



FOREWORD

Beyond Capitalism: From Here to There



At the turn of the millennium the peoples of the world have witnessed the pangs of discontent. In 1999 the pacific protesters who supported an alternative globalization confronted police brutality in Seattle. In the following years the same would be repeated in Genoa, Copenhagen, and elsewhere. The defense of Pacha Mama or Mother Earth is no real matter of concern for today's elite. Certainly an equitable brand of globalization isn't either. And in 2008 the orgies of the deregulation of finance imposed what is and will be a long crisis with tremendous destructive power. Poverty is hitting the advanced capitalist countries as never since the depression of the 1930s. We are witnessing the worst crisis of the capitalist system, indeed a crisis warned against for some time by independent economists. And the peoples of those countries are paying for the mistakes which they themselves have not caused. Not unsurprisingly a scent of discontent against that and widespread unemployment and poverty emerges in the air in many countries: the so-called Arab Spring, the Indignant movement in Spain, the anti-Wall Street movement in the United States, and so on.

But alas not all is despair. As the new millennium was born, the first World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil occurred. Thousands of people from all continents were present to debate new prospects for the economy and society. "Another world is possible" then became the motto and came to stay. Thereafter, in Porto Alegre and elsewhere, in both world and regional social forums, the event has been repeated and has grown in perspective. Not only is a loss of faith in capitalism manifested but above all else new ways of dealing with the problems of our time, especially when related to the economy, are pondered.

Considering new ways of running society, suggesting the organization of the economy in a postcapitalist society, obviously involves problems. It is never easy to speak of a conceivable future, of a utopia in the etymological sense (no place) of the term for it, as a whole at least, is still out of sight. However, speaking of utopia is easier—or, to put it more cautiously,

less difficult—than speaking of the crossing, that is, the transition to a new type of society. Nobody knows how or when such a challenging and difficult undertaking will be successful. Indeed, one cannot even foresee *whether* it will occur. Thus, a revolutionary faith and hope are necessary for the lack of the same would mean the successful persistence of the status quo. Such a sin of omission cannot be afforded vis-à-vis an increasingly barbarian world.

Indeed another society is already being built, whether at a national level in some very rare or infrequent cases such as that of Venezuela or through neighborhood and workplace organizing projects in countless countries all over the globe. These quests for change, these experiments which can be seen as both cause and effect of theories on the matter, have not thus far gained full momentum. That is why we here speak of alternatives for today and the future. It is quite possible that, albeit thus far in only partial or incomplete terms, the future has already begun. That is what, more frequently implicitly than explicitly, the 12 chapters of this book provocatively suggest.

Neoliberal capitalism

Despite spectacular failures (most recently the financial crisis of 2008 to present) neoliberalism continues to dominate the policy visions and commitments of global decision-making elites. Within projects of neoliberal capitalism most people are in need of liberation from their socioeconomic circumstances. Neoliberalism creates an increasingly polarized and impoverished society. This includes economic inequalities within countries as well as the oppression of poorer countries and the poor globally.

Neoliberalism includes the domination globally of financial markets, investment, and speculation over traditional production economies (as under industrialism or secondary sector dominance). The domination of financial markets is enacted partly through neoliberal social policies that subordinate poor people and poorer economies to the priorities of capitalist markets and trade. There is also concern over the neoliberal constitution of subjectivity—the creation of neoliberal subjects for whom neoliberalism is regarded simply as a “way of life,” the only possible world, as it has been recently put, or, to use Margaret Thatcher’s slogan propagated a few decades ago, “TINA—there is no alternative.” The production of neoliberal subjects is a key aspect of contemporary struggles over dispossession and exploitation.

For many commentators, 1989 and 2001 provide key dates in the periodization of the symbolic history of neoliberalism. The year 1989 signaled, of course, the collapse of the Soviet regimes as well as the final years in office of Reagan and Thatcher, whose mythologies of the renaissance of the

United States and Britain as the “rightful” world powers provided impetus for the rule of “free market values” and the demise of social welfare (and social movements). Notably, the collapse of distinctions between Left and Right, and the loss of belief in possibilities of revolutionary transformation, became widely entrenched after the collapse of the Soviet forms of “communism” after 1989. The other symbolic date is 9–11, 2001. This moment has served as the mobilizing myth behind the recent nationalist and expansionist drives to war and occupation and the US pursuit of global geopolitical domination.

