

The New Spartakists.

The thought of Rosa Luxemburg to understand the Global Movement¹.

Iñigo Errejón Galván & Pablo Iglesias Turrión²

“The proletarian revolutions criticise themselves”
K. Marx

“Men do not make their history in an arbitrary way. But they do it themselves”
Rosa Luxemburg

Key words: Autonomy, Collective action, Global movement, Marxism, Mobilisation process.

Abstract: Some of the most important issues discussed inside the Global movement against Capitalism and war are the relations between political party and movement, movement Autonomy as opposed to institutional dynamics, and organisational problems. In this paper, we will recuperate some categories and political concepts from Rosa Luxemburg’s thought. We will try to use those instruments to analyse some aspects of the mobilisation process of the Global movement since the Seattle demonstrations until the demonstrations against war in 2003 and 2004 taking the example of Madrid.

Introduction: Our intentions

Rosa Luxemburg was born a few days before the proclamation of the Paris Commune and was killed a year after the Bolsheviks take power in Russia. Her life is framed in the proletariat's “assaults to the sky”, and thus a beautiful historical link is made to an energetic and brilliant revolutionary woman that dedicated her life to this goal.

But, in spite of the sufficient emotional motives that exist claiming for Rosa's restoration, it is the capacity of her legacy to rethink the emancipatory practices what makes her the centre of our reflection. We talk about a badly treated author, hidden away, denigrated and distorted.

Rosa, the eternally critical, the firmest defender of the socialist democracy in front of both the liberticidal Jacobinism and Blanquism and the subordination of social democratic

¹ As ‘Global Movement’ we understand the multiplicity of globalising struggles that have mobilised against Neo- Liberal Capitalism over the last decade.

² Iñigo Errejón is an Erasmus student of politics at Utrecht University (Holland) and Pablo Iglesias is a researcher in political science at the Complutense University (Madrid, Spain). E-mails: eneko83@hotmail.com and pabloiglesias@cps.ucm.es

politics to the bourgeois formal democracy, should be recovered in a time when the systemic ideologues call to fold illusions; precisely to keep thinking, criticising, proposing, understanding the thousands of fists that are still raised to deny the fallacy of “the end of history” or the end of the movements (Della Porta/Mosca, 2003:7).

For us, this is not just an ethical question but also a methodological starting-point. Despite the academic institutionalisation of social movement studies from the 1960s, we have to see the theoretical studies of socialist and anarchist movements in the XIX century to know the origin of social movement theory.

In fact, the origin of the category of “social movements” comes from the famous book by Lorenz Von Strein, “The history of social movement in France (1789-1850)”. There he used the term “social movement” to escape Prussian censorship, but he meant “the history of the workers’ movement” (Pérez Ledesma, 1994:59).

Trying to acknowledge this fact, even Sydney Tarrow has built some parallels between several Marxist traditions and modern social movement theories. In this manner the Communist Manifesto of Engels and Marx has been likened to collective behaviour theory (Smelser); Leninist organisation theory to Resource Mobilisation Theory (see, for instance, McCarthy 1977); and, finally, Gramscian Hegemony has been likened to frame analysis theory (See, for instance, Snow/Rochford/Worden/Benford 1986). We think that this comparative intent is fruitless. The historical context of collective action is always much more complex. The theoretical paradigms even more so. Thus, in our opinion it is more useful to understand the paradigms in their totality than to try equivalencies or an eclectic synthesis between them.

We think that reading the classics again (or, as Borges would say, what matters is not to read, but to re-read) can be very useful in order to analyse contemporary social movement discourses. Thompson, Gramsci, Sorel, Luxemburg etc. are really important in understanding the present social movement discourses.

Hence, we are going to explain, firstly, some concepts of the Rosa Luxemburg’s thought. Then, and using these, we will try to explain some aspects and discourses of the mobilisation process of the Global movements, since the ‘battle of Seattle’ (against the WTO in 1999), the Prague demonstrations against the IMF and the WB in 2000, until the demonstrations against war in 2003 and 2004 (after the 11th March attacks) in Madrid.

Reform or Revolution: movement ontology within struggle

The Twentieth century opened in Germany with a social democratic movement that is an example to the world-wide proletariat because of its enormous power. It is in this context where Rosa Luxemburg develops her political activity.

The famous problem of the relationship between the economical and political aspects of the working class fight is one of the first theoretical concerns of the movement.

This would be the scenario for the great debate around the proletarian organisational and tactical questions.

In this sense Rosa affirms that the political and the economical aspects are two phenomena that are separated in the heads of the worker's organisations, but by no means naturally differentiated. The striker processes fulfil in practice- as the Russian revolutionary period in 1905- the unification of what has been separated only due to the conditions in which the class antagonism is being expressed. It is also in the quotidian fight where the masses, with the Party at the head of them, know how to put into practice the reform-revolution scheme: the everyday combat for the partial improvements in the living conditions framed in a long-term strategy with the conquest of power as the ultimate goal, to politically execute the economical transformations that are already mature in society, that is, to realise the historical progress.

