PROOF

Part IV
Alternative Forms of Politics

11
Alternative Policy Groups and Transnational Counter-Hegemonic Struggle

William K. Carroll

In *Global Slump: The Economics and Politics of Crisis and Resistance*, David McNally observes:

> Periods of enduring crisis and sporadic resistance are complex and danger-ous. Desperation, anxiety, and hopelessness preside. The dominant class seems no longer to believe in itself. Rarely does it bother to espouse lofty ideals like freedom and betterment of the human condition . . . Rather than trying to inspire belief in their system, society's rulers seem to have no higher purpose than maintaining the status quo, squeezing profit and privilege out of a decrepit but well protected machinery of power . . . . Naked money-grubbing, mercenary politics, and the uncon-cealed use of force in the service of power are the order of the day. Governments seem content to attack the population; the rich live merely to get richer. In all these ways, the decade of austerity becomes one of social and cultural regression.
>
> (2011: 187–8)

McNally is describing the organic crisis of our time. Such a crisis, as Antonio Gramsci (1971: 276) famously wrote, 'consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear' (cf. Gill 2012c: 234[1]). Organic crisis not only problematizes ruling-class visions and strategies while deepening the sense of despair. As old ways become unviable and as conditions of life deteriorate, popular discontent fuels outbreaks of protest which, however, stall for lack of organizational infrastructure and radical vision. Neoliberalism, as McNally (2011: 189) holds, may well be incapable of summoning up a compelling vision of the future, but much the same can be said of the Left, at least in its social-democratic guise. In an era when space opens for a radical imaginary that might posit a clear alternative to neoliberal globalization, where are

259

PROOF

the sites for such collective imagining, and how might their activities be integrated with the agency of movements?

This chapter focuses on an emergent component of global civil society: *transnational alternative policy groups* (TAPGs) that research and promote democratic alternatives to neoliberal globalization. Since the 1970s, an increasingly crisis-ridden economic globalization has fuelled concerns in the global North that democracy is being hollowed out as governments lose capacity to pursue policies that stray from what has been called the corporate agenda, even as democratic forces and practices within a number of Southern states have recently strengthened due to pressure from below – as in Latin America's 'pink tide' and the Middle East's 'Arab Spring'. Indeed, as neoliberal globalization have reshaped the political-economic terrain, North and South, transnational movements have developed as advocates of a 'democratic globalization' that endeavours to enrich human relations across space by empowering communities and citizens to participate in the full range of decisions that govern their lives (Chase-Dunn 2002; Munck 2010; Smith 2008; Smith and Wiest 2012). Alongside and in symbiosis with these movements, TAPGs have emerged – 'think tanks' that research and promote democratic alternatives to the corporate agenda of top-down globalization.

As collective intellectuals of alter-globalization, these are think tanks of a different sort from the conventional ones that advise political and corporate elites. Groups such as the Third World Institute (ITeM, Montevideo), the Centre de recherche et d'information pour le développement (Paris), the Transnational Institute (Amsterdam), and Focus on the Global South (Bangkok) create knowledge that challenges existing corporate priorities and state policies, and that advocates alternative ways of organizing economic, political, and cultural life. They disseminate this knowledge not only via mainstream media venues but through activist networks and alternative media, and they often work collaboratively with social movements in implementing these alternative ideas. This chapter provides a preliminary analysis, and addresses some of the challenges they face as transnational counter-hegemonic actors on the contested terrain of global civil society.

Global civil society has been defined as 'the realm of non-coercive collective action around shared interests and values that operates beyond the boundaries of nation states' (Glasius, Kaldor and H. Anheier 2006: v). Often idealized as a coherent collection of world citizens moving forward towards social justice, global civil society is more accurately viewed as a field of conflict and struggle, distinct from the global economy and the inter-state system yet internally related to both. Although transnational networks underwriting imagined international communities reach back to the late seventeenth-century networks of Freemasons (Van der Pijl 1998), only recently has global civil society been recognized as a 'terrain for legitimizing and challenging global governance', a 'discursive space'

(Ford 2003: 129) that helps reproduce global hegemony while offering a foothold to counter-hegemonic politics (cf. Fraser 2005; Keane 2003; Munck 2006).

This terrain has long been dominated by a cosmopolitan bourgeoisie, reflecting the superior material and cultural resources of a dominant class (Van der Pijl 1998). In the twentieth century a network of business-oriented think tanks and policy groups entered the field, including the Mont Pèlerin Society and Trilateral Commission. Such hegemonic policy groups have been the object of extensive research (Gill 1990; Carroll and Carson 2003; Mirowski and Plehwe 2009; Carroll and Sapinski 2010) that has under-scored their importance as sites of conventional knowledge production and mobilization (KPM), sometimes known as 'policy-planning' (Domhoff 2006). By the century's closing decades a new breed of 'advocacy think tanks' (Abelson 1995) were actively shaping the neoliberal project of market-centred society (Macartney 2008; Stone 2000). Widely implemented in the 1980s and 1990s as the political complement to economic globalization, neoliberalism tended to increase economic disparities and to degrade public goods while thinning the social basis for political consent and expanding the range of disaffected social interests (Cox 1987; Gill 1995b; Teeple 2000). By the mid-1990s neoliberal policies had provoked a variegated grassroots politics of 'alter-globalization' – resisting the 'corporate agenda' but also putting forward democratic alternatives (Coburn 2010; Smith 2008).

Some have seen in these developments a nascent counter-hegemonic bloc (Carroll 2006; Chase-Dunn 2002; Gill 2000), but this view is hardly unani-mous (Day 2005; Stephen 2009). Indeed, in the decade since George W. Bush declared a war on terror much of the impetus for alter-globalization was first redirected into a massive anti-war movement in 2002–03 and then seemed to dissipate into a continuing series of anti-G8/G20 protests. The pattern, as noted in our opening quotation, has been one of sporadic resistance – campaigns that tend to stall for lack of organization and shared vision. The series of breath-taking popular struggles of 2011, focused around the militant occupation of urban space – which took on global proportions as it cascaded from Tahrir Square through Madrid to New York and scores of other cities – offers a vivid example, which is not to say that the Occupy movement was without impact, whether political or cultural. Among the problems faced by alter-globalization movements is that of *counter-hegemonic* KPM – the pro-duction and promulgation of alternative strategies and visions that, as taken up in practice, might foster a cathartic shift from the fragmented resistances typical of subalternity to a shared ethico-political project that can become 'a source of new initiatives' (Gramsci 1971: 367). The groups investigated in this research aspire to such counter-hegemonic KPM. They have furnished intellectual leadership for transnational movements and have taken up a unique yet problematic niche within the organizational ecology (Hunt and Aldrich 1998) of global justice politics.

PROOF

My focus here is on specifically *transnational* alternative policy groups that *pose their politics globally*. These groups are the counter-hegemonic response to such transnational hegemonic initiatives as the International Chamber of Commerce, Trilateral Commission and World Business Council for Sustainable Development.