The Reagan-Thatcher project was a response to the decline of the period of postwar economic growth, the so-called golden years or the glorious 30 years (roughly 1945–75) when social democratic Keynesian ideas on the economy were practiced in the global North after which economic liberalism was resuscitated (hence the term *neoliberalism*) with a vengeance. The neoliberal ideology, that was part of a broader structural adjustment project, offered several diagnoses for the collapse of the postwar boom—all of which were viewed as systemic. The pillars of neoliberal mythology involved attempts to overcome the supposed imposition of market rigidities, always attributed to the purported power or interference of labor unions, government regulation, “unfair” tax burdens on entrepreneurs who were presented as the real engines of the economy, and the excessive costs (in capital’s view) of welfare systems that had among their imagined faults the creation of a “culture of poverty” which removed incentives for the working class to accept work in lower paying jobs, with little or no security. Indeed, these were the very work conditions sought by the budding entrepreneurs with their service sector economies. These pillars all remain as part of current political and economic discourses, even if some of the rough edges have been smoothed down (such as the most virulent attacks on single moms under popular Reagan and Bush discourses).

The task for neoliberal governments has been, and continues to be, the removal of the supposed market rigidities, government regulations, and interventions in social welfare. Governments are said to exist to create or expand markets and protect property (militarily as well as judicially), especially from movements of the working classes and poor. Nothing more. The catchwords are deregulation and privatization. Notions of equality are reduced to an “equality of opportunity” that refuses even minimal efforts toward any actual redistribution of income (unless it goes from poor to wealthy).

In fact, despite the claims of neoliberal mythologizing, neoliberalism has actually been effected through what might be called more appropriately a “Military Keynesianism.” While claiming to desire “less government” or “smaller government,” ruling parties from Reagan through Obama and Thatcher through Cameron have massively grown the military and police functions of the state, at enormous cost, operating staggering deficits and

running up record debts (as did the Reagan administrations, despite recent Republican revisionism). Neoliberal governments also, despite the mythology, have worked to centralize government, reaching the heights of executive exercise of authority as practiced under Bush the Younger. In addition, despite the antiwelfare bootstrapping rhetoric of successive administrations, neoliberal governments have also increased tax cuts, public grants, and interest free loans to corporations. What some term “corporate welfare,” these policies have effected a massive transfer of wealth upward from poor to rich. Never mind the usual complaints about wealth redistribution offered by neoliberal parties.

The political outcome of neoliberalism has been the reduction of political action to the spectacle of mass media panics, poll chasing, and public relations focus group driven “issues management.” In the North, a range of moral panics (typically centered around the poor and working classes) have been, and continue to be, regularly deployed to excite the electorate. So-called terrorists and “illegal” migrants have formed some of the most popular recent manifestations. Homeless people, “squeegee youth,” and “riot girls” (punk influenced feminist activists) posed some of the earlier examples. The hegemony of neoliberalism among parties of both Left and Right constructs politics as a matter of “positioning conformist citizens in front of the market.”

Under such conditions, politics lost much meaning and distinctions between Left and Right, in mainstream party politics, dissolved in the electorally strategic, and highly profitable, pursuit of the marketable “centrist” position. Politics has been evacuated under economic managerialism and the forever-deferred promise of trickle-down economics according to which increases in wealth for the rich will, over time, filter down somehow to the poor. This approach, of course, has actually increased wealth even more for the already rich while devastating the poor and their communities.

Notably, the purportedly alternative politics of Clinton and Blair, supposed liberals, actually served to consolidate and extend the Reagan-Thatcher projects making them more palatable (at least initially) to working-class voters. Many disappointed liberals and social democrats are beginning to realize that Obama represents a similar “alternative” politics (or Trojan horse neoliberal).

The current period requires nothing less than a proliferation of new democratic projects. As Kenneth Surin argues in his *Freedom Not Yet: Liberation and the New World Order*, “What is desperately needed today, therefore, is a new sociopolitical settlement, at once practical and theoretical, that will reclaim the political for the project of a democracy that will place the interests of the dispossessed at its heart” (2009: 11). Overall this new democracy is possible only as a project of liberation from the dispossession and exploitation that are at the center of capitalist structures of domination and power.