Forgetting this implies, for Rosa, to fall in the parallel abysses of reformism and sectarianism (1977: 499). The former plunges into the mystification of the democratic bourgeois forms, misunderstanding the existent relations between the social classes and moving itself away from the conflict; thus, becoming an inoperative force for social transformation. The latter plummets into the mere apology of conspiracy that does not establish distinctions between ultimate goals and short-term targets, shipwrecking in speculations about the insurrectional outbreak because it lacks a political programme; which is to say, it moves away from the masses and survives only the time the mere repression needs to put an end to the adventure in which the rebels' will is the only weapon of those who, having lost all the connection with social reality, can only predicate this world's evilness and how beautiful the new one would be, and the braveness of the small group of professional revolutionaries that would bring the era of happiness with an accurate assault on the political structure.

Rosa innovates again when she recovers another of the lessons from the proletarian combats: The strikes, as the revolutions (maybe the popular mobilisation waves in our days?) don't have to be called for. They are not decided neither in the cupules of mass organisations nor in the central committees of the vanguards. They respond to historical moments that determine their own fighting tactics and organisational models through improvisation, reviewing and renewal while drawing on a rich base of historically formed repertoires of contention.: the enrichment of the popular action's arsenal³. It is not difficult to recognise here its proximity to the Global Movement, whose practice has been characterised by the invention and reinvention through consecutive battles.

In this sense, it could be interesting to use a George Sorel perspective in considering the contention dynamics of the Global movement and its construction of anti-systemic meaning. If the strike showed the symbolic anticipation of the revolution -the "beyond" reformism of Rose in her confrontation with Berstein-, the repertoires of contentious collective action of the Global movement are able to construct an anti-systemic imaginary in the same terms.

³ Something more interesting than what Melucci called the 'Luxemburg model' (1994:169).

When Luca Casarini, the Italian *Disobbedienti* spokesman, says that '*Another World is Possible*' should not be proclaimed but practised, -and- in that practising conflict is inevitable (Casarini, 2002:72), he is recognising that the emancipatory future horizon can only be discovered in action, through practice. George Sorel wrote the same: *the general strike was not born from deep reflections about philosophy, but in practice* (Sorel, 2004:3).

It is through action that consciousness is constructed, that the revolutionary subject starts to exist. If Bakunin had already mentioned that *an anarchist is who fights for anarchy*, Rosa continues the affirmation translating to political theory what the Spanish poet Antonio Machado would say not many years later: *caminante no hay camino, se hace camino al andar* (traveller there is no road, you make it by travelling). Something quite close is what the Italian *disobbedienti* postulate nowadays when saying: *L' altro mondo si fa possibile disobbedendo adesso*. Permanent creation through movement is a revolutionary idea that Rosa addresses and will have to be kept in mind to understand the present paper.

The insurrectional calls are in Rosa's thought mere sermons from the exterior of the masses acquisition of conscience, as well as to the development degree of the production and domination relationships. The propaganda should not have an utopic function: the task is not to convince about the desirability of the socialism, but to contribute to give a historical meaning to every present contradiction explaining the inevitability of more, bigger and harder fights between the dominant class and the proletarians.

The role, then, of the vanguards, that are just the hard cores of the most conscious workers and the intellectuals next to them, is not to predict the outbreaks but rather to understand and explain them in relation with the capitalist current conditions, to be a spur for radicalisation that takes part as the most advanced faction in each fight. The vanguard has to discover the main contradictions of the capitalist system and to propose commands directly aimed at them. Tactical instructions that should have the revolutionary strategy as a map, as firm as conditions make possible -which is not easy to interpret-, going always to the limit, but without breaking the necessary link with the current desires and animosity of the masses: *one step in front of the masses, but only one* (Lenin).

That is not, however, to say that the consciousness and the historical understanding have to be provided externally to the working class by a group of professional revolutionaries, as the Leninist theory says, because, as pointed above, Rosa defends that the people learn about their positions and tasks in this world through the antagonism that makes them to clash with the capitalist class. The masses learn to rule by ruling, because only the self-administration gives consciousness. As the pro-independence left shouts in the Basque Country streets: *Borroka da bide bakarra*, the struggle is the only way, not only because the class struggle is not deniable by theoretical abstractions and because the oppressed owe all their improvements just to the fight, but also, and more importantly, because any shortcut both in substituting mass struggle by elections -as the one represented by Bernstein's revisionism- or by minority conspiring action - Blanqui, Leninist vanguards- jumps over the exercise of the democratic power from the bases, hence puts on the masses' shoulders management not compensated by the proletarian power. The proletarian dictatorship is impossible if this class does not execute it directly, if the working class has not previously learned to rule in thousands of battles where the worker councils' power has

been outlined. Luxemburg just formulated the I International famous slogan: *The liberation of the workers will be a product of themselves or will not be.*

We have, therefore, the Autonomy, which Rosa has not yet explicitly formulated in spite of her support for a “horizontal” and direct proletariat exercise of power. However, Rosa undoubtedly strives for a political direction that orientates the councils' dictatorship. Against the mystification's' understanding of autonomy as the absence of leadership, Rosa's Autonomy relates to an organisational state and a tension towards the permanent class self-constitution. That does not exclude, however, the necessary action of a thinking vanguard that has to analyse the moment and to propose the accurate instructions to the masses. But here we see a weak point in Rosa's theory because she does not explain why the masses are going to accept the historically most accurate commands. It seems she sees in them an instinctive capacity for the true.