The changing terrain of contention

Counter-hegemony arises on a terrain shaped not only by the contradictions of class society but by the hegemonic practices and visions of the dominant historical bloc. To understand the counter-hegemonic projects that TAPGs pursue, we must first consider how hegemony is secured and maintained within late capitalism. As Fred Block (1977) observed some years ago, within capitalism a key aspect of hegemony is that the ruling class does not rule. Instead, its core interests, always in alliance with other social groups and institutions, are articulated through the agency of organic intellectuals, whose ranks include business leaders and many other organizers of practical life. Such intellectuals are 'organic' in a double sense: they are 'organizers' of an advanced capitalist way of life and their intellectual work is functionally – organically – predicated on the dominance of capital in human affairs (Vacca 1982: 62–3). The history of conventional think tanks forms part of this story of class formation from above. Linked into the circuitry of policy networks, mainstream media and corporate elites, think tanks of the right and centre have become important sites of knowledge production and mobilization in the construction of a neoliberal discursive field (Carroll and Shaw 2001; Mirowski and Plehwe 2009). Moreover, these collective intellectuals continue to proliferate. The hard right Atlas Network fosters and supports more than 400 market-oriented think tanks around the world, most of them nationally focused; the Ottawa-based Think Tank Initiative, hosted by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), has since its establishment in 2008 funded 52 think tanks in 23 Southern countries.[2]

Set against the many high-profile purveyors of hegemonic policy, sites of cognitive praxis[3] 'from below' have been slower to form, much more modestly resourced, and until recently, have tended to focus on national theatres of political contention. All this reflects the difficulties in moving from subalternity to counter-hegemony. Think tanks of the right and centre have deep roots in the development of twentieth- century capitalism, with its rationalization of management, administration, planning and policy. In contrast, TAPGs are a recent invention. For instance, Canada's main nationally oriented left think tank, the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, was founded (as an informal network) in 1980, and it was not until 1997 that the more transnationally oriented Polaris Institute, also based in Ottawa, emerged.

In a formal sense, TAPGs resemble such advocacy think tanks as the Fraser Institute: they provide intellectual leadership through research, analysis and knowledge mobilization. Yet they differ qualitatively from their conservative counterparts in three respects (see Table 11.1).

Substantively, hard-right policy groups advocate what Hayek (1976) called a market-driven politics of 'plain justice' (Carroll 2007); even mainstream policy groups advocate no more than a new regulatory regime within a neoliberal framework (Carroll and Carson 2003). TAPGs, on the other hand, are proponents of what Nancy Fraser (2005; 2010) has termed 'global justice', that combining claims for redistribution, recognition, representation, and indeed ecological salvation (Carroll and Ratner 2010).

Procedurally, hegemonic think tanks conduct policy research and engage primarily with elite political and business circles and corporate media sustaining a network of alliances or historical bloc supporting neoliberal capitalism (Stone 2000). For TAPGs, advocacy takes the form not of conventional liberal politics but of participatory democratic praxis – in

Table 11.1   Neoliberal and transnational alternative policy groups as sites of KPM

Elements in KPM	Conventional neoliberal think tanks	Transnational alternative policy groups	Challenges for TAPGs
Substantive practice	Advocate, through KPM, 'plain justice' of the market	Advocate, through KPM, global justice and ecological salvation	Global justice contradicts 'common sense;' namely, plain justice and the regnant inter-state system.
Procedural aspects	conduct policy research and engage with elite political and business circles and corporate media	Create and mobilize veridical knowledge through participatory democratic praxis; cultivate counter-publics	Dialogical, polycentric communication and participatory KPM are less efficient than instrumental, state-centred KPM, yet TAPGs have shallow pockets.
Orientation toward future	Design and promote policies to replicate parameters of the existing way of life while solving immediate problems	Prefiguration: identify and advocate practices and relations that prefigure alternative futures	Replicating the status quo trades easily on reified assumptions of permanence; prefiguration requires strong powers of imagination and persuasion.

dialogue with movements with the intent of strengthening the capacity of counter-hegemonic publics to challenge the common sense of the day.

Finally, compared to their conventional counterparts, TAPGs are involved in *prefigurative* politics – attempting to bring new, participatory democratic practices into existence or to fruition. This implies a critical epistemology and ontology: an approach to inquiry and knowledge production that explores the alternative futures that already inhabit the present, and that considers how these elements of socio-political reality can be nurtured (Ollman 2003). The emphasis on prefiguration also distinguishes TAPGs from protest groups that in directing their limited resources to resistance and opposition often lack capacity to be proactive. In this sense, TAPGs can be seen as *catalysts* in the shift from a reactive politics of protest (as in the 1999 'Battle in Seattle' Gill 2000; Glassman 2002) to what Michelle Williams (2008) calls a 'generative politics of counter-hegemony' that seeks to transform state and economy by developing new institutions, organizations, and political actors rooted in an empowered civil society.

Each of these tasks raises challenges which are amplified by the perennial dearth of funds that is the predicament of most anti-capitalist groups. *Substantively*, the call for global justice challenges well-entrenched identifications of politics with sovereign states and goes against the grain of 'plain justice' and market civilization (Gill 1995a), which as neoliberalism has penetrated everyday life have taken on a veneer of common sense. The Westphalian 'partitioning of political space along territorial lines insulates extra and non-territorial powers from the reach of justice' (Fraser 2005: 81) while containing political identities within national borders. Within this political-economic configuration, the call for global justice may appear both unrealistic and irrelevant, and may thus fail to resonate with many people. In comparison with conventional think tanks, which trade effortlessly upon established verities of markets and states, TAPGs face a continuing uphill struggle to establish the credibility of their basic ethico-political claims.

Procedurally, dialogical communicative practices that nurture a network for democratic globalization are difficult to build and maintain. Participatory approaches are less efficient than positivist methods (St. Denis 2004) and yield knowledge whose qualitative richness is difficult to communicate in the sound bites of mainstream media. Alternative media may be more accommodating, but reach far smaller publics. Finally, the address of social movements is polycentric, and far more complicated than state-centred lobbying and interest group politics.

The commitment to *prefiguration* also brings special challenges. Conventional policy groups rely on existing structures of transnational capitalism, and consider how those structures can be replicated and extended more efficiently or with less harmful human and ecological consequences, typically through market mechanisms – free trade agreements, carbon trading, poverty reduction strategies, 3P arrangements and the like. Even when the market fails, backstopping the project is the widespread belief that, as

Margaret Thatcher put it, 'there is no alternative'. TAPGs advocate and nurture alternatives that break from hegemonic forms. This requires powers of creativity, imagination and persuasion, combined with sober appraisal of the possibilities for living otherwise that are opening up in this era of organic crisis.

Very schematically, we can conceptualize think tanks of the left and right as embedded in opposing historical blocs or as Smith (2008) puts it, global networks. Each organization develops and deploys knowledge with the strategic intent to make its bloc more coherent and effective; that is, it exercises a kind of leadership. Concretely, this entails quite different practices. Neoliberal leadership operates 'from the "top down" [and] seeks to stabilize power structures and strategies of rule, albeit with some marginal modifications under crisis conditions in ways that do not fundamentally challenge the dominant modes of accumulation and power' (Gill 2012a: 3). Neoliberal think tanks, firmly committed to capitalism and hierarchy as principles of economic and political organization, fit easily into existing elite structures: their messages, strategically focused on well-formed policy networks, are routinely conveyed by like-minded corporate media (Hackett and Zhao 1999). TAPGs, on the other hand, as collective intellectuals of an incipient global left, face the challenge of reaching a massive, diverse potential constituency and creating new political methodologies that go against the grain in giving shape to emergent oppositional practices (Carroll 2007).

Below, I do some of the spade work for researching the role of transnational alternative policy groups within alter-globalization politics. The objective is to explore, in the practices and discourses of these groups, some of the paradoxes of counter-hegemonic knowledge production and mobilization, particularly in the context of the contemporary economic and ecological crisis.

A preliminary judgement sample

This research programme is in its early days. My focus here is on a judgement sample of 16 major TAPGs, each of which satisfies these criteria:

- independence from states (each group is constituted as an NGO or network of NGOs, although it may accept funding from state or intergovernmental organizations[4]);
- a core function of knowledge production and mobilization (KPM) that challenges existing political-economic hegemonies and that presents alternatives, creates new paradigms, and so forth;
- a significant part of that KPM takes up transnational issues and speaks to transnational publics;
- the group engages a wide range of issues (it is not specialized in one domain such as water, trade or capital-labour relations).

A number of important groups come close to satisfying these criteria, and as this research programme develops we will widen the net to include them.