Renewing resistance: The historic year 2011 and beyond

If 1989 and 2001 represent symbolic markers in the periodization of recent struggles, at least as far as the ruling class counterrevolutions are concerned, it can also be said that 2011 will stand as a signature moment in social history—this time on the side of resistance. The uprisings and mass mobilizations of 2011, from the Arab Spring to Occupy, suggest a renewal of resistance and social struggles that had been in some ways obscured after 2001.

On December 17, 2010 a young Tunisian college graduate who was obliged to make a living as a street vendor in order to survive was mistreated and humiliated by the police. Whether he was bearing in mind the historic antecedent or not, the young man repeated a gesture practiced by Vietnamese bonzos as a protest against the occupation of their country by American troops four decades earlier, and, setting his body on fire, offered himself as a holocaust.

Why did this gesture touch all Tunisia and the entire Arab world and inflame the latter, indeed to the extent that that is happening to this very day? Well, in the Arab world and indeed in the world at large, unemployment has been increasing frightfully, especially for the young as they can barely get into the labor market. Furthermore in many poor countries the prices of food have increased beyond the capacity the public has to pay. Many Arab, European, and American youths as well as youths from other countries have been waiting for jobs for years without being able to make it.

All that was propitious for commencing the “Arab Spring.” Democracy, even that highly limited bourgeois democracy or liberal democracy as its pundits call it, has not prevailed in the Arab world. For this reason and others, Arabs are considered backward in the West when in reality it’s all been a question of a conglomeration of dictatorships and absolutist monarchies patronized by the West itself for decades. Thanks to the linguistic unity of the Arab world from Morocco to Iraq and also to internet, the whole Arab world was inflamed to revolt: revolt against the high prices for food, revolt against unemployment, revolt against authoritarianism.

Some dictators fall but the vacuum is filled in by partisans of the status quo. That is notorious in the case of Egypt, a country with 80 million inhabitants. Dictator Mubarak lost power. But the military junta, his own child and holding strong ties with multinational enterprises, took the reins of the country into its own hands. The junta has surreptitiously encouraged discord among Muslim activists (not all of whom are religious) and the Coptic Christian minority. But the young activists insist that both Christians and Muslims are Egyptians. Tahrir Square in Cairo is frequently

occupied by tens of thousands of demonstrators. The police have even used a new poison gas imported from the United States and threw it against many activists. And they threw the bodies of many fatal victims along the more distant sides of the Square. But the struggle goes on.

Through various new media, the longing demands made by Arab youth spread to Spain's youth by contagion. In Madrid, Barcelona, and other cities a new movement is gradually formed. They have christened themselves the Indignados—the Indignant. In England the youth from the slums, discriminated against by the police sometimes quite brutally, are also rebelling. They know they are condemned to grow without ever conquering a job amidst governments which call for cuts from social spending by the national budget.

Finally in the heart of the Empire the Occupy Wall Street movement begins. Once again the demonstrators are by far mainly youths with the same worries. Countless numbers of them observe, as do their peers in other countries, that the “democracy” we know does not favor the real anxieties and needs of the people.

The Occupy movement has reached a thousand towns in the United States according to its organizers. Although the figure may be exaggerated, surely it involves a high number of participants. In Brussels, the capital of the European Union, young Belgian, French, and Spanish demonstrators plus demonstrators of other European nationalities recently organized marches.

In Spain, the United States, and elsewhere the situation suggests the presence of anarchists. Anarchists have always avoided interaction among political parties. The anarchists had a most active role in the Paris Commune of 1871. Later they struggled against the status quo in Russia and still decades later in Spain. But it is not only a question of anarchist demonstrators. It is a question of young people who perceive that with the present system there is no future in sight. In each country there is not a neatly knit movement, that is, there are no clear leaderships. That kind of activism has been formed spontaneously as answers to so evident anxieties. One instinctively feels the need to guarantee an organization. Subjects such as the setting up of places for sleeping for people who have come from farther away and use sleeping bags, the provisions each individual or each group makes for food, and so on are all solved and not infrequently with the support of a large part of the public who do not occupy squares but who want to be of some help materially.

There are not yet any demands, there is no greater program or project. Owing to the complexity of the present state of affairs it is natural that such be the case in the beginning. But just to expound what one does not want is quite significant. One does not want capitalism. That is quite clear. The building of an alternative will have to come with time, will have to ripen.

