in the front line of all those peoples fighting globalization and the phasing out of their economic and national sovereignty, used arguments based on an anachronistic internationalism to justify globalization, from a supposedly Marxist standpoint.

⁴ Wolfgang Münchau, “Radical left is right about Europe’s debt”, *Financial Times* (23/11/2014).

⁵ see e.g. “Low-paid Britons now number five million, think tank concludes”, *BBC News* (26/10/2014) and “Lowest paid stuck in ‘poverty trap’ as UK govt mulls fresh £30bn austerity round”, *RT* (11/2014).

The new nationalist Right is embraced by most of the victims of globalization all over Europe, particularly the working class which used to support the Left,⁶ whilst the latter has effectively embraced not just economic globalization but also political, ideological and cultural globalization and has been fully integrated into the NOW — a defining moment in its present intellectual and political bankruptcy. The process of bankruptcy of the Left has been further enhanced by the fact that, faced with a political collapse in the May 2014 elections for a Euro-parliament, it has allied with the elites in condemning these nationalist parties (which sometimes do use neo-nazi rhetoric), as fascist and neo-Nazis, even consenting to the use of blatantly fascist methods in order to suppress some of them (as e.g. in Greece). Yet, the only real neo-Nazis in Europe today, both in terms of their history and ideology but also in terms of their practice, are the Ukrainian neo-Nazis, who, however, have been fully supported by the Transnational Elite and (paradoxically?) even by the Zionist elite⁷ (despite their clear anti-Semitism!) in achieving regime change and the conversion of Ukraine into an EU protectorate.

However, there is nothing surprising about this stand of the Transnational Elite, which had also allied with the Taliban in Afghanistan with the aim to defeat the Soviet army, and then with the criminal jihadists in Libya and Syria, in order to overthrow the national liberation regimes in these countries (the well known ISIS presently under attack by the Transnational Elite). But, there is an important implication of this, which has to be stressed. The rise to power of a real fascist or neo-Nazi party today is impossible for any country that is fully integrated into the NWO. This is because real fascism and Nazism were historical phenomena of the era of nation-states before the globalization era, which had a significant degree of national and economic sovereignty. But in the globalization era it is exactly this sovereignty, which is impossible for any country fully integrated into the NWO. This implies that the only kind of "fascism" possible today is the pseudo-fascism, which is supported by the Transnational Elite itself, as the case of Ukraine clearly had showed!

It is therefore clear that the aim of the Transnational Elite that administers the NWO is to convert nation-states, through the phasing out of their economic and national sovereignty, into, at best, some sort of "local authorities" within a system of global governance, or, at worst, a kind of informal protectorates (as e.g. Greece). Therefore, today's social struggle is not anymore just a struggle for social liberation, as it used to be in the past but, also, a struggle for national liberation. This does not of course mean the return to an era of nation-states

⁶ Francis Elliott et al. "Working class prefers Ukip to Labour", *The Times* (25/11/2014).

⁷ "Communists seek Jewish denouncement of oligarch over E. Ukraine raid sponsorship", RT (07/11/2014).

fighting each other for economic reasons (the division of markets) or geopolitical reasons. It could mean instead the creation of a new democratic world order like the one I described elsewhere,⁸ and the process for the development of a Eurasian Union of sovereign peoples could potentially play a crucial role towards it. This process has of course nothing to do with "a reordering of world affairs based on 'spheres of influence'," as ideologists of neoliberal globalization and promoters of the plan for world governance argue, in an obvious attempt to denigrate the struggle of peoples for sovereignty⁹ and self determination. Some could argue here that the risk may arise in such a scenario that, when a nation breaks from the NWO, new forces may emerge that could use the recovered national-economic sovereignty in order to implement e.g. racist policies on the population. However, one wonders whether such arguments can still be supported today when the supposed democratic beacons of the globalization era, the US and Israel, have clearly shown their true racist face: the former, when on top of the intrinsic economic violence against the Afro-Americans it now shows that the built-in physical violence against them has never stopped (although usually covert at present), while the latter has now legislated the second rate status of the indigenous population, the Palestinians.

The case of Ukraine is particularly important, as it not only highlighted the unipolar nature of the present world order, as expressed by the "world community" (i.e. the Transnational Elite plus the associated client elites), but, also because it may well herald the end of the present world order and the emergence of a new bi-polar world. On the other hand, the anachronistic Left, lacking any theory of globalization, was in no position to explain how the Transnational Elite was able to impose a complete political, economic and ideological isolation of Russia, simply because it dared to object to its plans to fully integrate Ukraine into the NWO through the EU. No wonder the same "Left" resorted to century-old anachronisms about inter-imperialist conflicts to interpret the present decisive world conflict, which culminated with the Ukraine coup.

Yet, it was hardly a difficult task for the Transnational Elite to ostracize Russia, given that, following the collapse of "actually existing socialism" and the parallel bankruptcy of the Left, it controls far more than just the world economy — through the TNCs. It controls also:

⁸ "Towards a new Democratic World Order", *Pravda.ru* (03/11/2014).

⁹ Gideon Rachman, "China, Russia and the Sinatra doctrine", *The Financial Times* (24/11/2014).

- the world polity, through its protectorates and semi-protectorates it has set up all over the world, and the international institutions of various kinds it influences (from the UN up to international tribunals e.tc.);
- the world ideology and the perception of reality itself, through its control, via the TNCs, of world mass media, international Universities and research centers, think tanks, NGOs etc;
- the world culture, through its control of the production and distribution of cultural commodities.

Last but not least, the Transnational Elite has secured the effective tolerance of the anachronistic "Left" in its wars and engineered insurrections, as the Left's stand on these issues is, at best, a stand of keeping "equal distances" between the competing "imperialisms," and, at worst, of open support for the supposed "revolutionaries" in Syria, Libya e.tc, as Trotskyites and "libertarians" of various sorts did. Not surprisingly, this stand potentially leaves the Transnational Elite free to destroy the last significant attempt for effective resistance against the NWO, through the creation of an alternative global pole of sovereign nations, as the Eurasian Union was originally conceived. Yet, national and economic sovereignty is the necessary condition (though not a sufficient condition as well) for any systemic change — which is still supposed to be the aim of the Left!

P.S. In my article on "[the internet and freedom of speech](#)," I referred to the case of political slandering as one of the worst forms of abuse of the freedom of speech, supposedly provided by the internet. It seems now that a mud slinger, who happens also to be a proud member of the International Organization for a Participatory Society (IOPS), was so inspired by this article as to write in the social media that I am now "writing for and receiving money" from "the bloody paper of the Russian Communist Party" (i.e. Pravda), and that this does make me "a stooge of a section of the Russian elite" (sic!) As, "by coincidence," [I criticized in the past this particular political project \(without ever receiving a reply to it\)](#), I hope that this does not mean that this sort of "Left" has now resorted to mud slinging to attack its critics!