Table 11.2 offers a temporally sequenced description of the 16 TAPGs. Four groups formed in the mid-1970s, at the culmination of the 1960s protest

Table 11.2 Judgement sample of 16 TAPGs

Est'd	Name	Acronym	On WSF IC
1974	Transnational Institute (Amsterdam) http://www.tni.org/	TNI	YES
1975	Third World Forum (Dakar) http://www.forumtiersmonde.net/fren	TWF	*
1976	Tricontinental Centre (Lauvain-la-Neuve, Belgium) http://www.cetri.be/	CETRI	YES
1976	Centre de Recherche et d'Information pour le Developpement http://www.crid.asso.fr	CRID	YES
1984	Third World Network (Penang) http://www.twnside.org.sg/twnintro.htm	TWN	YES
1984	Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (Manila) http://www.dawnnet.org/	DAWN	YES
1989	Instituto del Tercer Mundo (Third World Institute) (Montevideo) http://www.item.org.uy/	ITeM	YES
1990	Rosa Luxemburg Foundation (Berlin) http://www.rosalux.de/english/foundation	RLF	
1994	International Forum on Globalization (San Francisco) http://www.ifg.org/	IFG	YES
1995	Focus on the Global South (Bangkok) http://www.focusweb.org/	FGS	YES
1995	ZCom (Woods Hole, Mass, USA) http://www.zcommunications.org/	ZCOM	YES
1997	Network Institute for Global Democratization (Helsinki) http://www.nigd.org/	NIGD	YES
1998	People's Plan Study Group (Tokyo) http://www.ppjaponesia.org/index.php	PPSG	
2001	Centre for Civil Society (Durban) http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za	CCS	
2005	Alternatives International (Montreal) http://www.alterinter.org/	ALTINT	YES
2005	India Institute for Critical Action: Centre in Movement (New Delhi) http://cacim.net	CACIM	

*Participates on World Social Forum International Council (WSF IC) through World Forum for Alternatives, a joint venture with CETRI.

wave, and as the crisis of the post-war era set in. The Transnational Institute (TNI), initially the international branch of the Institute for Policy Studies (based in Washington DC), was created in 1974 as 'an international network of scholar-activists committed to social change',[5] but also as a defensive response to Chile's 9/11 – the Pinochet coup of 1973. The Dakar-based Third World Forum emerged in 1975. It has pursued a proactive political agenda, informed by Samir Amin's Marxist reformulation of dependency theory and emphasizing the strategy of 'de-linking' from global capitalism. Belgian-based Tricontinental Centre (CETRI) and Paris-based *Centre Recherche et d'information pour le developpement* (CRID) also were established with Third World foci, expressing the strong anti-imperialist thrust of the 1960s protest wave.

In the 1980s, three groups based in the global South formed. The Third World Network (TWN) and DAWN – Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era – were established in 1984, the former in Malaysia, the latter initially in Bangalore, India (currently based in Manila). The TWN grew out of a national consumers association; DAWN was established as a global network of feminist activist intellectuals of the South. The 1980s was prime time for consolidation, in much of the global North, of neoliberalism and the so-called Washington Consensus (Beder 2006), which subjected Southern countries to IMF-led austerity programmes, which in turn spurred the formation of TWN, DAWN and other progressive initiatives. DAWN in particular drew upon women's entry into the public sphere of paid work, which in the South was hastened by the Structural Adjustment Programs of the late 1970s and 1980s. Later in the decade, the end of military dictatorship in Uruguay created an opportunity to establish the Third World Institute (ITeM) in Montevideo, with ties to Third World Network. For movements in the North, however, the 1980s was a time of defensive, nationally bound campaigns, whether by British miners resisting Thatcherism (1984) or by popular groups in Canada opposing a free trade deal with the United States (1987–88) These largely unsuccessful efforts resisted the neoliberal tide without advancing forward-looking alternatives to it. Yet in 1990, Berlin-based and socialist-oriented Rosa Luxemburg Foundation was formed, initially as a small political group called the 'Social Analysis and Political Education Association'. It has since acquired a large organizational presence in Germany and globally, with offices worldwide.

In the mid-1990s TAPGs proliferated, as an intellectual aspect of the gathering global democracy movement, but also as critical responses to the crises and contradictions of neoliberal globalization. The world of TAPGs gained its first major North America-based group in 1994. An intellectual outgrowth of the struggle against NAFTA and the Uruguay Round that begat the WTO, San Francisco's International Forum on Globalization (IFG) continues to describe itself as a North-South research and educational institution critiquing the impacts of economic globalization. A year later, Massachusetts-based ZCom

emerged, initially as the interactive website ZNet. Inspired by the anti-imperialist film, Z, this TAPG has made extraordinary use of the full panoply of new communications technologies in KPM.[6] Also in 1995, Focus on the Global South (FGS) formed in Bangkok and began to develop its 'deglobalization paradigm', discussed below.

In the nine years after 1996, five more TAPGs were founded. These late risers have framed their projects around the critique of capitalist globalization and the call for global alternatives, often emphasizing the need for an empowered global civil society, as do the Network Institute for Global Democratization (NIGD, based in Helsinki, established in 1997) and the Centre for Civil Society (CCS, based in Durban, founded in 2001). People's Plan Study Group, established in Tokyo in 1998 as a network of social movement activists and action-committed intellectuals, searches for democratic alternatives to global capitalism and maintains permanent research groups on transborder alliances and globalization, social movements, and other themes. Finally, two TAPGs were founded in 2005. Montreal's Alternatives International, with close ties to the Parisian complex of NGOs, emerged as a network of 'global justice' organizations dedicated to fostering solidarity and mutual understanding. The India Institute for Critical Action – Centre in Movement (CACIM), based in New Delhi, came directly out of the WSF process and has emphasized 'building and maintaining real and virtual spaces for fundamental research and critical reflection, exploration, action, and creation in the field of movement, from books, seminars and workshops to websites, listserves, and action alerts'.[7]

As social movement theorists have emphasized, activism has a cyclical character that is expressed in 'cycles of collective action' (Tarrow 1994) or 'waves of democracy' (Markoff 1996). In terms of TAPGs founded per year, Table 11.2 suggests two waves of intense TAPG formation, one from 1974–76 (1.33 TAPGs founded per year), and other from 1994–98 (one TAPG founded per year). These eight years account for nine of the 16 groups that formed over the 32-year period. The two waves appear to be articulated with the major cycles of activism over the past half-century. From the perspective of movement formation, we can see the invention and proliferation of TAPGs as an intellectual aspect of these waves. The first (which actually continued through the first half of the 1970s) is identified in the collective imaginary with Paris 1968 (Wallerstein 1989); the second (which began to build in the 1990s) identified with Seattle 1999, and took a far more international character (McNally 2006).[8] As transnational actors, TAPGs that formed in the first wave (mid-1970s) responded to the injustices and social crises engendered by the 'development of underdevelopment', including in the case of TNI the Pinochet coup of 1973 – Chile's own September 11. TAPGs emerging in the second wave responded to the injustices and crises of neoliberal globalization, a recurrent motif in the political frames through which IFG, FGS and other groups understand their projects. However, it is important

to note the formation, during the 1980s, of three key Southern centres of alternative knowledge production and mobilization, as neoliberal austerity and democratization of the state (in the case of Uruguay) presented different combinations of threat and opportunity to activist intellectuals of the global South.

The relationship between global accumulation and waves of TAPG formation is even more complex. The first wave of TAPG formation coincides with the end of the post-war era of fordism in the North and developmentalism in the South, and the first generalized international recession since the 1930s (1974–75). The second coincides roughly with the accumulation of disparities issuing from neoliberal austerity, and a growing consciousness of ecological maladies that stem from endless accumulation on a world scale. It is in this wave of activism that we see the emergence of transnationally organized resistance to neoliberalism's 'new constitutionalism' (Gill 2012a: 5) – as in the 1994 Zapatista uprising against NAFTA and other inequities, the international campaign against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (1998) and the 'Battle in Seattle' which disrupted the WTO Ministerial of 1999.

