

CONCLUDING SESSION

DISCUSSIONS

CHUSHICHI TSUZUKI

THE CHAIRPERSON (PROFESSOR TSUZUKI)

Now we have come to the last, concluding session after having listened to nearly a dozen excellent, really thought-provoking papers and lively discussions. My overall and perhaps superficial impression is that for the last two days we have repeatedly heard the word 'decline'—the 'decline of England,' the 'decline of America' that would take a hundred years to complete, even the 'decline of the Japanese-style management' in Japan while it is still made something of abroad, and also the terms post-something, post-modern, post-ideology, post-bourgeois civil society. In other words we are seized by a vague feeling of the fear of the approaching future about which we know almost nothing, in spite of the tremendous progress we have made in socio-technological terms. Nevertheless, new hopes have been expressed here and there in the course of the four sessions, for a new alliance of the old and new social movements against internal colonization, for the radicalization of the workers employed in the subordinate positions of the informational society, or for the rise of a western-style individualism and civic spirit among the Japanese who were aptly designated as economic animals half Americanized.

The sort of pessimism that underlies the word 'decline' and the implied horrors of the unknown future seem to me to be due to the following three factors. Firstly, in our previous sessions we more or less disregarded History or historical perspective. As a result we more or less agreed that History began 20 or 30 years ago, at best when the Second World War came to an end. Secondly, as we focussed our attention on the events which took place in the last 30 years or so, we, just like the advocates of the new social movements, refuse to speculate on a historical project, a positive utopia or a new mode of production. Yet, as far as I can see, a new mode of production, possibly Socialism, has been our hidden subject all through. This came to the surface increasingly as we approached the end of the sessions. Almost every one of us wanted to say something about Socialism, but we are somehow inhibited from doing so, and the courageous audience raised the problem, probably out of impatience.

Thirdly, the above question—our shyness before Socialism—, it seems to me, has something to do with the after-effects of what Professor Wallerstein called the world-wide Cultural Revolution, of which Professor Castells told us about his experience in Paris. The decline of the old left was not apparent at the time of that revolution, the May Revolution in Paris in 1968, and the spread of the revolt elsewhere, in which the new left allied with the minorities and the neglected not only attacked the hegemony of the old liberal-socialist coalition but also more or less successfully challenged the legitimacy as well as the efficacy

of the old left who had claimed to be anti-system. We now recall Eric Hobsbawm's pathetic cry—'The Forward March of Labour Halted?'—raised in the late 70s. The decline of the old left was no doubt due in part to its own inner contradictions (such as its traditional class basis reconciled to its acceptance of consensus politics, its neglect of the underprivileged in spite of its championship of the weak, its double allegiance to the welfare state and to the capitalist market economy, the collapse of its industrial basis which meant the need for the restructuring of national economy within the world system of capitalism, its unawareness more or less of the issues involved in this restructuring which is well illustrated by the absence of a really internationalist outlook) but the decline was also due to the persistent attacks from the state under Reagan, Mrs. Thatcher and their likes. If we focus our attention on the events for the last 20 years or so, we cannot escape from the tremendous impact Reaganism and Thatcherism, and their many other offshoots, had on the restructuring of our society. To weaken trade unionism, 'to bring the working-class to their knees,' and 'to reduce real wages' were the real purposes of Mrs. Thatcher's government, declared Lord Kaldor, the Keynesian economist. I should add a quotation made by Professor Robin Cohen in his book *New Helot*, a quotation from Professor Castells: 'A twenty-first century capital and a nineteenth century proletariat—such is the dream of monopoly capital in order to overcome its crisis.'

Now I would like to invite comments on these three points: 1) historical perspective of the world capitalist system or society, 2) the problem of Socialism or strategies and alternatives, not 100 or 200 years from now but 10 to 20 years, and 3) the role played by Reaganism and Thatcherism in terms of the historical perspective of the world system and also of the strategic considerations. I would like to invite each panelist to give us a short comment on any of these issues or else a supplement to or amplification of his previous presentation.