In the United States and western Europe, regions that were harshly hit by the worst crisis of the capitalist system, which began in 2008 and will

last quite a long time, the movement to occupy the squares got less intense during the winter in 2011–12. But later with the spring all tends to begin anew.

Probably the crisis which began in 2008 will be the last one. Beginning half a century ago in the advanced capitalist nations the rate of profit has been decreasing dramatically as Karl Marx had foreseen. Virtual capital, which was only 10 percent of all the capital on the planet in 1970, is now something like 97 or 98 percent of it. Although the system is only decades from its end—historically, therefore, very close to it—it will continue to devour millions of innocent people until it draws its last breath. It is important the vacuum left by capitalism be not filled by a new oppressive system. So that the struggle will be worth while it will be necessary to build an egalitarian society, that is, a society without social classes.

There are various factors favorable to the social struggle that has been intensified since 2011. As an American observer has said, unlike what has happened on the occasion of the G20 and G8 and similar meetings, the new demonstrations which arose in the historic year of 2011 can occur more often because they no longer occur necessarily in opposition to meetings set up by the governments of the biggest economies in the world of our time. A second positive factor is that there is always strong support by people not directly involved in the demonstrations, which becomes evident thanks to the supplying of food for the demonstrators and also frequent expressions of supportive opinions. A survey done in late 2011, for instance, showed that 46 percent of the Americans believe that the Occupy movement people have the right to have their demonstrations whereas a smaller proportion has the opposite opinion. And in countries where over the years there are occupations by the workers, the population of the vicinity (and beyond) tend to defend the rebellious workers. About ten years ago in Brazil over 50 percent of the people interviewed for a survey declared themselves favorable to the occupation of unproductive *latifúndios* (big landed properties) by peasants who were willing to plant in them. All that happens despite the orientation of the opinion formers of the great private media for people to believe the opposite.

But, as was foreseeable, the bourgeois state reacted to that. The police in various countries become truculent. To deter the Occupy Wall Street movement President Obama in March 2012 signed an unconstitutional law that provides for the imprisonment of demonstrators who enter grounds close to buildings of the federal government. Also there are and there will be attempts to create new legislation which will restrain freedom of expression on internet.

Therefore the questions remain: How confront state forces which are often hostile or even brutal? How confront a restrictive legislation whose purpose is to promote the interests of the mega bourgeoisie, especially the bankers, and not the interests of the people? How confront the media? This

last problem is being confronted with a certain degree of success as we suggested a few lines above. In a nutshell: to confront the mega bourgeoisie which has extremely strong means to defend its interests is a challenge with a difficult solution. What is needed is enormous pressure by the people. As long as there is repression there will be rebellion.

The path ahead

Political innovation, and indeed the alteration of politics, is required to achieve social liberation from neoliberal capitalism. Opposition to neoliberal politics and the possibilities of social transformation and the development of real alternative social relations beyond state capitalism are at the heart of a range of new social projects. These form the basis for the works analyzed and discussed in the present volume.

The first part of the book is concerned with prospects for a democratic economy without privileging any particular geographic area. It begins with an essay where José Brendan Macdonald views the role of workers as participants in the productive system thanks to the invention of cooperatives two centuries ago. Although the egalitarian ideals of the cooperative movement have been eroded over time in so many cases, the presence of self-managed enterprises and the diffusion of their need and their advantages is a strong indication in favor of a project for a new civilization.

In an anarchistic perspective, Michael Albert presents the basics of the parecon or participatory economics theory. Its four basic values—solidarity, diversity, equity, and self-management—are expounded. In such a truly egalitarian, classless society the interests of others will necessarily reflect positively on one's own interests.

Dada Maheshvarananda expounds Prout or the progressive utilization theory, which is quite foreign to current individualism that pervades the society today. The economy for the well-being of all is seen not only in physical but also in ecological and spiritual perspective. The highest development of the various aspects of individual and collective well-being is proposed. Five basic principles are put forward.

In his chapter, Jeff Shantz examines the ideas and practices of especificist groups—an approach to anarchist organization that has developed over the past half-century, primarily in South America. He explains platformist anarchism and discusses its influence on especificist practices. A crucial element is the process of “social insertion” or the involvement of anarchists in popular social movements and the daily struggles of the oppressed and working classes. This includes work in neighborhood committees, landless tenant movements, or rank-and-file union organizing. The revival of platformism recently has provided an important impetus for anarchist workplace and community organizing in various contexts globally. Shantz

outlines debates within and between especificist groups and provides an analysis of specific movement practices, strategies, and tactics with particular emphasis on especificist organizing in Brazil and Argentina.