It is not surprising to find that cycles of transnational protest and capital accumulation are in some respects 'in phase' with waves of TAPG formation. On the one hand, capitalism's crises and contradictions have provided impetus for the cognitive praxis that TAPGs undertake: much of their intellectual work endeavours to explain and critique those crises and contradictions, and to advocate globally just alternatives. On the other hand, the establishment of vibrant movement communities in the 1960s/70s and 1990s created a strong demand by activists, both North and South, for alternative political knowledge and a strong supply of movement intellectuals who could, through TAPGs, produce and mobilize such knowledge.

The undulating pattern of TAPG formation recalls Polanyi's (1944) thesis that the disintegrating tendencies of capitalism provoke a 'second movement' in defence of community and society (Ashman 2004; Birchfield 1999; Gill 1995b). In a globalizing world, however, protective responses take a form different from the social democratic, state socialist and fascist projects that Polanyi analyzed in depth. In the contemporary context, 'the self-defense is of a transnational character, linking together nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), environmental movements, women's movements, labor networks – a veritable transnational public designed to protect constituencies against market devastation' (Burawoy 2003: 240).

Transnational alternative policy groups strive to facilitate the formation of that public. In producing and mobilizing alternative knowledge they struggle against the market logic of capitalist disembedding while also striving to dislodge neoliberalism from its hegemonic location in popular consciousness and political policy. Somers and Block (2005) point out that the hegemony of neoliberalism *embeds the market*, ideologically, within

structures of common sense – particularly in the domain of political policy but also in wider cultural fields. TAPGs are to a considerable degree engaged in discursive struggles to challenge this hegemony, but their intellectual production extends beyond critique to the advancement of alternative visions, strategies and policies. To have effect, however, this praxis must produce not simply knowledge of post capitalist alternatives; it must produce – in collaboration with the agency of allied groups – transnational counter-publics, cultures of solidarity and communities of practice that instantiate that knowledge, embedding it and beyond their own life-worlds. This sort of embedding is not centred upon national states (as in Polanyi's formulation from the 1940s); the emphasis is on constructing critical knowledge and solidarities, across borders, within global civil society – understood as a terrain of contention (Conway and Singh 2009). TAPGs direct their efforts not to one or another nationally defined citizenry, but to humanity as a whole in an ethical universalism that 'reflects the voices and practices of self-determining, self-defining individuals and communities' (Atasoy 2009: 10). In this sense their global justice politics takes up the standpoint not of nationally bound civil societies but of what Marx (1845) called 'human society, or social humanity'.

Indeed, the great challenge for TAPGs is to take KPM beyond a defensive critique of neoliberal globalization (whether centred upon national states or writ larger as in Tobin Tax schemes), into a prefigurative mode. A key site for such a shift has been the World Social Forum (WSF), and it is instructive to note that effectively three-quarters of our TAPGs participate on the WSF's International Council – its planning committee – pulling them into an 'open space' that serves as an intellectual commons for transnational movements and NGOs (see Table 11.2). However, a politics of global justice must ultimately reach beyond open-space dialogue to engage directly with capitalist and state power – whether in the form of protest politics or, as Evans (2008) notes, through allying with progressive state actors, in 'virtuous circles' of political practice that strengthen, at the global level, both movements and alternative state initiatives. Some TAPGs show evidence of such alliances.[9]

We can also see in Table 11.2 that continental Western Europe has held the largest clutch of groups (five of 16). North America – heavily over-represented as a favoured site for hegemonic think tanks[10] – is comparatively under-represented in the world of alternative think tanks. Perhaps this reflects among other things the relatively disorganized state of left politics in North America. Left think tanks of the South, (comprising seven of the 16) are of course *vastly* under-represented relative to the distribution of world population – a legacy of the material and cognitive injustices of colonialism and imperialism (Santos 2006).

The *regionalized* character of counter-hegemonic KPM is expressed not only in the location of TAPGs, but in the scope of their work. Some groups

aspire to a fully global purview – TNI, IFG, NIGD, RLF and ZCom are exemplary. That all these TAPGs are based in Europe and North America suggests a continuing strain, within the world system's North Atlantic heartland, of cosmopolitan universalism in the framing of counter-hegemony. On the other hand, a number of mostly Southern-based TAPGs focus their efforts on issues and publics that are transnational yet also regional. For instance, CCS trains its efforts to a considerable degree on southern Africa; FGS has an Asian focus, as does PPSG; DAWN, TWN, ITeM and TWF all take the global South as the target for their KPM.

Importantly, these TAPGs are not all of one piece in their political projects. FGS places the 'paradigm of deglobalization' at the centre of its social vision; other groups such as NIGD (also IFG), hew more closely to a vision of democratic globalization, explicitly contrasted with neoliberal globalization; TWN trumpets Third World resurgence – reminiscent of the 1970s movement for a 'new international economic order' that was choked by the rise of transnational neoliberalism (Bair 2009). Despite this diversity, some overarching points of convergence can be discerned:

- The critique of neoliberalism – of the class power and disparities it reinforces and the problematic implications of endless, unregulated accumulation by dispossession;
- The importance of social justice and ecological sustainability as paramount values – a nascent social vision of global justice and sustainable human development (Magdoff and Foster 2010);
- The belief that such an alternative future can be achieved only through grassroots democratic movements;
- The ethical and strategic importance of North-South solidarity;
- The value of critical analysis that can inform effective and appropriate strategies for creating change.

TAPGs and the dual crisis

Earlier, I noted that alternative policy groups have formed on political terrain already occupied by hegemonic sites of KPM. But that terrain has also been reshaped by the uneven crisis of capitalist globalization. This crisis has a dual character, both economic and ecological (Harvey 2011; Magdoff and Foster 2010). Like other crises, it has not played out smoothly and uniformly, but is itself and expression, spatially and temporally, of uneven accumulation. Notwithstanding this unevenness, rising from the Volcker recession of the early 1980s, the neoliberal growth model underwrote an economic boom, punctuated by extremely unequal development, which lasted for a quarter of a century, even as it bred the conditions for chronic instability. The boom enhanced capital's structural power, sharpened inequalities

PROOF

and unleashed, via financialization, a massive volume of stateless fictitious capital (McNally 2011). However, the logic of accumulation by dispossession has been a highly contradictory one (Harvey 2003), and already in the 1997 Asian financial crisis the implications of declining industrial profitability, over-accumulation and anarchic capital markets could be discerned. The crisis of 1997 devastated lives and livelihoods in east Asia and ramified to Russia and then Argentina in 1998, yet its impact in the global North barely registered, as core states, mobilized within the G-7 and IMF, were able to displace the crisis into debt obligations and conditionalities that drove countries like South Korea, Indonesia and Argentina to the wall.

In Europe and North America the ensuing decade inflated a bubble economy that deferred the reckoning until 2008. When the bubble burst, neoliberalism's deregulatory logic was momentarily put into question as were the premises of endlessly expanding, credit-driven consumption. However, just as the 1997 crisis was extremely uneven in its spatial scope, the crisis of 2008ff has appeared to a great extent as a regional disruption, focussed in this case upon Europe and the United States. In much of the global South, and particularly in the BRIC countries, recent rates of accumulation have been stellar, even as global capitalism's core state have languished under the burdens of unemployment, fiscal imbalances and unredeemable sovereign debt. Still, it is doubtful that the recent pattern of rapid accumulation on the semi-periphery and slow-to-no growth at the centre can be sustained through time. Moreover, even where rates of accumulation remain robust, the global deepening of a market model 'combines ontologically distinct *crises* of livelihood into globally manifest intersections of expression' (Introduction to this volume). Hence the language of a global crisis has real purchase, despite the crisis' unevenness of expression, whether in 1997–98 or 2008 onwards.