The mistakes that the exploited class does, are its opportunities to extract conclusions thanks to the revolutionary critic. It is the way towards the conformation of a class strategy to the assault on power from the bottom. The awakened intellect of Rosa follows properly this assessment: socialism is not only the socialist measures but them driven by the only class that can do this: the workers. That is why the autonomy, the political freedom and the democratisation of the power are pillars sine qua non for the socialism. The best antidote against the dangers of opportunism, bureaucratisation and corruption, against, in a word, the dictatorship, is the freedom of critic and disagreement, the free development of the masses political consciousness and debate. The freedom is the best spur of the masses vitality, so the next weapon of the proletariat dictatorship.

The revolutionary politics have to move in between the *dialectical contradiction that the proletariat army is recruited in the fight itself and just through it becomes conscious of the targets aimed* (Luxemburg 1977: 531).

The affirmation that there are not *a priori* programs implies the autonomy that is translated in the denial of the separation between the moments of elucidation, organisation and fight. With this separation also dies the bourgeois distinction between those who decide and those who execute. The socialist self-discipline appears as a result of great doses of democracy directly practiced by the masses. The discipline that, as Lenin glorifies, the factory teaches the proletarian, comes also from a whole society in which the goods are the measure and principle of every social relationship. The emancipator policy, thus, cannot limit its action to the conquest of the bourgeois domination apparatus, but it has to transform them in a democratic way for the critic protagonist role of the people to ensure a firm popular government, avoiding a dictatorship in bourgeois sense: with a minority giving orders to a proletariat become passive and governed subject (Luxemburg, 1977: 561).

With Rosa we comprehend the meaning of the spontaneity, rejecting with the same force the anarchist mystifications and the Leninist despises. The development of the production and domination provides the conditions for spontaneous movements that, once in the fight, create forms of organisation and combat a thousand times more advanced than what the most revolutionary of the directions could have ever imagined. The historical objective logic goes in front of the subjective perception of its carriers. This moves every vanguard to a role necessarily “conservative”. The masses, as the expression of the class

struggle sharpening they are, can go further than any leadership. That is why the process of taking the power and socialising it is their entire responsibility. The vanguards are, thus, only the more advanced groups that try to explain the current conflicts in the context of the history of the class struggle and the degree of capitalist development.

The problem is noted above, because as we said, Luxemburg does not overcome the metaphysic of the masses, as she puts them in an almost sacred position due to their instinctively revolutionary capacities. The question of why the masses can not be wrong in their subjective comprehension of history, of why they are going to be for sure direct instruments of the necessity of the social revolution. Here Rosa leads a dangerous side for the attacks that the official theory of the “real socialist countries” will direct against her “infantile spontaneity close to anarchism”.

It is not indispensable to have a majority for a revolutionary action; rather the majority is obtained through a cunning action that connects with the current necessities of the masses. Postponing the revolution due to a lacking of a majority is the same as not allowing its birth. Under the existent alienation in a life dominated by salaried work and a cultural universe that determines the ideological domination derived from the material domination that the bourgeoisie has, there is no possible massive alignment in the ranks of the revolution until it has started. This is but a mere acceptance of the democratic-bourgeois principles in the band of the revolution. The popular majority is conquered through the revolutionary overthrow of the Capitalist State and its substitution with the workers self-determination institutions (Feijoo, 2004).

The global movement, therefore, does not have to aspire to be sympathetic to a certain public opinion which is the abstraction of the mediatic opinion, rather, it should build resistances connected to the largest number of struggles (labour, neighbourhood, student, gender, civil rights, against the Systemic War), precisely because the nuclei of each one of these conflicts are the more valid militants of the Movement of Movements that lifts a multi-faced alternative, certainly quite ambiguous, to the global disorder that reigns the planet; the alternative is expressed in its necessary historical form, that is, like a negation of the existing .

Rosa aids in the understanding of the street aspect and "destructive" dimension of the Global Movement. Its overcoming could come through the building of self-administered experiences opposed to the logic of the capitalist gain. But neither the accumulation of the majority nor the nice *falansteries* can substitute the imperious necessity of combat. The struggle of classes educates and clarifies the masses, tossing false conceptions and fears while anticipating, in that fashion, the socialist societies in which the power has been placed in the services of the collective will's realisation.

Rosa allows for the liberation of the suffocating grip that the left inherits from the liberal-positivist thoughts since it breaks with the false opposition of the dictatorship/democracy. In her criticism of the Russian Revolution she brings to light the ideological roots of Lenin and the Mensheviks as well as Kautsky.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the mere conquest of that which created the bourgeois domination. It is not enough to “turn around” the State to use it as an execution tool of the necessary transformations for the socialism transition, since for socialism the active participation of the masses is as necessary as air is to life. The suffocation of the open political life means the suffocation of the vitality of the workers' councils, that is, the motor power of the revolution. The political liberties, which in the bourgeois society represent the shell that covers the nucleus of the exploitation (its real distinctive meaning), are for the socialist state the guarantee against the dictatorship of a professional minority: the guarantee against a dictatorship in the bourgeoisie sense. As opposed to the Leninist conception that the revolutionaries must act as Jacobins for socialism, the demolition of the dominion of classes is no more than the plain realisation of the worker's democracy (Lenin 1997).