Heloisa Primavera introduces ideas on social currencies and the solidarity economy or solidarian economy as some of us prefer to call it. Social currencies are created and managed by communities, used as a medium of exchange and of account but not as a value reserve because they produce no interest when they are not in use, which makes them useful for the distribution of wealth and useless for speculation or accumulation of capital. Although Argentina and Brazil are the countries where social currencies flourish most today, the phenomenon occurs on all continents.

Chapters 6 through 12 are dedicated to specific cases of alternative forms of the economy in concrete historical practice. Chapters 6 through 9 concern cases from the global North whereas the rest speak of the global South.

Alessandra Azevedo and Leda Gitahy are concerned with the role of technological education and innovation in the Mondragón cooperative complex in the Basque Country in Spain. In striking contrast to capitalism a brief history of the Mondragón cooperatives, their principles, and their development of technology are reviewed.

Gregor Gall examines worker occupations and worker cooperatives at present bearing in mind lessons from such experiences in the 1970s and 1980s in Britain. Such phenomena were not ideologically motivated and are often prey to neoliberal or social liberal discourse. Spending with judicial disputes and the worsening of working conditions and difficulties with obtaining credit are pointed out. All this is borne in mind notwithstanding the author's inexplicit moral rejection of capitalism or indeed in a certain sense because of it as certain realities can be seen as admonitions before new action is taken.

Jeff Shantz examines the crucial challenges facing movements for positive social change in Canada, as in the broad mobilizations opposing the G20 meetings in Toronto during the summer of 2010. Alliances are made between unions and community-based social movements. The chapter begins by looking at union responses to direct actions during the G20 and attempts to contextualize these responses within ongoing practices and perspectives on organizing. It ends by highlighting a couple of projects that point toward a transcending of the divide between labor/community organizing and mass/direct action that has contributed to something of an impasse in political mobilizing in Ontario.

Gar Alperovitz considers what happens in advanced industrial economies like that of the United States, where traditional redistributive economic policies and programs have fallen out of favor, yet forces of crisis, which radicals once predicted would usher in a new, more egalitarian and democratic era, are well attenuated. It is argued that, paradoxically, as the

growth potential of corporate capitalism declines and traditional redistributive mechanisms weaken, new spaces are opening up in which new, democratized forms of ownership and control of wealth are slowly emerging. After describing these developments, the chapter explores the long-run possibilities and prospects their evolution.

Chapter 10 is the first one to set the scene for alternatives to capitalism in the global South. A critical approach to the Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela is formulated by one of its many foreign sympathizers. Juan Carlos Monedero speaks of the “social debt” to Venezuela’s poor, and the attempts to reinvent the state through the so-called missions. Partly due to the inheritance of the petroleum income, the presence of a social economy in contradistinction to the capitalist and state sectors of the national economy is still quantitatively timid.

Peter Ranis analyzes enterprises recuperated by workers from capitalists, and other types of worker cooperatives in Argentina. These occupations represent dramatic confrontations between private property rights and the labor rights of the working class faced with unemployment and poverty, all of which must confront the legal-constitutional and political-institutional frameworks embedded in the body politic. By their capacity to form alliances with progressive community, legal, political, and labor forces, these mobilizations represent an alternative path to economic development that is predicated on worker solidarity and democracy in the workplace.

In the last chapter, Vishwas Satgar gives us a view of the former apartheid agro-food complex in South Africa which has been restructured and globalized. This has been translated by the imposition of neoliberal policies which search for advantages based on competition and not on meeting people’s needs. Food insecurity is spreading but forms of resistance to it have also appeared. Some of the solidararian economy practices which respond to this neoliberal pattern are portrayed here. A special emphasis on two cooperatives—one rural and the other urban—which illustrate this resistance is given. Finally, the challenges facing solidararian economy food sovereignty cooperative alternatives are shown.

Onward

History—both past and present—is cruel. The challenge is to defeat barbarity. It is not a question of creating another world without imperfections. The human condition teaches us that there cannot be a society which is perfect, without problems. But that does not invalidate the intent to mounting a civilization which inhibits injustice notoriously. Through new mechanisms it will be possible to get there.

