

**IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN'S CONTRIBUTION
TO MONDOLOGY AND THE CRITICAL THEORY
OF THE GLOBAL WORLD SYSTEM TRANSITION ***

UDC 316.324;316.42;316.2 Volerstin

Ljubiša R. Mitrović

Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, Serbia
ljubisa@filfak.ni.ac.yu

Abstract. *The author focuses on the origin and development of the world-system theory of Immanuel Wallerstein, and especially his contribution to start a critical theory of global transition and mondology as a transdisciplinary science about the world and man. The basic Wallerstein's thesis is: when one system enters the field of transition, the direction and the result of its movement are not certain. Different alternatives of social changes from progression to regression are possible. The social changes in the fields of transition depend on numerous subjective and objective factors but also on the moral and political roles of social agents in the social struggles in the contemporary world. In the focus of Wallerstein's analysis there are global changes of capitalism as a historical system and the possible transition – within the social development – into the new subcapitalistic system. In the given context, Wallerstein analyses the role of antisystemic movements in the processes of global transition.*

Key words: *world-system theory, Immanuel Wallerstein, mondology, global transition, capitalism, antisystemic movements.*

INTRODUCTION: ON MYSTIFICATIONS AND ABUSES OF THE CONCEPT OF TRANSITION
IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCES

In the contemporary social sciences we find a playful array of new ideologems and pseudotheories, especially when it comes to the concepts of transition and globalization. Both uncritical use and abuse of these concepts are related to a wide range of approaches to them, namely, from layman's to ideologized-apologetic or rational-analytical ones.

Received May 30, 2007

* This paper is one of the author's research activities within the project *Culture of Peace, Identities, and Interethnic Relations in Serbia and the Balkans in the Eurointegration Process* (149014D), financed by the Ministry of Science and Environmental Protection of the Serbian Government

In this paper we are critically reviewing the concept of transition - as an "organizing myth," a peculiar form of ideological rationalization and justification of the radical social changes taking place in the postsocialist countries in Central and Eastern Europe with a special emphasis on the interpretation of Wallerstein's theory of transition within his world-system analysis.

The concept of transition in Western literature appeared as early as the seventies of the twentieth century (in papers written by Galbraith, Toffler, Bell and Draker) to denote a society's passage from one development cycle to another, from the industrial to the postindustrial society. Therefore, transition represents a global rather than a regional process and is not exclusively related to postsocialist societies.

If we exclude the purely terminological meaning, the concept of transition belongs to a group of dubious, extensive concepts among the multitude of those dominant in contemporary science. Its extensive use in the social sciences started in the eighties in the twentieth century and is related to the fall of the Berlin Wall and implosion of socialism. It is most often used to explain the passage from socialism to capitalism, from one-party authoritarian to pluralist democratic systems, from command-type economy to market one, from protomodern to modern civil society.

If we make a survey of numerous theories of transition at present we will find different attempts to attach to this term different contents of social changes, namely, from the way of production to the way of management and culture, from technology and economy to politics and culture. The representatives of the apologetic theory of transition in the West write about transition with euphoria. Thus, for instance, *F. Fukuyama* in his paper "The End of History?" regards the implosion of socialism in 1989 not only as the end of history but as a victory of the western liberal-democratic system of values in the form of a universal model of social development. *S. Huntington* defines transition as the "third wave" of democratization, radical systematic social changes (democratic revolution, democratic transition from authoritarian into democratic systems, the wave which firstly caught the societies of Southern Europe, Spain and Portugal, and, after 1989, Central and Eastern Europe). *Guy Sorman* writes about a great neoliberal transition as a breakthrough from the authoritarian Asiatic model to the liberal-democratic and market type of economy. *Peter Berger* speaks about a new capitalist revolution and its implications for new regions or parts of the global society, most of all for underdeveloped countries and former socialist societies.

The above-mentioned group of authors is joined by other authors, economists, political scientists and ideologues of globalism who affirmatively write about the restorative role of the neoconservative revolution in the process of restoring peripheral capitalism in the modern world. In this sense, a new theory of radical breakthrough is being developed now, only this time it has another sense, the rightist one, as a geostrategic prospect of international relations and power relations on a "grand chessboard" (*Z. Brzezinski*). It has also announced an "era of liberal empires" (*R. Kagan* and *R. Cooper*) and a new reading of colonialism, that is, imperial role of the great powers in the Third World countries.

Unlike these authors, in contemporary literature, there are others who critically view the crisis and transition at present as a controversial social process of different orientation and uncertain outcome. These are the authors of different professional occupations, from historians, economists to sociologists and anthropologists. Let us mention some of them, *E. Hosbaumann*, *S. Amin*, *J. Gray*, *U. Beck*, *Pierre Bourdieu*, *I. Wallerstein*, *L. Sinclair*,

P. Stompka, A. Zinoviev, A. Panarin, G. Osipov, Z. Golenkov, and others. Thus, for instance, Pierre Bourdieu writes about a neoliberal transition as a form of historical restoration of peripheral capitalism which is of conservative character.