What is clear is that this accumulation crisis has been accompanied by a worsening ecological crisis (see Chapter 2 of this volume). In the twentieth century, as an already internationalized capitalism 'scaled up' to a system of transnational production and consumption in which most of the world's burgeoning population is ensnared, its ecological externalities also began to reach global scale. Species extinction, the thinning ozone layer and global warming are expressions of capitalism in ecological overshoot. The economic and ecological moments of crisis are interconnected, but do not follow a unitary logic. Economic crises are of their nature cyclical. Short of an exit from capitalism, they eventually resolve themselves, on the backs of workers and other subordinates, as conditions for robust accumulation are re-established – as in neoliberalism's own success in disassembling many of the impediments to accumulation that Fordism and Keynesian welfare states eventually presented. The deepening ecological crisis, on the other hand, has no bottom (Foster 2010). Without timely and radical intervention,

ecological overshoot portends only a downward spiral, giving new meaning to the choice Rosa Luxemburg posed between socialism and barbarism (Angus 2010).

How have TAPGs responded to this dual crisis? Close readings of their websites offer some preliminary indications. Certainly, TAPGs take up economic and ecological issues, but to different degrees. Some provide quite extensive critical analyses of both dimensions of organic crisis, others much less so. The Transnational Institute, for instance, explicitly refers to the impending climate catastrophe and the economic crisis as a 'convergence of crises', and has led in responding to both aspects. In 1998 TNI published *Privatising Nature*, a prescient critique of market mechanisms as solutions to ecological maladies; in 2008 it spearheaded the Beijing Declaration (of 15 October), endorsed by 27 NGOs and incorporating a radical analysis of the financial crisis and a set of proposals for democratizing economic institutions.[11] In all, seven TAPGs feature in-depth analyses of the ecological crisis on their websites.[12] Eight[13] voice concern over the ecological crisis, and criticize the environmental impact of neoliberal globalization, but do not offer detailed ecological analysis.[14] In this relative sense, the ecological question differentiates our TAPGs as sites of counter-hegemonic KPM.

TAPGs also vary in how they have engaged with the crisis. Groups like the Transnational Institute and ZCom mobilize extensive networks of analysts for concise analyses of the events that comprise each immediate conjuncture of crisis. Their websites become, in effect, alternative media – nodal points for transnational counter-publics. Well-grounded, timely interventions in KPM focused on pressing concerns are indubitably of value in counter-hegemonic politics. They provide counter-publics with analyses that can be set against mainstream news narratives that tend either to reify what is a contingent reality under the rubric of 'the economy', or to vilify specific 'bad apple' personas – the Bernie Madoffs and Jérôme Kerviels.[15]

As important as it is to engage day-to-day, transnational counter-hegemonic struggle requires more. KPM singularly attuned to resistance in the immediate moment recalls Eduard Bernstein's (1899) fin-de-siècle adage, 'the ultimate aim of socialism is nothing, but the movement is everything', which has defined the politics of social democracy for more than a century. Counter-hegemonic politics requires the production and mobilization of knowledge that goes beyond the immediacy of the moment, and the immediate needs of movements in that moment. To remain on the terrain of the immediate is to cede the capacity to think and do otherwise. It is to confine one's practice to 'problem-solving', as distinct from critique (Cox 1995). 'Alternatives' become framed as more humane or environmentally sound ways of dealing with the same pragmatic problems that have already been defined within dominant discourse, and that are also taken up by organic intellectuals of capitalism's dominant class.

TAPGs and prefigurative KPM

Thus we arrive at the importance, within the organic crisis, of *prefigurative KPM*, as a companion to the day-to-day engagement with concrete issues that forms an indispensable ground for counter-hegemonic struggle. All 6 TAPGs engage in prefigurative KPM, but six devote considerable attention to this form of cognitive praxis. As intimated earlier, the visions they advance are not of all one piece, although they intersect in important ways.

The prefigurative KPM of the Third World Forum is closely associated with its founder, Samir Amin, whose *Accumulation on a World Scale* (1974) helped launch international political economy around the same time TWF was established. A global network of intellectuals, the TWF takes a critical stance on the major issues at stake in the world system and strives to identify concrete alternatives grounded in a dialectic of theory and practice 'between the scientific analysis of the problems and challenges on the one hand [and] strategies and targets of actual social movements on the other'. In what it describes as an ongoing 'search for convergence in diversity', the TWF seeks to 'identify, through the interpretation of the meaning of the movements, the more distant perspectives in which they are placed, the fundamental values and principles of the visions of society that they inspire', in order to raise 'each and everyone's awareness of the diversity vital to the construction of the future'. For TWF, the questions of democratization and development and of the *democratization of development* are key.[16]

As mentioned earlier, Focus on the Global South has placed the project of *deglobalization* at the core of its prefigurative KPM, which is undertaken by staff who facilitate transnational initiatives as well as country-based programmes from offices in Thailand, India and the Philippines. A paradigm intended to signify both the dismantling of the old and the construction of the new, deglobalization 'describes the transformation of the global economy from one centred around the needs of transnational corporations to one that focuses on the needs of people, communities and nations and in which the capacities of local and national economies are strengthened'. Focus's analytic work across five designated thematic areas – from 'defending and reclaiming the commons' to 'peace and people's security' – is informed by this prefigurative conception.[17]

The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation centres its prefigurative KPM around an educational programme rather than a research agenda in any conventional sense. Through participatory approaches such as discussion groups, its Academy for Political Education helps people gain 'the knowledge that can empower them and enable them to act'. RLF's Institute for Critical Social Analysis, founded in 2008, focuses on researching and 'strategizing left politics and *democratic-socialist transformation* of the current capitalist society'.[18] Beyond its German base, RLF is active through regional offices and partnerships with NGOs and movement groups in more than 25 countries, where its

prefigurative KPM is adapted to local settings. Among its activities in south Asia, for instance, RLF supports 'new theoretical approaches to and hands-on activities for creating alternative societal and economical forms', including joint work with alter-globalization movements and local and regional socialist forums.[19]

The Transnational Institute's prefigurative KPM dates from 1999, when it undertook the *New Politics* project to document, publicize and evaluate actual experiences with direct, participatory democracy as well as the formation of new sorts of political parties emerging from movements in Latin America, Europe and Asia. The project generated hundreds of articles reflecting on the practices of social forums, movements and parties, citizen's struggles and democratization.[20] Recently, TNI reorganized its work areas, folding New Politics into an Economic Justice, Corporate Power and Alternatives programme which includes an Alternative Regionalisms initiative to build capacity for policy autonomy in the South.[21]

Two United States-based TAPGs are particularly active in prefigurative KPM. In the midst of the financial crisis of 2008 the International Forum on Globalization convened a global meeting of economists and leaders of key NGOs, to raise basic questions about the continued viability of capitalism, and then leveraged this initiative into its *Post-Capitalism* programme, which articulates 'steps to new economies of sustainability, equity and peace'. More recently, IFG launched its *Opening Silos* programme, aimed at stimulating a new 'global, intergenerational, multi-disciplinary leadership movement' – that is, the creation of organic intellectuals for global justice. Established in autumn 2011, Opening Silos exemplifies the catalytic role that TAPGs can play, vis-à-vis social movements, as centres of counter-hegemonic knowledge production and mobilization. Through a series of two-day meetings on every continent, Opening Silos encouraged new intersectional movement integration, 'crossing geographies, constituencies, program targets, even ages, toward a far more eclectic and wider ranging movement'.[22]