Rosa and Bolshevik⁴

The Russian Revolution is where the great laboratory where Rosa tests her analysis tools and her socialist democracies' proposals. It is in the debate with Lenin and Trotsky where the most interesting conceptions about organisation are constructed in Rosa's thought, but also her weaknesses. Although she recognises the theory that Trotsky would formulate later in “The permanent revolution”, in which he says the proletariat has to accomplish the democratic-bourgeois tasks altogether with the socialist ones in those places where the bourgeois revolution has been uncompleted. Rosa seems to show a certain theoretical weakness in her critic against the representation policies of the Bolsheviks. She criticizes them because they abolished the universal suffrage and the Constituent Assembly (though it is true that in its specific composition was going to be a counter-revolutionary alternative power, it should not be dissolved as democratic form) implementing in a juridical anachronism (Feijoo, 2004) the total power of the soviets for which the economical conditions were not mature yet, because the masses were not, due to the crisis and the underdevelopment of the country, industrial proletariat; in this context the power of the soviets would not be the popular democracy but the Jacobin dictatorship supported on the small group of qualified factory workers. But Rosa, at the same time, accuses the Bolsheviks of hesitancy in executing the socialist task -which in her conception of the revolution is the same as saying putting in die danger the revolution itself- in the fields both of the agriculture and the nationalities. The Bolsheviks concessions to the peasantry are in fact, according to our author, a stick in the core of the revolution: the slogan of "land for those who work it" has moved the peasants in the short term to support the revolution, but having to pay a big cost for that. They are now the small owners of low-productive lands, and they are potentially hostile to any transformation towards the socialization of the agrarian property. They, in addition, could boycott the revolutionary proletariat of the cities by denying them the fruits of their lands. As Luxemburg expresses: The Leninist agrarian reform created a new and powerful strata of popular enemies of the socialist transformation in the countryside, enemies whose resistance will be more powerful and firmer than the one played by the great nobility (1978 [1922]).

⁴ In this title, the authors do not share the same opinion. Anyway, we think that the title is really beneficial in opening interesting discussions.

In the field of nationalities Rosa sees equally an unforgiving delay in the revolutionary measures to a socialist transformation of Russia. The Bolsheviks, by accepting the self-determination right of the existent nationalities in the former Zarist State, they renounced to a larger revolutionary area while giving a powerful weapon to the diverse national bourgeoisies to silence the only real self-determination, the class emancipation. Luxemburg recognises that they were forced measures imposed by the extremely difficult situation the Bolshevik Government had to deal with, but she strongly criticises the Lenin's pretension of *transforming the needs in qualities advising them for the world wide proletarian policy* (Luxemburg, 1977: 592).

What is important here is to point out the paradox that Rosa did when advocating in opposition to the "all the power to the soviets slogan" because of immature material conditions - surprisingly coinciding here with Kautsky, from which only differentiates thanks both to her recognition of the above mentioned Trostkist theory, and to what we consider a way of dodging the issue by trusting in the cunning of the Bolshevik command to overcome the tasks that the bourgeoisie was not going to accomplish.- while at the same time demands the strongest energy and the most direct execution in the fulfilment of the socialist transformation in the countryside and the nationalities. In the first case the Bolsheviks are guilty of advancing juridical measures over uncompleted socio-economic bases. In the second they are guilty of doing the opposite hence making more difficult the travel to communism. The modern capitalist conditions, whose absence makes premature to put already the power in the hands of the soviets, seem to be present when the questions are the nationalities and the agrarian issue. It is an obligation to point, at this point, that the subversive spirit of the brave woman we study, finally made her to move in favor of the proletariat's councils government when the arose in Germany in 1919. The affirmation of the socialist democracy is then clear in Luxemburg, over the different analyses on the socio-economic structures where they are to be implemented.

The Leninist traditional theory of the class consciousness assess that the workers cannot arrive further than a "tradeunionist" consciousness of their immediate and corporative interests, so it happens to be necessary a vanguard of the theoretically most advanced workers plus the intellectuals identified with the proletariat cause, in order to provide from outside the revolutionary consciousness by educating and orienting the masses in the tasks coherent with the historical evolution that moves itself towards the socialism. Rosa opposes to that a lucid critic on the Leninist too mechanical view of the relation between class and vanguard. According to her, the Party goes at the front of the masses only if is audacious and intelligent enough as to understand and to explain the current situation and the meaning of the fights fought at the moment drawing a program so accurate that the masses make it theirs. But this is only possible where the masses have the capacity to argue, to discuss, and to have a critical opinion. The free expression of the masses, they control over the political and economical process is what saves revolution from corruption, bureaucracy and the bourgeois dictatorship. The freedom for everybody is what ensures the proletariat can be guided by the vanguard but not dominated by it. Rosa shows here how Lenin and the social democratic reformist are the two sides of the same coin: the liberal-positivist conception of democracy and power. Her stroke of genius lays in her usefulness to comprehend the liberticidal deviations of the "real socialism" not from the liberal critics but from the attack on both. Denouncing the bureaucratic nightmares as constructions emanated from a

bourgeois way of seeing and, thus, practicing the power. This led a room for the thinking of alternative conception of issues such as the class, the power or the democracy, whose definition will determine our capacity to challenge the polity understood as domination and the democracy as a formal process. With Rosa we can walk the way of the democracy as an emancipator tool, of the liberty as a quotidian and permanent exercise. The goal does not justify the mediums. The repression must be limited to the old class of the exploiters. Democracy and power socialization are inseparable from the revolution triumph, because of efficiency and historical reasons rather than moralistic abstractions.

