

# The Vampire Strikes Back!



## a cursory look at the politics of Globalise Resistance

*"Mass movements don't get the political representation that they deserve unless a minority of activists within the movement seek to create a political leadership, which means a political party that shares their vision of political power from below. Such a party will be much less than the movement numerically, but much more than the movement ideologically and organisationally."* John Rees, *The Battle after Seattle*, Socialist Review #237, January 2000 (SWP monthly magazine).

Perhaps it was coincidence that the above analysis and a previously unheard of organisation calling itself Globalise Resistance (GR) emerged into the arena of anti-capitalist politics prior to the IMF/World Bank annual meetings in Prague in September 2000. Or perhaps not.

Globalise Resistance has set about putting itself at the front of the ill-defined and often contradictory anti-globalisation movement. Bringing the movement's "stars" together at their gatherings: Monbiot, George, Klein, *et al.* they pay lip service to the liberal preoccupation of curbing the excesses of the global market on the one hand, while bolting on a "socialist" alternative of old labour re-nationalisation of the public utilities and calling for intervention from the state.

GR is deeply conscious of its perception by others as being a political "front" for the Socialist Workers Party; it understands the suspicions that many people have of the SWP's chameleon-like changes in priorities throughout its history. If an issue is no longer profitable in terms of party-building, it is discarded, often leaving SWPers on the ground bewildered by the leadership's change of strategy. Many good and committed activists have left the SWP over the years, feeling chewed up and spat out; some never returning to political activity as a result of such cynical manoeuvring. GR is currently being juggled alongside the SWP's other project as a major element within the *Socialist Alliance*, who stood candidates at the last election, largely on an old labour agenda.

This year's "protest" (lobbying, it seems, doesn't convey the sought after cred) at the Labour Party conference in Brighton will follow the same lines as every other SWP intervention. The strategy is straightforward: make calls on the leadership of ... [insert bad guys here] ... to take action on our behalf; in the hope that the disillusionment that inevitably results from the "failure" of the leadership will bring the hoards flooding into the Party, won over by its militant stand against the nasty institutions.

## EFFECTIVE OR SYMBOLIC?

At a GR mobilising meeting in London recently, an activist sought clarification as to whether GR intended to attempt to shut down the Labour Conference or just to protest nearby. The floor and the platform were unanimous in their response. So off to protest it is then.

"Unity through diversity" is the new GR mantra, but the protests in Brighton have no other objective than the usual set-piece of demands, followed by feigned outrage that "we've been sold out". It might seem odd to object to unity until one examines exactly what GR "unity" means in practice... The implication is that anyone who objects to joining together behind GR (remember Oxford Circus on May Day?), thus limiting themselves to protest, is sectarian and "undemocratic". We reject this proposition out of hand.

On the contrary, it is methods of the direct recent years; organised to celebrating a diversity emphasis on each person's have been inspired to take movement has developed and



exactly *because* of the action movement in non-hierarchically, committed of many tactics and with the *active* participation that others action themselves, and the grown.

Militants and radicals have learned the lessons many times throughout history (some paying with their lives) that putting our faith and our resources behind "united fronts" — coalition building with social democracy — results without fail in the bolstering and upholding of the status quo *or worse*.

Despite the above criticisms we agree that there is a need for open dialogue within the anti-globalisation movement, to gain a better understanding of the capitalist beast and to develop our responses accordingly. But as anti-capitalists we are not interested in propping up capitalism's left wing. The old ideologies of the 19th & 20th centuries are dead and decaying. There seems to us little point in prolonging the agony by continuing to repeat the mistakes made in the last century in the name of human liberation.

Our vision is a world community without capitalist relations, a society without classes, organised "from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs". Our methods seek to challenge the separation between what constitutes political action and "normal" everyday life. It is only when we can see how every element of our daily life is mediated by capital that more and more people will take back their lives; refusing to be dominated. Or indeed represented.

**This leaflet was written by some concerned Stake Holders**

**If you're interested in discussing any of the issues raised here email: [vampirestrike@hotmail.com](mailto:vampirestrike@hotmail.com)**