Lastly, ZCom's prefigurative KPM is written into its mission statement, which notes two implications that stem from its commitment to 'fundamental transformation': (1) 'successful action in the present depends very much not only on understanding current conditions but also on broad clarity about future goals and building the links between the two'; (2) 'a movement able to transform society requires massive, highly informed, participatory, unwavering allegiance which will only grow and persist if the seeds of a better future are embodied in the actions of current activists'.[23] Two major initiatives that embody these ideas are participatory economics (*PARECON*), a detailed vision for decentralized council socialism emphasizing workplace democracy, which informs the practice of various workplaces in and beyond North America, and the IOPS Project, launched in January 2012. IOPS (*International Organization for a Participatory Society*) is taking shape as

a revolutionary organization that aims to win a better world through flexibly exploring and advocating long term vision, building the seeds of the future in the present, empowering the lives of its members, organizing in an internally classless and self-managing way, and winning changes in society that better the situations of suffering constituencies while also laying the ground work for more changes, and construction, to come.[24]

These brief accounts of prefigurative KPM illustrate how, as the production and mobilization of knowledge becomes attuned to the possibilities for a transformed future, the gap between cognition and action closes. In each instance, the point is not simply to critique mainstream policy, nor to offer policy alternatives designed to be implemented within existing institutional arrangements. Rather, prefigurative KPM consciously cultivates and promulgates radical alternatives that set in motion processes of transformation, not replication. To accomplish this, alternative policy groups need to be in close dialogue with the social movements whose collective agency can drive transformative change; indeed, much of the work of counter-hegemonic KPM involves just such a dialogue – well exemplified by the extensive movement partnerships of groups like DAWN, TNI and CCS.[25] In much the same way that participatory action research, as a methodology, subverts the distinction between knowledge production and political change, in prefigurative KPM the line between research and political action blurs, as functions of the think tank merge with those of the social movement organization.

Conclusions

The centres of alternative knowledge introduced in this chapter share a common *modus operandi* as transnationally oriented think tanks on the left. Yet they are differentiated in terms of political frames, organizational forms, and spatial locations within the global system. This diversity points to a larger reality. Taken as a whole, the 16 TAPGs comprise a spatialized organizational ecology that takes in 'open spaces' for dialogical engagement (for instance, CACIM) as well as more formally organized groups (for instance, RLF), which may have greater capacity to articulate and advocate prefigurative alternatives (Carroll 2010; Evans 2008). In much the same way that, for the right, a diverse organizational ecology of policy groups creates a rich discursive field that 'offers possibilities for nuanced debate and diverse action repertoires, all within the perimeters of permissible neoliberal discourse' (Carroll and Shaw 2001: 211), the set of TAPGs seems to offer a diversity of sites, North and South, for constructing counter-hegemonic alternatives, a creative process that requires both open spaces and more strategically oriented organizations engaged in prefigurative KPM and collective will formation. But that very diversity also points to the difficulty in combining both aspects of counter-hegemonic politics – open space and the political organization – in a single

place – a classic conundrum that has beset many left parties, as well as, more recently, the World Social Forum, with its perennial debates over its identity as 'open space' or 'movement of movement'.

As the uneven, dual crisis of neoliberal globalization continues to unfold, TAPGs and other sites of transnational counter-hegemony will continue to face the challenge of engaging within changing conjunctures in ways that speak to concrete needs and ontological insecurities while helping to build intellectual and material capacity for a radically transformed world. This challenge can be expected to express itself in different modalities, according to how agencies of counter-hegemonic KPM are organized and positioned politically, culturally, and geographically.

Crises always pose a conjunction of threats and opportunities to the social actors caught up in them. On the basis of these preliminary findings, we can begin to profile the opportunities and risks that different alternative policy groups face. Groups strongly grounded within nation-states face the risk of *capture* within the perimeters of those states, yet they are positioned to help inform national-level processes of socio-political transformation. Caracas-based Centro Internacional Miranda (CIM) arguably exemplifies both sides of this paradox. Since 2005 it has functioned as a state-supported agency of the Bolivarian Revolution. It has promoted research, reflection and training on strategic issues in the process of political change, linking with economic, social and cultural initiatives within the Bolivarian Revolution (Molina 2006). Originally given a strong international mandate with a major role for foreign collaborators (effectively a state-sponsored TAPG), insiders to CIM report that more recently its brief has been narrowed to domestic popular education with a nationalist thrust, as the Venezuelan government grapples with political reaction from the domestic ruling class and its international allies, and the slow pace of socialist transformation. The risk here is one of replicating the practice of the 'old internationalism' in which 'the international dimension of struggle was subordinated to the strategic objectives of the national dimension . . . the immediate objective of the struggle was primarily national and the related internationalism was instrumental to it' (Nilsen and Cox 2005, unpaginated).

On the other hand, groups that operate in transnational spaces face the challenge of *establishing the relevancies* of their analyses and initiatives to local, on-the-ground movement actors, through tangible, dialogical collaborations. Theory, including the critical discourses TAPGs produce and circulate, 'becomes a material force', as Marx (1844) put it, 'as soon as it has gripped the masses'. The corollary, however, is that ideas that remain disembedded, as abstract formulations, construct what Gramsci called 'castles in the air' (quoted in Germino 1990: 19). Efforts by groups like IFG, TNI and ZCom to embed prefigurative KPM in local contexts, reviewed earlier, indicate an awareness of the magnitude of this challenge, but closer investigation will be required to assess their effectiveness.

PROOF

By the same token, Northern-based groups need to avoid tendencies towards *abstract universalism* (as in most human rights discourse), which in substance shores up Eurocentric hegemonies. Conversely, Southern-based groups need to bring the energy of anti-imperialist and Indigenous perspectives, often exemplary of 'militant particularism', into a global vision. In both North and South, what is needed is a dialectical approach to the universal and the particular. As David Harvey has argued,

> universality always exists *in relation to* particularity: neither can be separated from the other even though they are distinctive moments within our conceptual operations and practical engagements. The notion of social justice, for example, acquires universality through a process of abstraction from particular instances and circumstances, but, once established as a generally accepted principal or norm, becomes particular again as it is actualised through particular actions in particular circumstances.
> (Harvey 2001: 194, emphasis in original; cf. Ashman 2004)

For all groups, regardless of how they are positioned in the world system, what Santos (2006) calls the 'work of translation' – of bridging across languages, identities, and visions – looms large. Within WSF discussions it has become clear that 'the global left is intercultural' (Santos 2008: 261). Transnational alternative policy groups, most of them active participants at the WSF, need to elaborate practices of intercultural translation that preserve autonomy while creating common ground (cf. Carroll 2010: 185; Conway 2011). At stake in this is the reconstruction of knowledge 'in ways that permit us to be non-Orientalist' (Wallerstein 2006: 48), without simply inverting the colonial epistemic hierarchy – as in the valorization of non-Western ways of knowing over post-Enlightenment thought. In grappling with the continuing tension between emergent universals (such as, 'human rights' and 'global citizenship') and the concrete, particular contexts of life in a highly differentiated world, 'we are required to universalize our particulars and particularize our universals simultaneously in a kind of constant dialectical exchange, which allows us to find new syntheses that are then of course instantly called into question' (Wallerstein 2006: 49). The promise of transnational alternative policy groups lies in the 'inter-culturality' that can issue from their cognitive praxis as it instantiates 'a dialogical strategy of knowledge production, premised on a post-colonial sensibility' (McMichael 2009: 28). As collective intellectuals of alter-globalization, TAPGs can facilitate the formation of a 'world knowledge', conscious of its historicity and 'rooted in a politics of "strategic diversity", which situates alternative visions/knowledges in the context of shared, but differentiated, experience of the discourse and impact of global integration' (McMichael 2009: 29).