A key feature of the rise of neoliberalism has been the failure to problematize categories of class struggle. Notions of social class and class struggle have clearly been marginalized throughout the past three decades. This marginalization has been deepened in media manipulated politics of the neoliberal period.

The need for categorical innovation provides impetus for contemporary movement projects. Radicalism—socialism and anarchism—requires a renovation of its own categories, and the current period of crises provides some encouragement for that effort. The bureaucratic, centralized state (of Sovietism and corporatism) has had its day—belief in the need for a state apparatus to manage affairs, even in a liberated society, must be superseded. In the end it is not enough to seek only a politics to the Left of social democracy. This is extremely limited. The real issue is the existence of those institutions themselves, not their democratization. The real questions are power, access, decision making (and, indeed, property and wealth) rather than the return of regulatory bodies (that might again degenerate in the face of the above structures). This is a social democratization rather than a formally political one.

There remain attempts to divert politics once again into the party politics of different parts that still make up the same whole (with loyal oppositions of Left and Right). Yet the real problem is party politics, representative democracy, and the domination of politics by professional organizations. The real problems might be understood as authoritarianism and statism, which create, maintain, and thrive on the dispossession that is the root of state capitalism.

The great pressing necessity in the present period is the crucial need for the development and extension of bonds of community solidarity: locally and globally. In our view, there is a real need for liberation movements, especially in the North, to build what Shantz prefers to call infrastructures of resistance. These are the institutions and shared resources that might sustain communities and movements in struggles over time. There must be institutional analysis, both of the decline of previous infrastructures of resistance within the working classes (unions, mutual aid societies, flying squads, workers centers) and of emerging alternatives and their promise and prospects for continued development. The construction and maintenance of these infrastructures of resistance are at the heart of many of the projects discussed in this collection.

Even more, the works of the contributors to this collection, and the projects they analyze, suggest one must have reservations about any duality of revolution/reform that frames much of political movement debate. These works offer living examples of efforts that move well beyond reform and provide the basis for thoroughgoing social transformation while avoiding the political stereotypes that pose revolution as a moment of violent rupture or break with history. Rather these works engage with projects

that offer real possibilities for sustaining communities and struggles in the real world while also providing the capacity necessary for broader social transformations—for movements beyond capitalism.

At the same time, there is a continued need for radical theory, which remains indispensable. In much academic work there has been too little engagement with the political theorizing, strategies, or tactics being produced and debated within contemporary movements and by activists and organizers. The contributors to the present volume engage the philosophical possibilities of radical, socialist, and anarchist, perspectives on liberation from capitalist regimes of economic exploitation and political domination.

Unlike many post-Marxist theorists who, over the past few decades of “end of history” defeatism in Marxist circles, have given up hopes for revolutionary transformation and turned instead to social democracy (so-called radical democracy), the contributors seek the conditions and prospects for revolutionary or radical change (change that gets to the roots of problems) in the twenty-first century.

From an anticapitalist perspective, economic crises, such as the current financial crisis of 2008 to the present, are results of the structures of capitalist development, of regimes of production and accumulation. Indeed the financial crisis is the product of deep tensions within the capitalist system of accumulation which can only be removed through removal of the system that produced, and continues to produce, them in the first place. This distinguishes such anticapitalist approaches from those of other critics—liberal, conservative, postmodern, and post-Marxist alike—for whom the question of capitalism as a system of accumulation to be superseded is largely avoided or discounted.

New ways of developing associated workers, of practicing trade fairly, of using social currencies, of defending the rights of workers and common people, and even of developing the economy at large on a national and international scale are being experimented. What happens in Argentina, or Canada, or Spain, or South Africa can be examples for what can happen in other latitudes. Cultural differences will continue but that does not mean that human needs and aspirations have no common denominators. Indeed they have many whether one speaks Chinese, Arabic, English, Portuguese, or whatever.

This is a book of the radical imagination, of the images, hopes, and desires that motivate or inspire political actors, movements, or communities. It is also a book of the here and now of practical reality. The desire for freedom and equity are multiplying today perhaps more than ever before. Indeed another world is possible. And there are many signs that it may already be on its way.

Jeff Shantz—Surrey, Canada
José Brendan Macdonald—João Pessoa, Brazil
October 2012