We are now arrived to the adventurous thesis that constitutes the nuclei of our paper. We believe to have theoretically deducted how why Rosa Luxemburg is an anticipation of the Marxist trend that advocates for the power of the workers' councils. Even a step further, this woman, limited, as it is natural by the historical context in which she writes, opens the door to the evolution from the extreme left to the Autonomism.

Rosa precedes Anton Pannekoek (1981) in his defence of the proletariat and councillor democracy when she advocates by the power executed from the base, from the working places. It is the first step in the recognition of the working class as an autonomous subject. Rosa is indirectly autonomous.

The last years of Luxemburg were witnesses of numerous councilor experiences: the Italian strikes just after the First World War and answered by the fascist reaction, the councillor experiences in Austria a few years later, the Sovietic Russian Revolution, or even the anarcho-sindicalism that was parallel to the Spanish Civil War, that could be considered another expression of "democracy from the factories". Actually, it was the support of Rosa Luxemburg in 1919 to the workers' insurrection what carried her to the death, perpetrated by the repressive forces of the German Government, betrayed by those who had been so many time described in her books as dangerous opportunist obstacles for the proletariat constitution in a class through the combat. This was the last political alienation of Rosa, and the most clear taking of position for the power of the working class, for what years later will be the trend of the Proletariat Autonomy.

At this point is important to put her in relation to the great Italian Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci, who made a revolution within the revolutionary thought which his evolution from a phase clearly postulating the workers' councils to his crucial elaboration of the concept of hegemony⁵ which is the theoretical surpassing of the mechanical conceptions about the class-vanguard relationship ideas.

Rosa left a comprehension of this relationship in which the class constituted once for all when arriving to the enlightenment by the combined action of the own experiences and the elucidatory work of the Party. The only admittance that the proletariat transits from -in Luckacsian terms- *class in itself* to *class for itself* through the combat, it is, that the class is dynamically constructed by the movement, it is an enormous hole through which later will appear the proletariat autonomy. We are not really far from the comprehension of the class as a permanent self-constituent tension that does not find an end until its total

⁵ Perfectly analysed by Perry Anderson in *Considerations about the occidental Marxism*.

disappearance with the dialectical negation of the other term of the antithesis: the State and the Capital. The working class is thus, in explicitly autonomous theory, movement, action, struggle, collective construction; it has to deny the existing to be, to eliminate itself altogether with all the class society. The working class is then constant tension towards communism.

It is necessary to understand the historical limitations that prevented her thought. This way we are able to know if she arrived exactly where she wanted or if, as it points our thesis, arrives to the gates of the Autonomy waiting to Gramsci to take the key out of his pocket to led space to Negri to cross it.

Antonio Negri and Felix Guattari (1999) elaborated a brilliant study that allows us to understand from a historical perspective the evolution that we defend is already present in Rosa. They analyse the relationship between class composition and organisation tendency. If for the professional worker the union was his/her natural constitutive and combative expression; and if for the mass-worker immerse in an industrial and Fordist process of production, in enormous factories with a great concentration of proletarians, corresponds the workers' council as vehicle of fight and conquest of the productive apparatus; to the postFordist societal-worker, who works in more reduced staff environments less subjected to the assembly lines than to the dynamics looking for implying all his/her communicative and vital capacities in the production of added value, corresponds the autonomy. Precisely because she/he does not need any mediation thanks to her/his creative and independent capacities, thanks to her/his property of what is more valued by the capital, the main production medium: the ideas, the knowledge, the technical and human wisdoms.

We will add here a complementary excuse for Rosa: There is not until 1932 that the Karl Marx's "The fragment about the Grundrisse" (1972[1932]) is published in the USSR. So it was impossible to Luxemburg to know the concept of "General Intellect" that is pointed in this book, which is crucial to understand the changes in the class compositions that are the real material base for the autonomous tendencies on the Marxism: the variety of technical qualities that put the proletarians in capacity to reject the mediations and sabotage the capitalist command affirming their best co-operative and self-valorisation potencies⁶.

Rosa Luxemburg, of course, did not live enough to see these transformations in the class composition, so she arrived as far as she could. As the good historical materialist she was, she based all her analyses not on predictions or passionate desires, but in the real conditions that conformed her time, to which the socialist idea should be adapted. That is what she did in relation with the opportunist deviation in the social democratic movement, which the imperialist war and which the issue of the organisation for the struggle and for the construction of the socialist democracy. The contribution that has awaken more interest here, the one that makes Luxemburg deserve a honour place to trace the roots of the autonomous tendencies in the proletariat and its theoretical formulations, is her impressive dynamical comprehension of the class and its constitution. To affirm that it is created in each fight, in each defeat even more than in even victory, in the experiences of govern and administration, is as much as to say that the class is not an object needed of an external

⁶ See Negri 2001.

contribution of historical consciousness, but an autonomous subject with enough capacities to think, to always reconstruct itself. This has an obvious conclusion: the masses are able to rule themselves, able to emancipate, able to freedom.

The mutations that the autonomy will suffer moving it from the “proletarianism” to the so called "new social movements" as a result of the changes in the postFordist societies go beyond our proposals in the current paper, but they are the linking of Luxemburg with the inherent autonomy that characterised the feminist, environmentalist, antimilitarist and squat movements in the Eighties and the Nineties, giving them structures of assembly and objectives away from the institutional mediation.