PROFESSOR WALLERSTEIN

I note for the purpose of this discussion that I am at the extreme right of the panelists but from the audience's point of view the extreme left. I have no pessimism about the decline of the world system of capitalism. I have only a joy. Therefore, to me this is a very positive phenomenon. I do, however, fear about the approaching future, since it is unknown, unclear. I think it would be prudent to be fearful about it. Nor do I have shyness about my positive utopia which is indeed Socialism. I have never been shy about it. And I think I want to use a very elementary definition of Socialism which is, I think, original and classic one, which is relatively egalitarian, relatively democratic, which is therefore based on a fundamentally different mode of production than capitalism. What that would really look like no one knows, and Marx at least had wisdom not to try to tell us what it would look like.

I would like to pick up, therefore, Manuel Castells's point and go from there. The essence of what he told us is the point—which I fundamentally agree with—that the net result of revolutionary movements and activities for the last 100 or 150 years has in the best of cases been social reform, and it was only through revolutionary movements and activities that we have in fact achieved significant social reforms. So you can chalk up 100 years of Social Democratic activities, 75 years or 100 years of Communist activities, 100 years of activities of the Indian National Congress and other nationalist movements

and say that what they accomplished was some social reform. I think that was a tremendous accomplishment. I do not want to underestimate it. I think it is a worthy heritage. However, all they accomplished were social reforms. That is the other way of putting it. The world-wide revolution of '68 was in many ways an assertion that that is not enough. They had not accomplished revolution. Now as for reform, there is a theory that underlies it. It is basically a liberal theory, an incrementarist theory, which says: reform bit by bit brings about a good society. I do not believe that is true. I think, reform bit by bit brings about the maintenance of an on-going process in a slightly alleviating phase, ironing out crinkles, but does not bring about a good society. Therefore, the question is that if revolution does not bring about revolution, what does bring about revolution. I do not think that reform brings about revolution. I think, that is the problem frankly before us for the next 10, 20 years.

Let me dispose of Reaganism and Thatcherism in one sentence. I think we'll agree 10 years from now that it was a blip on the horizon. And I do not believe that it was historically significant phenomenon. Let me go to the more serious question—what then would happen in the next 10, 20 years. I think one of the two most significant things that will happen—and I do not know how it will come about—will be an immense debate among the three main varieties of the old left movements and the three main varieties of the new left movements. The three main varieties are geographically located: the Social Democrats of the west, the Communists in the so-called Socialist countries, and the nationalist movements in the third world. These are the old varieties, and against these there are the new varieties in each of these areas, most explicitly in the west, second most explicitly in the east and just now emerging in the third world: the new movements that are basic reactions against the coming to power of the old movements because all they did bring about was reform. So I think we have six varieties of the movements and all denounce each other, or they did so 10 or 15 years ago, and now they are beginning to talk with each other in a very tentative way. I think it is a terribly important world-wide conversation that is going on and that will go on. The key question is, if the strategy of taking state-power (i.e. revolutionary strategy) was not the strategy that would in fact bring about fundamental transformation of system. Is there an alternative strategy that will in fact work? I do not think anybody has put forward any coherent answer to the question.

I think that is what from the movement's point of view collectively we have to concentrate on for the next 20 or 30 years. I think, the world capitalist system will come to an end, but it does not follow that you get your socialist utopia at all. One alternative is that the people who have power and privileges simply try to create the new world order which will be different from world capitalism but in which they continue to have power, and, I think, many of them will be found in the so-called movements. So the debate within the movements is the key debate. It will go on next 10, 20 years, and that will more or less determine the next 50 or 75 or 100 years beyond it. I think the key question is: are there efficacious alternative strategies or a single strategy other than or in addition to the taking of state power (revolution) that will meaningfully have to do with transforming the world. I think the line one has to think along is the mode of advancing disintegration of the system. And there are multiple modes and multiple resists.