Regarding national authors who critically discuss the problem of transition in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe as well as in our country we should mention M. Pečujlić, M. Marković, Z. Golubović, Z. Vidojević, O. Kovač, and others. Considering his own research, the author of this paper also joins the latter group of authors.¹

I REVIEW OF DIFFERENT TYPOLOGIES OF TRANSITION

Any global survey of different theoretical definitions and typologizations of globalization in contemporary literature will reveal different approaches to the issue in question. Firstly, there are differences among the authors which spring from different paradigmatic subcultures, peculiarities of their professional interests or their ideo-political orientations and worldviews.

Concerning this, it should be stressed that in a multitude of conceptual definitions of transition from the reductive terminological meaning to the complex scientific philosophical-sociological defining of transition, as a transformation of one system into another, the radical transition from one strategy to another with numerous implications for the status of people and social classes, layers, and groups, affects the changes of their social chances in the system of social power distribution.

In contemporary literature, in addition to numerous theoretical definitions of the concept of transition, there are also different typologies of transition.

Thus, for instance, some authors make a difference between the *partial* and the *global* transition depending on the domain it penetrates (namely, whether it gets into individual activities or the whole global society system). Or, the difference is made among local, regional or planetary transitions; or, among megatransition, mesotransition and microtransition. Transition is spoken about as referring to different fields (technology, economy, class structure, politics, culture). Or, there are different types of transition regarding the social sense of transition activities, that is, transformation: a) from industrial to postindustrial society, b) from traditional to industrial one, c) from authoritarian-one-party to pluralist-democratic societies, and d) from society with command-type of economy to societies with market economies.

A critical analysis of the theoretical approach in papers of sociologists and political scientists related to transition in the world makes us face different theories of transition: democratic transition, authoritarian transition or the phenomenon of blocked transition, with the transition having two opposite trends: evolutionary and non-evolutionary or retrograde.²

The experience of transition in the Balkans in the last fifteen years has led us to conclude that the following paradigms have been used most often for interpreting the changes since 1989, namely: a geopolitical paradigm, a culturological paradigm, an institutional paradigm, the theory of modernization and a developmentalist paradigm. Some of our so-

¹ See the author's study *Way to the Dependable Society (Balance of Transition in the Balkans)*, Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 2004.

² See Z. Golubović, "Tranziciona raskrsnica postsocijalističkih društava (Ogledi)" (Transition Crossroads of the Postsocialist Societies (Essays)), *Republika*, No. 368-369, 1-30, 2005, p. 14.

ciologists (S. Bolčić and S. Vujović) have made a typology of the interpretive models of the postsocialist transformation into:

Model of peripherization of economy and society (within Wallerstein's division of the world system into core, semi-periphery and periphery),

Osolian concept of pressure groups,

Idea about political-economic cycles, and,

Stance about political capitalism (M. Weber's model).

In his book *Difficulties of the Passage into an Entrepreneur Society (Sociology of Transition in Serbia in the Early Nineties)* (1994) S. Bolčić writes about transition as a passage from the command-type of economy into an entrepreneur society. In his study *Challenges of Transition: New World and Postsocialist Societies* M. Pečujlić writes about postsocialist societies as a new form of peripherization of economy and society,³ as a zone of failed transition. Z. Golubović in her studies speaks about a transition crossroads of postsocialist societies, emphasizing the fact that "transition in postsocialist societies resembles much more a conceptually non-conceived-of improvisation (by the principle of attempts and errors) than an elaborate socio-economic and political project leading to a radical change of the social system, and not only to the destruction of the former regime."⁴

Mladen Lazić, in his studies, places postsocialist transition into a wider context of the global structural crisis in the West and East underlining that it leads to the peripherization of society and original accumulation with numerous social implications.⁵ Likewise, the author of this paper, in his studies *Contemporary Society: Strategies of Development and Actors* (1996) and *Way to the Dependable Society (Balance of Transition in the Balkans)* deals with the phenomenon of transition and gives a typology of transition societies starting from the dominant strategy of social development.

Table 1. Type of transition, strategy and society

Type of Transition	Model of Strategy	Type of Society
1. Inverse, regressive premodern	Retraditionalization (ethnofeudalism, tribal society)	Traditional, precivil, protomodern
2. Reversible neoliberal	Dependable modernization (neoliberalism)	Capitalist, peripheral, dependable
3. Reversible neoconservative	Deformed realsocialist authoritarian modernization (neoetatism)	Semiperipheral polytocratic
4. Progressive socialdemocratic (transition with social responsibility)	Socialdemocratic modernization (social partnership, social state "welfare state")	Modern, developed, pluralist, socialdemocratic society

Source: Lj. Mitrović *Contemporary Society: Strategies of Development and Actors*, Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 1996, p. 167

³ M. Pečujlić, *Challenges of Transition*, Pravni fakultet, Belgrade, 1997, p. 53-56.