From Seattle to Madrid: A new movement growing in the battle

The origin of the Global Movement is a very discussed topic in the academy and also inside the movements. Some authors locate the origin of the movement in the protests against IMF and WB in Berlin in 1988 (Gerhards/Rucht 1992:561). Others in the student and worker struggles against the IMF economical planning in Korea (Mezzadra/Raimondi 2002:22). Others in the struggles against unemployment in France, in Brazilian MST or in radical ecologist movement in Germany (Aguiton 2001:12).

In our opinion, all of those experiences are very important in order to understand the genealogy of the Global Movement. However, we think it is possible to design the historical path of the Global Movement regarding the groups who encourage contentious actions in Seattle and Prague (the unquestionable media origin of the Global Movement in the US and Europe that permitted subsequent experiences like Genoa or Salónica).

After the EZLN rebellion in Mexico in 1994 and the solidarity social society demonstrations in Mexico in the same year, there were international demonstrations to support EZLN around the world. A lot of EZLN solidarity groups were constituted around the world and, finally, the EZ spokesman and military chief Subcomandante Marcos sent a letter to the European Zapatista meeting in Berlin to convoke the “Primer encuentro intergaláctico por la humanidad y contra el Neoliberalismo” (First intergalactic meeting for humanity and against Neo-liberalism) in La Realidad (Chiapas) in the summer of 1996. In that meeting and in the posterior “Segundo encuentro intergalactico” that took place in Spain in 1997, these groups founded the network “People’s Global Action”, PGA.

People’s Global Action was perhaps the most important international grassroots globalization network that made possible the new collective action repertoires of the Global Movement.

What is the relation between that and Rosa Luxemburg’s thought?

As we are going to explain, inside those collective action repertoires there are a lot of things that describe the "another world possible" as something more built in the battle than built in the program. Thus, the organisation as a process (Luxemburg 1904).

What was the relation between Zapatism and Rosa Luxemburg's thought? As José Guadalupe wrote 'perhaps the Left will have to reclaim the Rosa vision of Marx whereby Communism is the conscious production of the social relations of production and understand this problem of production social relations as possibility condition -as Zapatistas say- for a Society where all be allowed (Guadalupe, 2001:6). It is absolutely essential the understanding of the Marxist behavioural dimension developed by Rosa. In our opinion, that is one of the keys for transcending the "Real Socialism" terrible experiences and for understanding the new possibilities of rebellion against Capitalism.

Speaking about Seattle, what were the main lessons after the battle? Whoever has the spatial control of the city can influence the way that the conflict can follow. The key to understand the world-wide media dimension of the Seattle facts is the failure and suspension of the summit and the police confrontation. And the summit failed, because activists could blockade the WTO delegates' access into the Sheraton Hotel, trying to resist (using different strategies) the police⁷.

So the beginning of a new series of global protest (see Della Porta/Tarrow 2004 and Herreros 2004) against capitalism in its neo-liberal form, was born in the struggle process. Moreover, the series of global protest was born in the success of a new collective action repertoire that we have called the "Berlin Model" (Iglesias, 2005)⁸.

We have characterised this repertoire in 5 thesis:

1. The Berlin model has been developed by the global movement in a historical moment of capitalism where the Nation-State is no more the privileged scenario in producing and developing political contention.

2. Nowadays, Information and Communication Technologies allow the "attenuation" of the geographical scales where the contention (To understand the precise concept of contention see Tilly 1986:3-4) collective action is been developed. Thus, the ICT multiply the symbolic geographical dimension of the collective action.

3. The Berlin model implies contention dynamics that discuss materially the urban spatial control by the authority and its agencies (Corporations, Governments, Police...). That discuss symbolically the law meaning using civil disobedience tactics as symbolic constituent power⁹.

4. The Berlin Model has not a concrete beginning but the Seattle demonstrations in 1999 point the beginning of an unexpected explosion of this repertoire. From Seattle, the Berlin model begin to move on uninterruptedly.

⁷ For a more ample development of this explanation, see Iglesias 2004b,c; 2005).

⁸ We consider that the mass demonstrations in 1988 against the IMF and the WB in Berlin (See Gerhards and Rucht 1999) anticipated what were to become the typical strategies of collective action of the global movement, as enacted and mediated on a grand scale in Seattle in 1999.

⁹For the concept of constituent power and law anticipation, see Negri/Hardt 2002 and Negri 2002. For the relation between Global Movement and civil disobedience see Iglesias 2002

5. The Berlin Model is the hegemony repertoire between the different expressions of collective action of Global Movement in Europe from Prague to Genoa and the anti-war movement.

After Seattle, a “new new left” (Ross, 2004) was born going beyond the old left “domestic” problems (Arrighi/Hopkins/Wallerstein 1999: 38). Again Rosa’s concept of final objective (society’s transformation) in her polemic with Bernstein is at least in the spirit of the Global Movement battles.

We could see again the anti-capitalist spirit in the demonstrations against the IMF and the WB in Prague. It is very important to remind that in Prague there almost were no political parties and big trade unions. They arrived into the movement under the Social Forum’s “coat”.

So it is possible to speak about the Movement Autonomy. Autonomy in relation to movement and the formal institutions.