This conference is supposed to be on cultural changes. Culture is a very vague word. Yet one might suggest that there is more to the world in culture than in economy meaning

production arena and state apparatus. There is much wider world out there in which we participate, and social transformation has to involve activity in that whole world.

Finally I would say we ought to spend more time in what I would call utopistics. We got our fingers burnt collectively, though we, none of us, in this room. It was in the middle of the 19th century or early 19th century when people engaged in a lot of utopistics, and some sensible things were said and silly things were said. Along came realists in the middle of the 19th century and late 19th century and said 'that's a waste of time.' In some sense for the 19th century it was a waste of time. I am not sure if it is a waste of time now. We ought to spell out more what it is that we are trying to construct.

PROFESSOR CHANDRA

I would like to start from the first question and go over to the second and leave the third to those who have the experience of Reaganism and Thatcherism.

In the last 200 years starting with the French Revolution, the two major and probably world-wide movements have been one for Socialism and the other for national liberation and for democracy. It has been a tragedy for the Socialist movement that it has failed to learn from the national liberation movement which has for various reasons been broadly successful in their images and objectives, while the Socialist movements have not. From this point of view I would like to suggest that the movement for Socialism or new mode of production can very much learn from the rich experience of the national liberation movement. I do not mean to glorify them as merely successful or anti-imperialist. I mean as movements which were able to do what Socialist movements set out to do, that is to capture the state and transform state power. Let me illustrate this point by making a reference to the new social movements which are the major forces for social change in the advanced countries. Despite disclaimer it seems to me that the discussions basically had some sort of pessimism about the capacity of these new movements to achieve social transformation. It seems to me that if you go by the experience of the national liberation struggles some such relations as they had ought to be established between the new social movements and the old social movements. The new social movements are bound to be a basic part of the Socialist movement or the movement for fundamental social transformation. The answer is not whether the new social movements should be institutionalized or not, but I think the real answer lies in how to build a movement for Socialism which is more than a party, yet which has a minimum organisational structure and discipline, a movement in which we shall have large differences so that it can accommodate new and old social movements with all their different emphases and differences. There needs be no single revolutionary design nor any single overriding ideology. And yet the movement must have a common vision, a vision towards which they move, a vision which leads them to social transformation, or broadly speaking Socialism as it has been visualized by the broadest section of the people for over the last 150 years.

Secondly, it seems to me that—this is where the new social movements can play a very important role and are showing the way—that is, no basic social transformation can occur unless the mass of the people are mobilised and unified.

My last comment will be that I think this entire question of reform or revolution will continue and has to be freshly thought out. I do not think it is enough to say either that

reform will somehow lead to revolution or that reform cannot lead to revolution. I think both reform and revolution have to be so defined that they are held together and continue. How can a movement go through several stages of achievement without being co-opted and carry on over tens of years or even a century towards its final goal? I will also say that I do not think at least for the coming 20 years the conditions are ripe for social transformation or Socialism to come about on a universal basis. While I agree very much with Professor Castells about the role of the localities and of a local movement and of local unification and local power, I will still say that social transformation will not occur with local power. Therefore I think the relevance of state and national-level politics to the movement for social reformation is very much there. I wish Professor Bachtiar had come. Then we could have discussed this aspect.

PROFESSOR KATO

Dr. Wallerstein talked about the cycle of hegemony and the cycle of social movements. He emphasized that in 1968 there was a cultural revolution, and in the context of the United States and Europe, as we can see from this symposium, the event turned out to be very important. In the Japanese context, however, our experience in 1968 did not blossom out into a full-fledged cultural revolution. Maybe that was one of the reasons why there is a subtle nuance of difference between the European speakers and the Japanese as well as the speakers from the third world concerning the new social movements. The same thing can be said about modern history. Universalism seems to be quite evident in the western context, but in the Japanese context universalistic kind of values that have emanated from the west are strong only in our longing for those values to take root in Japan. Dr. Yazawa talked about the issues of Asia and Japan; the question is how the western universalism is going to be incorporated into this total framework.