⁴ Z. Golubović, "Transition Crossroads of Postsocialist Societies (Essays)," *Republika*, No. 368-369, 2005, p. 14.

⁵ M. Lazić, *Destruction of Society*, Filip Višnjić, Belgrade, 1994, p. 192-193.

Further on in our discussion we are trying to systematically explore the works and ideas of Immanuel Wallerstein and to point to the importance of his paradigm for our understanding of the structure and dynamics of contemporary global society by focusing especially on his critical foundation of global sociology and the theory of global transition of world society.

II WALLERSTEIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE THEORY OF WORLD-SYSTEM ANALYSIS, FOUNDATION OF GLOBAL SOCIOLOGY AND MONDOLOGY

The end of the millennium and the beginning of the new one are characterized by the world-historical process of *globalization /mondialization*. Concerning this process, there are controversial views of different explorers and actors in a wide range from globalophobia to globalophilia.

Mondialization is defined by the French sociologist Guy Rocher as a progressive expansion on the world ladder of activities and roles which had previously been reserved for regions and nations. The English sociologist Anthony Giddens, in his turn, writes about this process as intensification of the social relations at the international global level which opens up a phase of new social development of mankind. There are authors who have different views of globalization making differences between an asymmetrical and an associative type, or among an authoritarian or an imperial or a socialdemocratic model.

Likewise, there are authors who make a distinction between *mondialization* as a wider concept and planetary process which provides for unifying, integration and universalization of activities, forces, values and powers of mankind and, on the other hand, *globalization* which means linking up of activities, concentration, centralization of technology, capital and power at the group level, often in the name of particular monopolist interests of classes, corporations, states and regions.⁶ Such a process of globalization is not homogenization but, on the contrary, "extension of power and influence of a small number of dominant nations over the wholeness of national stock markets"⁷; it preserves the form of an antagonistic, asymmetrical structure of distribution of social power in the world entity and leads to unipolarism.

The greatest number of authors reduce the concept of globalization by identifying it with that of *the new world order*; they think that the history of globalization started in 1989. Since that time, this term has permeated media and papers. Others, on the other hand, think that the concept of mondialization has its roots in the theory of the prominent French historian F. Braudel and his conception of "economy-world," then in the works of McLuhan who wrote about the concept of "global village." Yet, it remains to be said that the American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein is known as a representative of historical sociology as well as the most outstanding founder of the theory of mondialization, that is, the school of the world system.

Immanuel Wallerstein (1930-) is the founder of a new paradigm in social sciences, the theory of the world system, representative of historical sociology as well as the founder of

⁶ See Lj. Mitrović, *Globalization and the Modern Left*, Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 2000, p. 14-15.

⁷ P. Bourdieu, *Signalna svetla-prilozi za otpor neoliberalnoj invaziji* (Contre-feux: Propos pour Servir à la Resistance Contre l'Invasion Neo-Libérale), Zavod za udžbenike, Belgrade, 1999, p. 43.

mondology as a new transdisciplinary science in the system of contemporary sciences. His school of world system belongs to the group of mondialist, universal and post-Marxist theories in sociology and contemporary social sciences.⁸

Wallerstein first started his professional career as an explorer of the postcolonial Africa in the seventies of the twentieth century; later on, he dealt with the issues of historical sociology, that is, problems of the global capitalist economy at the macro level. On the basis of these explorations he has formed his paradigm about a global world system as a new theoretical-methodological frame for exploring the genesis, structure and dynamics of the development of capitalism as a global modern world system. A critical analysis of this system's functioning is, in Wallerstein's view, related to the investigation of the rule of anti-system movements as an actor of de-legitimacy of capitalism, as well as to the search for alternative strategies of overcoming this system in the perspective of further historical development of human society. Hence some explorers conclude that Wallerstein is a representative of "historically oriented Marxism" (G. Ritzer) while, regarding his orientation, he is a liberal leftist and "grey eminence" of the antiglobalist movements at present, together with Noam Chomsky, Pierre Bourdieu, Samir Amin and Naomi Klein.

Immanuel Wallerstein, together with *Ferdinand Braudel*, *Terence K. Hopkins* and *Giovanni Arrighi*, represents the most important theoretician of the world system school. This school, in fact, started developing in the United States of America in the seventies. It has been spoken about as the most significant globalist paradigm in the social sciences in the twentieth century, equally important in sociology and economy, history, science of international relations and *globalogy* as a newly emerging social science.