Of course, intellectual leadership in the form of alternative knowledge production and mobilization is simply one aspect of a 'process of rebuilding

movements, infrastructures of dissent and oppositional capacities' (McNally 2011: 189). It would be a mistake to suppose that the various sites of counter-hegemonic knowledge production and mobilization that have grown out of global capitalism's crises and contestations are the decisive or primal forces in alter-globalization politics. Still, intellectual leadership does matter, and in the absence of a 'fifth international' pulling the diversity of left parties and progressive movements towards a creative convergence, the intellectual work of TAPGs takes on heightened importance. In this sense, the future of the global left, and the prospects for meaningful responses to the global organic crisis, depend in part on the effectiveness of TAPGs in learning from, working with, informing and inspiring critical movements, publics and progressive governments in a great variety of locations and across a wide range of issues, in a multiform politics of resistance and reconstruction.

Notes

1. Gill (2012b: 26) also observes, correctly, that organic crisis does not necessarily imply a complete breakdown of political legitimacy. 'The problem of political legitimacy for disciplinary neoliberalism has been met by strategies of depoliticization . . . as yet we have not seen any of the regimes governing North American or European polities being toppled.' Nevertheless, he continues, 'many problems once associated with the global South seem now to be migrating to the capitalist core of the world order' – a development that forms an important element in the global organic crisis.
2. See, respectively http://atlasnetwork.org; http://www.idrc.ca/EN/Programs/Social_and_Economic_Policy/Think_Tank_Initiative/Pages/About.aspx (accessed: 25 March 2013).
3. On the concept of cognitive praxis, see Eyerman and Jamison (1991:55) who hold that 'it is precisely in the creation, articulation, formulation of new thoughts and ideas – new knowledge – that a social movement defines itself in society'. In this sense, the work of TAPGs forms part of the practice of social movement activism.
4. In the case of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, affiliated with the Party of Democratic Socialism (now Die Linke) since 1996, the electoral success of the party, particularly since the 2005 federal election, has brought extensive funds from the German state, for which parties represented in the Bundestag qualify.
5. http://www.tni.org/page/history (accessed: 3 October 2011).
6. The year 1995 marks the beginning of ZNet, the Internet initiative that eventuated in Z Communications. This group had its origins in Z Magazine, established in 1987 as a national hard-copy serial of the US left. It evolved into an ICT-rich TAPG that fosters an interactive network of KPM through ZNet, ZSpace, ZSpeakers, and other initiatives. See http://www.zcommunications.org/ (accessed: 3 October 2011).
7. http://cacim.net (accessed: 28 July 2011).
8. The periodization of protest waves is contingent on one's theoretical framework. Wallerstein and McNally develop their analyses on the basis of historical materialism, which is the guiding framework for this study. In contrast, Markoff grounds his account of 'waves of democracy' in a liberal-pluralist understanding of nominally democratic regimes. He views the 1960s and 1970s as an era of democratic

recession and the later 1970s into the 1990s as a period in which 'in many different countries, regimes believed to be less democratic were replaced by others believed to be more so' (1996: 11).

9. For instance, on the strength of its policy work on democratizing public services, the Transnational Institute, at the request of the Chavez government of Venezuela critically evaluated Venezuela's re-nationalization programme in the telecommunications sector. Relations between progressive (Southern) governments and TAPGs are also reflected in exchange of personnel. In 2012 Focus on the Global South appointed, as its new executive director, former Bolivian UN Ambassador Pablo Solon (well known for his having organized the Cochabamba conference on the rights of Mother Earth in 2010), replacing Walden Bello, who is now a member of the Philippines Parliament.

10. Of the 400-odd 'free market' think tanks that make up the global network supported by the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, 177 are based in the United States and Canada and 85 are based in Europe. http://atlasnetwork.org/global-network-directory/ (accessed: 25 July 2011).

11. http://www.tni.org/archives/beijingstatementoncrisis (accessed: 26 July 2011).

12. Namely, CCS, DAWN, FGS, IFG, TWN, TNI, ZCom.

13. Namely RLF, TWF, PPSG, CETRI, NIGD, CRID, ALTINT and ITeM.

14. CACIM, with its ardent commitment to open-space discussion, does not present any substantive content, whether ecological or economic, on its website.

15. For instance, articles posted on ZCom's Znet site on 2 August 2011 included three critical analyses of the US 'debt ceiling deal' (reached on that day) by George Monbiot, Dean Baker, and Paul Krugman, a discussion by David Case of Italy's sovereign debt crisis and its implications for the Euro, and a report by Jerome Roos on the 150,000+ who protested in Israel against 'three decades of extreme economic neoliberalism'.

16. The quoted text is from the document, 'A short presentation of the organisation', available at http://www.forumtiersmonde.net/fren/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=74:the-third-world-forum&catid=39:forum-du-tiers-monde&Itemid=28 (accessed: 25 March 2013).

17. http://www.focusweb.org/content/who-we-are (accessed: 26 July 2011).

18. Founding resolution from 6 December 2008; emphasis added. http://www.rosalux.de/english/foundation/research-projects.html (accessed: 26 July 2011).

19. http://www.rosalux.de/english/worldwide/asia.html (accessed: 26 July 2011).

20. http://www.tni.org/node/597/by-issue (accessed: 26 July 2011).

21. http://www.tni.org/page/about-alternative-regionalisms-project (accessed: 24 September 2012).

22. http://ifg.org/programs/silos.html (accessed: 11 July 2012).

23. http://www.zcommunications.org/mission.htm (accessed: 26 July 2011).

24. http://www.iopsociety.org/mission (accessed: 25 March 2013).

25. For RLF, the dialogue of prefiguration includes interlocutors in movements as well as activists within Germany's Left Party, for which it serves as an intellectual centre. Other TAPGs operate at a distance from formal political parties.

References

Abelson, D. E. (1995) 'From Policy Research to Political Advocacy – the Changing Role of Think Tanks in American Politics', *Canadian Review of American Studies* 25: 93–126.

Amin, S. (1974) *Accumulation on a World Scale*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Angus, I. (ed.) (2010) *The Global Fight for Climate Justice: Anticapitalist Responses to Global Warming and Environmental Destruction*, Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Ashman, S. (2004) 'Resistance to Neoliberal Globalisation: A Case of "Militant Particularism"?' *Politics* 24(2): 143–53.

Atasoy, Y. (2009) 'Introduction', in Y. Atasoy (ed.) *Hegemonic Transitions, the State and Crisis in Neoliberal Capitalism*, New York: Routledge.

Bair, J. (2009) 'Taking aim at the New International Economic Order', in P. Mirowski and D. Plehwe (eds) *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Beder, S. (2006) *Suiting Themselves: How Corporations Drive the Global Agenda,* London: Earthscan.

Bernstein, E. (1899) *Evolutionary Socialism.* Available online: http://www.marxists. org/reference/archive/bernstein/works/1899/evsoc/index.htm (accessed: 18 July 2011).

Birchfield, V. (1999.) 'Contesting the Hegemony of Market Ideology: Gramsci's "Good Sense" and Polanyi's "Double Movement" ', *Review of International Political Economy* 6: 27–54.

Block, F. (1977) 'The Ruling Class Does Not Rule: Notes on the Marxist Theory of the State', *Socialist Revolution* 7(3): 6–28.

Burawoy, M. (2003) 'For a Sociological Marxism: The Complementary Convergence of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Polanyi', *Politics and Society* 31: 193–261.

Carroll, W. K. (2006) 'Hegemony, Counter-Hegemony, Anti-Hegemony', *Socialist Studies* 2: 9–43.

Carroll, W. K. (2007) 'Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony in a Global Field', *Studies in Social Justice* 1: 36–66.

Carroll, W. K. (2010) 'Crisis, Movements, Counter-Hegemony: In Search of the New', *Interface: A Journal for and about Social Movements* 2(2): 168–98.