PROFESSOR ROSENSTEIN

We have in our own language, Hebrew, a proverb which says that after the last temple was destroyed prophecy has been left to the fools. Well, nevertheless, many of us talk about the future. I will try to confine my comments to the area of work.

I think the quality of life in terms of the aspiration of the employees is not related to economic or even political regimes. It is not related in a meaningful way to Socialism or to capitalism. Let me remind you that Lenin many years ago was very impressed with the Taylorist system, in which he found socialist efficiency. Talking about the present and the future, I think work is a very central activity of people both in capitalist and Socialist countries. Is there a better or more appropriate place to emphasize the centrality of work than Japan? I am not at all pessimistic about the quality of work-life, and my optimism stems from the evaluation and estimate that the economic and social conditions which have developed for the last 20 years or so, will continue and be even strengthened. The aspiration for a better working life will continue, I believe, because the basic conditions like the composition of the work-force, the aspiration of the people, the will to draw satisfaction from work, to have some influence, not to be at some receiving end but to express some opinions—these conditions, I think, will continue. Nevertheless, it is very probable

that the instruments by which the quality of working life will be achieved will differ. I think there will be much more variety in its method. The European approach is rather a limited one, and it is not able to encompass the development which will take place in the area of work.

It seems to me that we can expect important developments in the three major areas. One of these is job-content. My impression is that relatively little attention has been paid to this in Japan, but we can assume that there will be a trend to more autonomy at work. The second area is the participative mechanisms or the participative techniques. I think in this area we shall probably witness a growing tendency towards integration of the representative system with the shop-floor democracy. And this has something to do with general disappointment with the representative system. It seems to me that even now this system will grow with workers, management and trade unions—we did not discuss enough about trade unions—and trade unions are now and in the future more interested in the development of this type of integration. The third is the area of management and human resources. It is clear in my mind at least that in organisations all over the world now there is the evaluation that human resources constitute a major source of economic organisations.

Let me end my comment by referring again to Japan. I think Japan constitutes a threat to the western world both in its ability to develop economically so fast and because of international economic competition. At the same time Japan is also a country to which many managers, researchers, consultants, are turning to learn about the management system developed here. And the big question from the point of view of other countries, managers, unions, and others, is to what extent it is desirable and to what extent it is possible to adopt the Japanese methods of management. I believe that the answer is partial.

PROFESSOR MOUER

Coming from what is known as a lucky country I have to confess that we are not used to thinking about the future at all. The Australians have tended to take their standard of living for granted. They are, however, coming to a point where they can no longer do that. Also situated geographically on the sort of the edge of the earth, they are not particularly conscious of the world system and perhaps have no coherent view of the world in that regard. But increasingly Australia is coming to feel the developments around it, particularly in Asia which is economically the most dynamic region in the world, and they feel these developments impinging on Australia. Without having the broad view of this world system they become aware of it in a most concrete place, that is work.

And I think, a fundamental change we see in work is the decline of the union movement. The decline reflects of course the restructuring of industries which is going on elsewhere. It also reflects the subtle changes in the male and female composition of labour force, particularly the increasing number of women moving into the professions. But I think the change in the role of the unions in Australian society will change the nature of that society, especially the ideological vocabulary with which people talk about dominant interest and minority interest. As part of this shifting that has occurred, one thing we have seen in the last five to ten years has been the growth of the national capitalist class, a number of independent entrepreneurs, the Fords, the Carnegies and so forth in Australia. There is the question of whether a Labour government is able to continue to operate as the repre-

sentative of the so-called labouring people. It raises the same question as raised in the last session as to the social movements—at what point do they co-opt themselves into government, and at what point after co-option they are no longer able to represent minorities within the society.