I. Wallerstein is Professor of sociology at the State University of New York, Director of the Fernand Braudel Center for the study of the history of economy and civilization as well as president of the International Sociological Association. He is the author of the following studies: *The Modern World-System I, II*, (1974), *The Capitalist World-Economy* (1979), *Historical Capitalism* (1983), *Dynamics of Global Crisis* (1985) with a group of authors, *Unthinking Social Science: The Limits of Nineteenth Century Paradigms* (1991), *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System* (1991), *After Liberalism* (1995), *Utopistics* (2000), *Decline of American Power* (2003), *The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-first Century* (2003) also with a group of authors. With his work *I. Wallerstein* has managed to promote the world-system analysis to the very top of contemporary social science and theory.

I. Wallerstein's analysis of the world system is involved with overcoming the crisis of modern science. It does not relate to other theoretical paradigms in a nihilist way but in a dialectical way, trying to integrate what is the most valuable in them. The basic sources that have influenced the theoretical development of *I. Wallerstein* are Marxism, French structuralist historiography (especially *F. Braudel*), historical economy (*M. Weber*, *Joseph Schumpeter*, *K. Polani*) as well as the dependist paradigm (*A. T. Frank*, *Samir Amin*

⁸ In the literature published in former Yugoslavia, the world system school of Immanuel Wallerstein is discussed in the papers by *Z. Vidojević*, *M. Pečujlić*, *M. Jakšić* and *M. Popović*. *Milan Popović* published his dissertation entitled "The School of Immanuel Wallerstein's World System" with a new title *Rhythm of the World*, CID, Podgorica, 1995; *Miomir Jakšić* published his study *Contemporary World System*, Čigoja, Belgrade, 1999.

and others). It should be stressed, however, that in the works of I. Wallerstein all this legacy has been reinterpreted and that the final outcome is a *synthesis* rather than eclectics.⁹

The main epistemological theoretical-methodological breakthrough and *novum* in the works of I. Wallerstein is mondialization of the theoretical apparatus.¹⁰ Namely, he thinks (unlike other Marxists who have started, in their analyses, from classes, workers and states) that the main unit should be a *world system* with a considerable capitalist division of labor and forms of reproducing class relations, exploitation and segregation in the world society. Through these contradictions, through the capitalist division of labor in geographic and social space, Wallerstein derives a division into the world core (nucleus), periphery and semi-periphery. In short, the *world center* dominates the world economy and exploits the rest of the system; periphery comprises those regions which provide the core with raw materials and it is exploited by the core, while *semi-periphery* is a residual category which comprises the regions which are somewhere between the exploiters and the exploited. It is crucial that Wallerstein's international exploitation is not defined by state borders but by the economic division of labor in the world.¹¹

In his works, Wallerstein follows the research logic of the theoretical and methodological *principle of totality*. He defines *historical systems* as, to paraphrase, large and permanent, relatively autonomous and time, that is space-defined entities, delineated by the social division of labor, that is, as integrated networks of economic, political and cultural processes which hold them together. He further states that it is his assumption that the historical system represents an integrated network of economic, political and cultural processes whose totality reflects the system totality.¹²

In his analysis of the historical emergence and development of capitalism from the 16th century till the present day (in his work entitled *The Modern World-System*, 1974) Wallerstein has shown that, so far, we have had only two kinds of world systems, namely, a) *world empire* (such as, for instance, the classical Rome), and b) *modern capitalist world economy*. The world empire is based upon political and military dominance while the world capitalist system is based on the division of labor and economic dominance. By analyzing the historical emergence of capitalism as a world system, Wallerstein shows that there used to be three necessary conditions for the growth of the capitalist economic system from feudalism, namely, a) geographic expansion through discoveries and colonization, b) development of different methods of division of labor and labor control by zones (for instance, core-periphery) and c) development of powerful states which become core states of the emerging global capitalist economic system.

In his analysis, Wallerstein shows how, by means of the division of labor within capitalism as a system, its different parts get specialized in special functions (specialization of

⁹ M. Popović, "Analysis of I. Wallerstein's World System," (Preface to *Historical Capitalism*), CID, Podgorica, p. 123.

¹⁰ Concerning his paradigm, I. Wallerstein says that his analytical perspective is something he calls "an analysis of the world systems." His basic analytical unit is a historical social system. His chronoscopy is based on the assumption that there exist arrows of time, in cascade bifurcations, which enable progress but do not make it inevitable (progress being a moral concept). He calls it a theory of possible progress. (See *Decline of American Power*, CID, Podgorica, 2004, p. 172).

¹¹ G. Ritzer, *Modern Sociological Theory*, New York, MCBrow-hill companies, 1996, p. 169.