As Viejo Viñas (1999:3) wrote, the main insight of Rosa’s thought is not just the capacity in building a discourse against elitists politics (Mosca, Michels etc.); is not just its capacity in going beyond the Leninist vanguard theory. The main insight is to offer a precious tool for the libertarian Marxist thought: the autonomous sector.

Nowadays, nobody could deny the importance of this sector in building the collective actions of the repertoires of contention in the Global Movement.

Understanding the three Prague blocks (the Italians *tute bianche*, the blue block of German autonomous, and the pink block), the *Disobbedienti* movement in Italy, the occupied social centres in Spain, the tactics of sabotage against the war in United Kingdom, in Greece, in Belgium etc., it is very important trying to build a theory in studying the Autonomous sector of Global Movement.

For this theoretical work, we think that Rosa is indispensable.

We want to finish citing the Madrid experience against the war in March 2003 and the 13th March revolt in 2004 just after the bomb attacks on the trains against worker civil population on 11th March 2004.

The demonstration against the war on 15th February 2003 in Madrid was immense (probably more than 1 million people). However, for us the actions in the following month were more interesting. The day after ‘allied’ bombardment started against Iraq, students occupied the main streets of Madrid without authorisation. That night, thousands of people were in front of the Spanish parliament (this is absolutely illegal in Spain). In those days, representatives of the governing *Partido Popular* were insulted and harassed in all the ceremonies they participated in.

This spontaneous dynamic was beyond ordinary political parties’ experience. For this once the Aznar Government was nervous because it was very difficult to control this movement. As we explain elsewhere (Iglesias 2005), most of these features were similar to

the Global Movement actions developed since Seattle in Europe. The 5 thesis that we cited previously could be applied.

The mobilisation process was able to define a struggle not only against the Spanish government's foreign policy but also against the system that produces those wars. The process of struggle allowed the "new new left" to understand the keys to open new doors.

The revolt against the PP government two days after the bomb attacks and one day before the general elections showed again this Madrid against the war. Maybe this mobilisation in front of the PP's head office had some importance in the electoral debacle of PP, but, in our opinion, this is not the main point.

That demonstration was an alive expression of a tension between antagonism and the political system. Even Zapatero's Socialist Party and its related media called on the people to go home in the middle of a context where a *coup d'etat* was not an altogether unreal possibility. But the people occupied the main streets of Madrid from 6pm on 13th March to 6am the day after (the day of the elections).

As Rosa knew, democratic resistance always comes from outside the system. That was the Madrid lesson 13th March 2004.

The Global Movement that had its mediatic and fighting baptism in Seattle 1999 and its inflexion point in Genoa 2001, has in the autonomy of its diverse and different components and in the direct action not integrated in the systemic structures its identification signs, but mainly in its permanent construction through the consecutive battles against the capitalist command processes and its institutions. Here is where the necessary tribute to the autonomy great-grandmother. When the other world becomes possible precisely showing here and now the possibility of challenging the old one, we have to remember Rosa Luxemburg talking about a class that creates itself by fighting, as well as Negri when pointing out that the proletariat exists as much as it negates its dialectical contraposition: the capitalist exploitation.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank Ulrich Oslender, Paola Toschi and José Mogollón Lee. Without their help, this paper would not have been possible. Special recognition for the contribution of Raúl Sánchez Cedillo, whose facilitation of literature has been essential. We would also like to thanks J.A. Errejón (Indigo's father) and J. Iglesias (Pablo's father) for their constructive critique and comments. This paper is dedicated to the Spanish's old freedom fighters and theirs sons who continue the same struggle.

REFERENCES CITED:

- Arrighi, G., Hopkins, T. K., Wallerstein, I. (1999): Movimientos antisistémicos. Akal. Cuestiones de antagonismo, Madrid. [(1989): Antisystemic Movements. London: Verso].
- Aguiton, C. (2001): Il mondo ci appartiene. I nuovi movimenti sociali. Feltrinelli, Milán.

-Casarini, L. (2002): "Disobediencia-Violencia". In Casarini and Others: Un altro mondo in costruzione. Le idee del Movimento globale . Baldini&Castoldi, Milan, pp. 69-76.

-Della Porta, D. and Tarrow, S. (eds.) (2004): Transnational Global Activism, Rowman and Littlefield.

-Della Porta, D. and Mosca, L. (2003): "Globalizzazione e movimenti sociali: una introduzione". In Della Porta (Ed.): Globalizzazione e movimenti sociali. Manifestolibri, Roma pp- 7-20.

-Feijoo, C. (2004): "Rosa Luxemburgo y la democracia socialista". In Revista Lucha de Clases, number 2.

-Gerhards, J. y Rucht, D. (1992): "Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany". *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 98, number 3, pp. 555-595.

-Guadalupe Gandarilla, J. (2001): "Rosa Luxemburgo: Teoría y práctica de la acción revolucionaria". In http://www.profesionalespcm.org/_php/MuestraArticulo2.php?id=313 (Access: 12/01/2005).

-Herreros, T. (2004): "Moviments i cicles de protesta: El cicle de protesta del Capitalisme global, 1994-2003". Paper presented at the *VIII Congreso Español de Sociología*, Alicante.

-Iglesias Turrión, P. (2000): "La lección de Praga". *Rebelión*, 10 October. In www.rebelion.org/economia/turrión101000 (Access:10/10/02).