Carroll, W.K. and R.S. Ratner (2010) 'Social Movements and Counter-Hegemony: Lessons from the Field', *New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry* 4(1): 7–22.

Carroll, W.K. and C. Carson (2003) 'The Network of Global Corporations and Elite Policy Groups: A Structure for Transnational Capitalist Class Formation?' *Global Networks* 3: 29–57.

Carroll, W. K. and J. P. Sapinski (2010) 'The Global Corporate Elite and Transnational Policy Planning Network, 1996–2006: A Structural Analysis', *International Sociology* 25: 501–38.

Carroll, W. K. and M. Shaw (2001) 'Consolidating a Neoliberal Policy Bloc in Canada, 1976 to 1996', *Canadian Public Policy* 27: 195–216.

Chase-Dunn, C. (2002) 'Globalization from Below: Toward a Collectively Rational and Democratic Global Commonwealth', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 581: 48–61.

Coburn, E. (2010) 'Resisting Neoliberal Capitalism: Insights from Marxist Political Economy', in G. Teeple and S. Mcbride (eds) *Relations of Global Power: Neoliberal Order and Disorder*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Conway, J. (2011) 'Cosmopolitan or Colonial? The World Social Forum as "Contact Zone" ', *Third World Quarterly* 32: 217–36.

Conway, J. and J. Singh (2009) 'Is the World Social Forum a Transnational Public Sphere? Nancy Fraser, Critical Theory and the Containment of Radical Possibility', *Theory Culture & Society* 26: 61–84.

PROOF

Cox, R. W. (1987) *Production, Power and World Order*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Cox, R. W. (1995) 'Critical political economy', in B. Hettne (ed.) *International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder*, Halifax: Fernwood Books.

Day, R. (2005) *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*, Toronto: Between the Lines.

Domhoff, G. W. (2006) *Who Rules America?,* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Evans, P. (2008) 'Is an Alternative Globalization Possible?' *Politics & Society* 36: 271–305.

Eyerman, R. and A. Jamison (1991) *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Ford, L. H. (2003) 'Challenging Global Environmental Governance: Social Movement Agency and Global Civil Society', *Global Environmental Politics* 3: 120–34.

Foster, J. (2010) 'Why Ecological Revolution?' *Monthly Review* 61: 1–18.

Fraser, N. (2005) 'Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World', *New Left Review* 36: 69–88.

Fraser, N. (2010) 'Who Counts? Dilemmas of Justice in a Postwestphalian World', *Antipode* 41: 281–97.

Germinio, D. L. (1990) *Antonio Gramsci: Architect of a New Politics*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University.

Gill, S. (1990) *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, S. (1995a) 'Globalisation, Market Civilization and Disciplinary Neoliberalism', *Journal of International Studies* 24: 399–423.

Gill, S. (1995b) 'Theorizing the Interregnum: The Double Movement of Global Politics in the 1990s', in B. Hettne (ed.) *International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder*, Halifax: Fernwood Books.

Gill, S. (2000) 'Toward a Postmodern prince? The Battle in Seattle as a Moment in the new Politics of Globalisation', *Millennium* 29: 131–40.

Gill, S. (2012a) 'Introduction: Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership', in S. (ed.) *Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, S. (2012b) 'Leaders and led in an era of Global Crises' in S. Gill (ed.) *Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gill, S. (2012c) 'Organic Crisis, Global Leadership and Progressive Alternatives', in S. Gill (ed.) *Global Crises and the Crisis of Global Leadership*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glasius, M., M. Kaldor, and H. Anheier (eds) (2006) *Global Civil Society 2005/6*, London: Sage.

Glassman, J. (2002) 'From Seattle (and Ubon) to Bangkok: the Scales of Resistance to Corporate Globalization', *Environment and Planning D-Society & Space* 20: 513–33.

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York: International Publishers.

Hackett, R. A. and Y. Zhao (1999) *Sustaining Democracy? Journalism and the Politics of Objectivity*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Harvey, D. (2001) *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2011) *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*, New York: Oxford University Press.

bibitem bibitem von Hayek, F. A. (1976) *The Mirage of Social Justice*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hunt, C. S. and H. E. Aldrich (1998) 'The Second Ecology: Creation and Evolution of Organizational Communities', *Research in Organizational Behaviour* 20: 267–301.

Keane, J (2003) *Global Civil Society?,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macartney, H. (2008) 'Articulating Particularistic Interests: The Organic Organisers of Hegemony in Germany and France', *British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 10: 429–51.

McMichael, Philip. (2009) 'Global Citizenship and Multiple Sovereignties: Reconstituting Modernity', in Y. Atasoy (ed.) *Hegemonic Transitions, the State and Crisis in Neoliberal Capitalism*, London and New York: Routledge.

McNally, D. (2006) *Another World is Possible* Second Edition, Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring.

McNally, D. (2011) *Global Slump*, Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Magdoff, F. and J. B. Foster (2010) 'What Every Environmentalist Needs To Know about Capitalism', *Monthly Review* 61(10). Available online: http://monthlyreview.org/100301magdofffoster.php (accessed: 25 March 2013).

Markoff, J. (1996) *Waves of Democracy: Social Movements and Political Change,* Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Marx, K. (1844) 'Introduction to A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's', *Philosophy of Right.* Available online: http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1843/critique-hpr/intro.htm (accessed: 25 March 2013).

Marx, K. (1845) 'Theses on Feuerbach', Thesis X. Marx/Engels Internet Archive. Available online: http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/theses.htm (accessed: 10 July 2012).

Mirowski, P. and D. Plehwe (eds) (2009) *The Road from Mont Pèlerin: The Making of the Neoliberal Thought Collective,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Molina, L. B. (2006) 'Centro Internacional Miranda', *MRZine* 15 September. Available online: http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2006/cim150906.html (accessed: 23 October 2011).

Munck, R. (2006) 'Global Civil Society: Royal Road or Slippery Slop', *Voluntus* 17: 325–32.

Munck, R. (2010) 'Globalization, Crisis and Social Transformation: A View from the South', *Globalizations* 7: 235–46.

Nilsen, A. and L. Cox (2005) 'Why do activists need theory?' *Euromovements Newsletter.* Available online: http://eprints.nuim.ie/445/ (accessed: 3 October 2011).

Ollman, B. (2003) *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

St. Denis, Verna (2004) 'Community-Based Participatory Research: Aspects of the Concept Relevant for Practice', in W. K. Carroll (ed.) *Critical Strategies for Social Research*, Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Smith, J. (2008) *Social Movements for Global Democracy*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smith, J. and D. Wiest (2012) *Social Movements in the World-System*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Somers, M. R. and F. Block (2005) 'From Poverty to Perversity: Ideas, Markets, and Institutions over 200 years of Welfare Debate', *American Sociological Review* 70: 260–87.

Santos, B. de Sousa (2006) *The Rise of the Global Left: the World Social Forum and Beyond*, London: Zed Books.

Santos, B. de Sousa (2008) 'The World Social Forum and the Global Left', *Politics & Society* 36: 247–70.

Stephen, M. D. (2009) 'Alter-Globalism as Counter-Hegemony: Evaluating the "Postmodern Prince"', *Globalizations* 6: 483–98.

PROOF

Stone, D. (2000) 'Think Tanks Transnationalization and Non-Profit Analysis and Advocacy', *Global Society* 14: 153–72.

Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teeple, G. (2000) *Globalization and the Decline of Social Reform: into the Twenty-first Century*, Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press.

Van der Pijl, K. (1998) *Transnational Classes and International Relations*, London: Routledge.

Wallerstein, I. (1989). '1968, Revolution in the World-System', *Theory and Society* 18(4): 431–49.

Wallerstein, I. (2006) *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power*, New York: The New Press.

Williams, M. (2008) *The Roots of Participatory Democracy*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.