¹² See I. Wallerstein, *Historical Systems Complex Systems* (1985) as quoted in M. Popović's study *Rhythm of the World* p. 92.

work force, food supply, provision of raw materials and organization of industry). Moreover, there is also a spatial distribution of the functions within the system so that Africa produces "slaves," Western and Southern Europe produce peasantry or tenants, while Western Europe is a core of wage-earners, the ruling class and other qualified personnel to occupy the positions related to supervision and management. To put it shortly, the core has free labor; periphery is characterized by compulsory work while the semi-periphery is the locus of tenants or lease-holders. Capitalism functions on the principle that the world center should dominate free labor market while the periphery represents a compulsory market for lesser trained workers and cheaper work force. The core has a much more differentiated division of labor, economic and social structure, while the periphery is undifferentiated, "monocultural" and dependent upon the world core and semi-periphery. Among these parts of the world economy there are established relations of dominance and segregation (core-semiperiphery-periphery). Wallerstein explains both peripheral and semiperipheral economy with the help of Emanuel's thesis about *unequal exchange* since the system spreads as much as it can to absorb profit through the given mechanism. In Wallerstein's opinion, the division of labor and exchange are constitutive elements of the world capitalist economy while underdevelopment is a necessary outcome of unequal exchange of labor as well as of exploitation which has been going on for four centuries, since the birth of capitalism. In his discussions of the development of capitalism, Wallerstein also analyzes the role of state and cultural subsystem. In his analysis, he shows that the state and politics have played an important role in the process of strengthening and developing capitalism. In that sense, he stresses that the states of the core zone (world system), as a rule, develop a strong political system while the periphery develops weak states subordinated to the world center.

The focal point of I. Wallerstein's discourse on the world system is found in the following theses: *first*, the world (world system) is a unique and controversial entity whose base is defined by the law of the division of labor and the law of interdependence; *second*, social structuring and spatial segregation (division into core, periphery and semi-periphery) are expressions of the international class division of labor and unequal exchange of labor; *third*, each social change does not automatically mean progress in the development of mankind; *fourth*, the development of capitalism as a system does not automatically assume a better and more progressive world; *fifth*, the scientific-technological revolution itself does not lead to progress; *sixth*, the world capitalist system is in the state of structural crisis and (according to Wallerstein's predictions), some time around 2050, it should pass into a new and different kind of historical system, and, *seventh*, in societies there are transitional periods; so, when one system enters transition, all the options are open. There is no inevitable secular direction of human history which would guarantee that the latter phase will always be more progressive than the former one.¹³ *Eighth*, unlike communism which, in Wallerstein's opinion, represents a utopia, socialism is a feasible historical system which enhances the rule of people over their own life (democracy) and releases their creativity.¹⁴

¹³ See I. Wallerstein's study *Typology of Crisis and the World System* as quoted in M. Popović in his *Rhythm of the World*, p. 94.

¹⁴ I. Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism*, p. 118.

Wallerstein, in his works, also reveals the exploitative essence of the capitalist way of production. The capitalist system has an egocentric aspiration of the capital owner towards profit as an ultimate good. Historically speaking, the capitalist system has become worse rather than better while progressing along the way. It has led to absolute pauperization of the proletariat in peripheral and semi-peripheral zones of the capitalist systems; it has also, to paraphrase, increased inequalities in the distribution of the world surplus of value. Hence ten to fifteen percent of the world economy population takes for itself a part of the surplus which is larger than it itself creates, unlike the remaining eighty five percent of the population. It has also given rise to an especially large increase of exploitation in the rural zones. It has produced numerous forms of segregation (class, ethnic, racial, gender) and led to further expansion of the phenomenon of social pathology. Finally, it has ominously posed, to hang over the whole of mankind, Damocles' sword of nuclear war.¹⁵

With his world-system theory I. Wallerstein has not only expanded on the subject of study of sociology as well as encouraged globalization of sociology regarding its wide range of research corpus and the level of its macrosociological analysis, but he has also paved the way for a possible formation of mondology/globology as a new transdisciplinary science for the exploration of the world and man, structure and dynamics of contemporary world society. His paradigm has fortunately brought together the structural and historical-materialist approach and elements of social action so that his theory is coming closer to the requirements for the formulation of the so-called *integrated paradigm* so much pleaded for by George Ritzer. Yet, it should be said that, regardless of all its advantages, the school of world system analysis also has some *limits*. Its critics point out that it has gone far beyond Marx's dialectical concept of the way of production, that it underestimates the influence of internal factors as well as a progressive role of capitalism in the historical development, just as it gives a primary and prior importance to exogenous or external factors, that is, the processes of foreign trade in contemporary society.

III I. WALLERSTEIN'S CONTRIBUTION TO A CRITICAL THEORY OF GLOBAL WORLD SYSTEM TRANSITION

I. Wallerstein, in his works *Geopolitics and Geoculture* (1991), *After Liberalism* (1995) and *Decline of American Power* (2003), discusses the key issues of the contemporary world system transition.