-(2002): "Desobediencia civil y Movimiento antiglobalización". *Revista telemática de Filosofía del Derecho*, number 5. In www.filosofiyderecho.com/rtfd/numero5/desobediencia3.htm (Access: 5/12/04).

-(2004a): "Los indios que invadieron Europa. La influencia del E.Z.L.N. en las formas de acción colectiva de los movimientos globales. Los tute bianche". *Actas del X Encuentro de latinoamericanistas españoles. Identidad y multiculturalidad: la construcción de espacios iberoamericanos*. Universidad de Salamanca, May 2004. In [http://www.sindominio.net/~pablo/trabajos/Ponencia%20Congreso%20Salamanca%20-%20Mayo%](http://www.sindominio.net/~pablo/trabajos/Ponencia%20Congreso%20Salamanca%20-%20Mayo%20) (Access: 17/10/04).

-(2004b): "The Global movement's strategies. New forms of collective action in the control of urban space in protests against international organisations. The anti-summit model". Paper presented at the *ESRC/RSGS Advanced Research Training in Human Geography, Kindrogan Field Centre*, 4-7 September 2004.

-(2004c): "Los Movimientos Globales de Seattle a Praga. El modelo contracumbre como nueva forma de acción colectiva". *Transactions VIII Congreso de la Federación española de Sociología*, September 2004, Alicante. In

<http://www.sindominio.net/~pablo/trabajos/2004-Ponencia-Modelo%20contracumbre>
(Access: 17/10/04).

-(2005): "Un nuevo poder en las calles. Repertorios de acción colectiva del Movimiento Global en Europa. El modelo de Berlín". *Política y Sociedad* 2005. In press.

-Lenin, V.I.U., (1997): El Estado y la Revolución. Fundación Federico Engels Madrid.

-Luxemburg, R. (1976 [1914]): La crisis de la Socialdemocracia. Anagrama, Barcelona.

-(1977): Escritos políticos. Grijalbo, Barcelona.

-(1978 [1896-98]): Reforma o Revolución. Akal, Madrid.

-(1978 [1918]): "Que se propone la Liga Espartaco". In Obras escogidas. *Biblioteca de textos socialistas* number 5, Editorial Ayuso, Madrid, pp. 151-161.

-(1978 [1922]): "La revolución rusa". In Obras escogidas. *Biblioteca de textos socialistas* number 5, Editorial Ayuso, Madrid, pp. 117-150.

-Marx, K. (1972 [1931]): Elementos fundamentales para la crítica de la economía política (borrador) 1857-1858. Vol. 2, Siglo XXI. México.

-McCarthy, J. D. (1977): "Resource of Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory". *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 82, number 6, pp. 1212-1241.

-Melucci, A. (1994): "Asumir un compromiso: identidad y movilización en los movimientos sociales". In Revilla, M.: Movimientos sociales, acción e identidad. *Zona Abierta*, número 69, pp. 153-180. [Melucci, A. (1988): "Getting Involved: Identity and Mobilization in Social Movements". In Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H. and Tarrow, S. (comps.): From Structure to Action. Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures, Greenwich: JAI Press, pp- 329-348].

-Mezzadra, S. and Raimondi, F. (2002): "Más allá de Génova, más allá de Nueva York. Tesis sobre el movimiento global". *Contrapoder*, number 6, pp. 21-34.

-Negri, A. and Guattari, F. (1999): *Las verdades nómadas & General Intellect, Poder Constituyente, Comunismo*. Akal, Madrid.

-Negri, A. and Hardt, M. (2002): Imperio. Paidós, Barcelona. [(2000): Empire. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press].

-Negri, A. (2001) Marx más allá de Marx. Akal, cuestiones de antagonismo. Madrid.

-(2002): "Che farne del *che fare?* ovvero: il corpo del general intellect". *Posse*, May number, pp. 123-133.

-Pérez Ledesma, M. (1994): “Cuando lleguen los días de la cólera (Movimientos sociales, teoría e historia)”. In Revilla, M.: Movimientos sociales, acción e identidad. *Zona Abierta*, number 69, pp. 51-120.

-Ross, R.J.S. (2004): “From Antisweatshop to Global Justice to Antiwar: How the new New Left is the Same and Different From the old New Left”. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, vol. X, number I, Winter 2004, pp. 287-319.

-Snow, David A., Rochford Jr., E. Burke, Worden, Steven K., Benford, Robert D. (1986): “Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation”. *American Sociological Review*, 51: 464-481.

-Sorel, G., (2004[1918]): El sindicalismo revolucionario. In http://www.antorcha.net/biblioteca_virtual/filosofia/sorel/sorel.html (Access:12/12/04).

-Tarrow, S. (2004): El poder en movimiento. Los movimientos sociales, la acción colectiva y la política. Segunda edición, Alianza Ensayo, Madrid. [(1998) Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics. New York/Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2nd ed.].

-Tilly, Ch. (1986): The contentious French: Four Centuries of popular Struggle. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

-Viejo Viñas, R. (1999): “La organización del movimiento. Notas provisionales sobre el *partido* en el pensamiento vivo de Rosa Luxemburg”. In *Autonomía Social*: http://usuarios.lycos.es/pete_baumann/Luxemburg.htm , (Access: 15/12/04).