One key for the future of Australia particularly with this new class developing is its links with the outside world and with capitalist groups in other societies, especially with Japan because of the tremendous influx of Japanese capital over the last few years. Although the economic relationship with Japan developed in the 1960s, it was not until the 1970s that people began to realise that we had a close relationship with Japan. But there were not many who could speak Japanese in Australia at the time. So we found that the emphasis was shifting from the economic ground to the economic plus cultural ground in the 1970s.

What is interesting for the Australians, one thing which came out from Professor Tsuda's talk, is that Australia may be adopting the so-called Japanese model while the Japanese are moving away from it. The Australians are working harder, while the Japanese are enjoying our hotels and beaches.

In any case coming to the question of Thatcherism there has been a move to the right in Australia, and the Australians tend to see it somewhat inevitable, which may be unfortunate, meaning that it is a given shift, and there are no choices. This is unfortunate particularly in terms of Professor Chandra's suggestion that there may be a possibility for independent development. We see in Australia at present time a decline, very small but perhaps still significant decline in provisions of welfare. We see centralisation occurring and a stronger national government emerging. At the same time internationalisation has been accelerated, and Australia is feeling that it is coming more into the world system. But at the same time racism remains a worry as we can see it in the recent debate on immigration. That raises a question of interesting categorisation between helots, denizens and citizens. I suppose the Japanese coming to Australia reflecting the position of their country will become denizens, whereas the other Asians coming to Australia will fall increasingly into the helot category. This then raises the question about the relations between Japan and Asia.

Today the most important question for Australian society, the question which has been most fiercely debated is the question of multi-culturalism, whether Australian society is a multi-cultural society or not. Professor Wallerstein mentioned before the possibility of English no longer being the only language for the world but perhaps several languages emerging, and there is the question of whether that is happening in Australia, or whether multi-culturalism will take another direction. In any case multi-culturalism will represent a move towards cosmopolitanism. Perhaps that will culturally bring Australia more into the world system.

PROFESSOR TSUDA

There has been a major participation of the Japanese in the Brisbane Exposition. There is a beautiful beach called Gold Coast near Brisbane where Japanese real estate agents have been grabbing for lands, and bus-loads of Japanese tourists have been buying gifts. The point is that Japanese money circulating in that area has been pushing up the prices including

hotel charges. This is typical of the globalisation of Japanese business, but we have to admit that there is a limit to the extent to which Japanese business interests are welcomed.

The Japanese among the advanced nations will become an aged society, a geriatric society. The system we have established for the last 40 years, the system of wages, the system of seniority, the hierarchical structure of Japanese companies, etc., cannot solve the question of giving proper jobs to the aged male workers, because the elderly are considered to be a burden on the companies. We have been hearing that the Japanese are flexible enough to solve the problems before them, but this is rather simplistic statement. I think the only progress we have made is in information and other advanced technology, but I wonder if we have the same flexibility and efficiency when we come to social problems. Similarly I do not think we will be flexible enough to deal with the problems Dr. Tsuzuki has put to us. And in the past 40 years or so, the core of the workers in each industry has been the core of the middle-class society. We have nothing against the middle-class, but this is not only a middle-class society but also a mediocre society. The society we have established is up against the wall and has really reached a deadlock.