Starting from the thesis that we are now in the era of globalization and transition and that social sciences have failed to provide for a useful instrument for analyzing things happening to the world system since 1989, I. Wallerstein, unlike an ideological interpretation done by plenty of "transitologists" who merely "throw dust in the eye," explicitly presents his critical concept of transition. In his opinion, transition is an open and controversial process of uncertain orientation and outcome. It is in the transitory period in which the struggle is taking place among different actors and their cultural orientations and strategies. Concerning all this, Wallerstein writes - to paraphrase - that when one system enters transition, all options are open. There is no inevitable secular direction of human

¹⁵ R. Radonjić, *Political and Legal Theories*, Unireks, Podgorica, 1996, p. 296.

history which would guarantee that the latter phase will always be more progressive than the former one.¹⁶ The author adds here that transition times are not a friendly football match. It is a fierce battle for the future and it will lead to a very sharp division among us.¹⁷

Analyzing the historical dynamics of capitalism as a world system, especially since 1945 till today, I. Wallerstein has pointed to the following phases: Kondratieff A-phase 1945-1973 (rise of the world economy), Kondratieff B-phase 1973-2000 (fall of profit) and C period from 2000-2050 (crisis and period of global transition into a new historical system).

Wallerstein also thinks that in 1968 numerous conditions were met for a global *revolution* but the strategic compromise of the political classes (most of all in the States and the former USSR), as well as opportunism of the old left, contributed to the failure to carry it out in the world at large. Likewise, he thinks that the year of 1989 did not mark only the implosion of socialism but it also brought about the collapse of the values of liberal ideology in the world so that, two hundred years after the French Revolution, the restoration process was launched to bring back conservative forces to the world stage.

Wallerstein writes that we are today living in a most terrifying "transition chaos": a system crisis (as an expression of the internal structural limits in further accumulation of capital) of the old system, defensive left and rise of conservative ideologies and movements, changes of the geostrategic distribution of powers, the rise of the neoimperial political power as well as decline of the real power of the USA and the rise of new regions such as Europe, Japan and China in the world.

The oil crisis in the seventies of the twentieth century was used by neoconservatives for their counter-attack (Reagan, Thatcher) or launching a new ideology and strategy of development in the form of aggressive affirmation of neoliberalism which further sharpened the existing structural inequalities in the North-South relation just as it led to the growth of contradictions and conflicts in the world at large.

While analyzing the structural contradictions of contemporary capitalism (core-periphery and North-South), I. Wallerstein points to the forms of contemporary class and social struggles, especially to the role of anti-system movements against the international capital. Though he speaks critically about the anti-system movements' integration into contemporary capitalism since they are, to paraphrase, an inner product of capitalism and they express the contradictions and limitations of this system; yet, in his more recent papers, I. Wallerstein advocates for the need and possibility of uniting old and new social movements (workers', national-liberational and new social movements). Wallerstein thinks that it is necessary, today, to make a synthesis of liberalism and Marxism in the light of an evolution of the contemporary world and to develop an alternative project about postcapitalist society. Underlining that the passage from one system to the other will not take place by sheer economic automatism but, instead, by an active use of reason, to paraphrase, and an organizing energy which is, at the same time, reflective and moral in the class struggle of the majority against the minority, namely, the struggle of those who

¹⁶ I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, Službeni glasnik, Belgrade, 2005.

¹⁷ I. Wallerstein, *Decline of American Power*, CID, Podgorica, 2004. p. 174-175.

are exploited against those who exploit, those who are deprived of the surplus of value that otherwise they themselves create against those who seize the surplus and live on it.¹⁸

Wallerstein also thinks that empirical socialism has so far represented part of the world capitalist system (one of its subsystems) so that its contradictions, dialectics and implosion are also related to the processes of the world accumulation and unequal exchange of labor and not only to the inner system disintegration processes. Concerning this, Wallerstein writes, to paraphrase, that the "socialist states" are in fact states within a unique capitalist economy ruled by the governments springing from the anticapitalist movements.¹⁹ These governments, however, suffer from numerous contradictions (bureaucratization and the like) and they do not embody any future socialist way of production. Such a way of production can be created only by transforming the entire unique world economy which will mark the end of the process that started in the past and which we are undergoing now.²⁰ Between empirical capitalism and socialism, as global social systems, there are empirical differences. Namely, to paraphrase Wallerstein, capitalism is a system in which production decisions are brought from the standpoint of optimal rentability for companies which, in its turn, leads to social irrationality. Contrary to this, socialism must be such a system in which production decisions are brought from the standpoint of social usefulness. Socialism is, according to Wallerstein, a system in which real inequalities will be reduced and, in time, will become smaller and smaller.²¹

As for the dynamics of historical development or society which is realized in space and time, Wallerstein regards it as a set of trends, waves and cyclic rhythms. Relying on the investigations done by economic theorists and sociologists, he points to the possibilities and limitations of capitalism as a global system. He also stresses that, in our USA-dominated century, the world capitalism has entered, since 1914, a structural crisis of the second order so that today capitalism is in the phase of de-legitimacy.

Wallerstein also predicts that, by around 2050, capitalism will be exhausted, regarding its structural crisis, by its contradictions and its de-legitimacy; it will pass into some new and different kind of historical system. Wallerstein speaks about this system not as a definitely socialist one but rather as a postcapitalist and new civilization project. He thinks that in the next century there will occur an essential reconstruction of the world. Namely, the existing contradictions between the rich "North" and all the more lagging "South" will dictate that the choice will be either compulsory reconstruction or an egalitarian one which would, in its turn, ask for a considerable redistribution of the world riches by taking away from the USA. This will lead to an entirely different world system. Socialism, though, is not the only possible outcome, says Wallerstein. There is another logical outcome, that is, domination of technocracy and meritocracy, attempts at further reforms and socialdemocratization of capitalism since, as he says, the world of bourgeoisie will not eliminate itself; instead, it will prefer to increasingly use the language of socialism while trying to create a system which is neither capitalist nor socialist.²² Wallerstein concludes that the forces of domination in the last few

¹⁸ I. Wallerstein, "Marx and Underdevelopment," *Treći program*, No. 82-83/1989, p. 147.

¹⁹ I. Wallerstein, *Crisis as a Transition Era. Dynamics of the Global Crisis*. Radnička štampa, Belgrade, 1985, p. 53.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 53.

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 53.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 54.

years have been many times more inventive than those of socialism²³ so that it is necessary for the forces within the anti-system movements to soberly estimate their experience, to reformulate their theories into long-term categories and to have a farther-reaching view of the present and more imagination in viewing the future. The crisis is objectively given, says Wallerstein, and it is going on. Its solution will, however, be a result of our collective subjective activity which is not determined in advance.²⁴

Wallerstein, however, does not only analyze the existing functioning of capitalism or its dysfunction but he also explores alternative projects of the future social development as well as actors. In that sense, he especially analyzes the rule of the anti-system movements and the new left in the process of global transition in the modern world and in the perspective of a possible development of mankind. In this context, he particularly explores the role of new social movements (especially ecological ones, movements for autonomy, identity), the role of non-government organizations, associations for human rights, civil society and anti-globalist movements as actors in the struggle for a different and better world with no exploitation and inequality. While fighting for a richer and more just world, Wallerstein thinks we should once again radicalize the issue of equality and democracy, redefine projects and strategies of the struggle in the modern world and in the perspective of a possible creation of some new historical system and the development of mankind.

Starting from the thesis of the actionalist sociology, that history is not a matter of gods but people and social actors who create it with their own activities, Wallerstein takes into consideration the guidelines for activities undertaken by the anti-system forces in the period of global transition through developing the concept of alternative strategies of action. Concerning this, he, among other things, pleads for the revolution as a strategy and as a tactic of social transformation and emancipation; hence, he stresses, to paraphrase, the need to 1) expand and unite the anti-system movements into the world with no elements of hierarchy (what is needed is a "colorful coalition" of actors of social changes or a plural "multiple left"), 2) use the defensive election tactics. In other words, to act in the politically pragmatic way without forgetting that victory in the election is not a goal but a means in political struggles, 3) stimulate continuously the processes of democratization in the world, 4) compel the forces of the liberal core to carry out their theoretical decisions by de-masking their political mimicry and demagoguery, 5) criticize constantly racism and other forms of social segregation and exclusiveness (make antiracism a measure of defining democracy), 6) move decisively toward de-commodification (creation of nonprofit organizations and systems that support themselves and lead to profit elimination), 7) always keep in mind that we are living in the era of transition from the present world system in a somewhat different one and that it is necessary to engage oneself in the fight for a new world since history is, to paraphrase Wallerstein, on nobody's side. It depends on our actual deeds.²⁵

While pointing to structural social inequalities in the global world system, Wallerstein, in his analysis, shows how they tend to manifest themselves, through the division of labor, as social and spatial and regional segregation on the relation core-periphery-semi-periphery. The author especially analyzes different forms of rationalization of social contradic-

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 56.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 56.

²⁵ I. Wallerstein, *Decline of American Power*, p. 239.

tions and conflicts and their being readdressed from the socio-class relations of inequality to the domain of ethnic, religious and racial relations which is a specific strategy of cultural and political camouflage. In this context, I. Wallerstein explores the role of contemporary geoculture stressing that the so-called theory about the clash of civilizations is today used as a "smoke curtain" to hide away much more profound structural inequalities and violence in the North-South relations as well as the crisis and deterioration of the ruling world system. The present system is reflected in a strategy of unequal exchange of labor in the world and in a transfer of problems from the world center countries to those of semi-periphery and periphery serving as the zone of cheap labor force and raw materials. A special attention to the exploration of alternative projects for the future Wallerstein devotes to the role of *critical sociology*. Concerning this he makes an appeal to explore, as he says, alternative possibilities for the creation of a historical system which would be more really prudent in order to replace the berserk and dying one in which we live. It is exactly where sociology can play a role; but only sociology which refuses to separate the search for truth from the search for goodness, as Wallerstein says.²⁶ In relation to this, he also adds that we have to liberate ourselves from a pious and deceitful talk about a value-free scientific thought. To paraphrase, we are living in a whirlpool of transition and we must know what shore we would like to swim to; otherwise, we'll get drowned.²⁷

Finally, though Wallerstein speaks about the present era of transition as a dark age before us,²⁸ it should be, yet, emphasized that he continually and in a very engaging way, points to the need to build the concept of an alternative order at the center of which there will be human rights and freedoms as well as the struggle for democracy and equality of all.²⁹ He thinks that a different world is really possible: one which is richer, freer and more just than the present one. Such a project should be fought for with heart and mind since the outcome of the struggle is, as Wallerstein says, quite uncertain since we are sailing along uncharted seas. He also adds that an enormous collective effort will be needed in order to develop a clear strategy of transformation.³⁰ There is no reason for either optimism or pessimism. But, in the transition era no one enjoys the luxury of non-involvement.³¹

Pointing to the need to search for new alternative projects of social transformation, emancipation of man and the world, I. Wallerstein ends his plead by the most inspirational idea, namely, that we should become practical, consistent, skillful keepers of our riches who question our utopias but still move forward. Regarding the fact that the present world system is falling upon us in the next fifty years, says Wallerstein, we must offer an essential alternative which is also a collective creation. Only then will we ever get a chance for Gramsci's hegemony in the world civil society and, thus, a chance for winning the fight against those who try to change everything only not to change anything at all.³²

²⁶ I. Wallerstein, *Decline of American Power*, CID, Podgorica, p. 91-92.

²⁷ I. Wallerstein, *Decline of American Power*, p. 172-178.

²⁸ I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, p. 228.

²⁹ Concerning this, Wallerstein writes that we have to offer a genuinely fundamental reconstruction. This is a project, he says, for at least fifty years. This is a world project and cannot be done locally or partially though local activity must be the main part of the structure. It requires quite a lot of human imagination but it is possible. It is possible but not in the least certain. We have to look for a true mixture of sobriety and imagination. We can find it at the most unusual places, in every corner of the world. See, *After Liberalism*, p. 49.

³⁰ I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, p. 211.

³¹ I. Wallerstein, *Decline of the American Power*, p. 178.

³² I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, p. 183.

REFERENCES

1. I. Wallerstein, *Decline of American Power*, CID, Podgorica, 2004.
2. I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, Službeni glasnik, Belgrade, 2005.
3. I. Wallerstein, *Utopistics of historical choices of the 21. century*, "Republika", Beograd 2000.
4. P. Bourdieu, *Signalna svjetla-prilozi za otpor neoliberalnoj invaziji* (Contre-feux: Propos pour Servir à la Resistance Contre l'Invasion Neo-Libérale), Zavod za udžbenike, Belgrade, 1999.
5. G. Ritzer, *Modern Sociological Theory*. New York, MCBrow-hill companies, 1996.
6. M. Pečujlić, *Challenges of Transition*, Pravni fakultet, Belgrade, 1997.
7. M. Pečujlić, *Challenges of Transition*, Pravni fakultet, Belgrade, 1997.
8. M. Lazić, *Destruction of Society*, Filip Višnjić, Belgrade, 1994.
9. R. Radonjić, *Political and Legal Theories*, Unireks, Podgorica, 1996;
10. *Republika*, No. 368-369, 2005.
11. Lj. Mitrović, *Globalization and the Modern Left*, Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 2000.

DOPRINOS IMANUELA VOLERSTINA MONDOLOGIJI I KRITIČKOJ TEORIJI GLOBALNE TRANZICIJE SVETSKOG SISTEMA

Ljubiša R. Mitrović

Autor se usredsređuje na pitanje porekla i razvoja teorije o svetskom sistemu Imanuela Volerstajna, i to posebno na njegov doprinos osnivanju kritičke teorije o globalnoj tranziciji i mondologiji kao transdisciplinarnoj nauci o svetu i čoveku.

Osnovna Volerstajnova teza je da kada jedan sistem uđe u zonu tranzicije, pravac i rezultat kretanja nisu izvesni. Različite alternative su moguće, od napretka do regresije.

Društvene promene u oblasti tranzicije zavise od brojnih subjektivnih i objektivnih činilaca kao i moralnih i političkih uloga društvenih aktera u društvenim borbama u savremenom svetu. U središtu Volerstajnovе analize su globalne promene kapitalizma kao istorijskog sistema i moguća tranzicija, unutar društvenog razvoja, u novi podkapitalistički sistem. U datom kontekstu, Volerstajn analizira ulogu antisistemskih pokreta u procesu globalne tranzicije.

Ključne reči: *teorija o svetskom sistemu, Imanuel Volerstajn, mondologija, globalna tranzicija, kapitalizam, antisistemski pokreti*