PROFESSOR COHEN

It seems to me that the question that you have posed to us asks another question. And that is what is the historical agency or the historical agent that can carry the transformation towards universalism or Socialism forward. And we had a number of different answers both historically and from the panellists at this table. We can think of Hegel's argument about the world historical actor. Marx considered the revolutionary proletariat to be the key historical agency. Lenin added the idea that the revolutionary party was the key agency that could propel revolution forward. And now we have heard in our panel that we should look also seriously to the capacity of national liberation to do that job. This is Professor Chandra's point. Or the social new movements of Professor Castells. Let me just quickly say that in each case we have some clear limitations and very clear possibilities. Let us look at the revolutionary proletariat first. As for Marx, he made a very important qualification. In the *Grundrisse* he talked about the revolutionary proletariat acting as the general representative of the society. In other words he saw this group as a universal group. But in 1968 which is something that a number of panellists have focussed upon, I think at that moment, for me symbolically, more than perhaps actually, the credential of the revolutionary proletariat was exposed, because they seemed to be acting exclusively rather than inclusively. They could not include the peace movement, the environmental movement, the ethnic minorities, the women, those people enlisted in human rights. Instead they became narrow. They defended their members in their workplace. Equally it seems to me we have through historical experience become rather sceptical about a revolutionary party. It has become hijacked by the opportunists, bureaucrats and apparatchiks. Then what about the national liberation movement? Yes, but again there are some limitations here, because in most countries—I think there are 170 countries now—we have perhaps reached the limit of a national movement. And one wonders also whether the national liberation movement is prone to be hijacked by the bourgeoisie, even though we may have general class composition. And finally the new social movement. I think Castells was very honest in his depiction of it and very intriguing and I have an image of the moth at-

tracted to the flame; the movement came closer and closer to the centre of the power, but as they reached it they flamed it and they die. So we are now left, it seems to me, with the question we started with. How do we construct a revolutionary agent, how do we understand, how do we propel transformation forward. And it seems to me we must look at the historical act again, and see its limits and possibilities. So let me turn the other way around. The revolutionary proletariat, yes a great disappointment I am sure to everybody in the Socialist movement, but nonetheless it still remains the major representative organ of the labouring people all over the world. Millions of the people are organised in the unions. The party, yes a disappointment if we look at the experience of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, but it does provide a potential vehicle for revolutionary intellectuals, perhaps cosmopolitan rather than universal, to meet, to discuss, to engage ideas and to begin to make links between the different aspects of the struggle. Equally the national liberation movement has successfully shown that it is possible to construct class alliances between the peasants, workers and the bourgeoisie. And finally the new social movements, as Claus Offe and Manuel Castells have vividly shown, have brought new sections into the transformation process. They brought women for it, they brought the ethnic minorities for it, they are inclusive movements although they are movements for single issues. So I am forced to a rather difficult conclusion, that we need still to understand the transmission belts and the ways in which these different revolutionary agencies can act together.

PROFESSOR TANAKA

I am interested in the maintenance of ethnicity. Mongolia is now divided into two areas. It is very rare to hear true Mongolian spoken when we walk along the streets in the Inner Mongolia. In the Outer Mongolia they have kept their national language, though they cannot use chopsticks which have been replaced by knives and forks. In Tibet the Chinese destroyed Tibetan traditional culture and language, but the priests led by Dalai Lama tried to resist such forceful destruction. Such an attempt to maintain ethnicity may be a case of particularism. Stalin once said that in form they might be ethnic, but in substance culture must be Socialist. Ethnicity is the movement which goes counter to universalism. Whether ethnicity can be kept intact, whether this should be cast in a positive frame, and to what extent this is possible, these are some of the basic problems I have in mind.

PROFESSOR OFFE

I am very much in agreement with what Robin Cohen has just said, but let me add a few points. I found it so extremely difficult to approach and discuss the problems of the normative significance of Socialism and strategy. The notion that is always traditionally connected with Socialism is the notion of some commanding heights that need to be occupied as the metaphor goes. And the question is what this commanding heights could be. The implication of a Socialist tradition is that this commanding height is the nation-state. And it is very unlikely whether the nation-state is in fact high enough to make any command possible from there. To be more specific, the capacity to control and to initiate social changes of the nation-state is notoriously in question under conditions we have dis-

cussed at this conference. There is a gap between what can be regulated in the present national context and what is determined by the market, that is the financial, goods and labour market of the international rather than the national scale. The powerlessness of the state is something that needs to be underlined and emphasized in this discussion.

The other important question is who is the one to occupy these commanding heights, and this is the question of revolutionary agents or collective actors, and let me quote Margaret Thatcher. She has recently observed that some people are talking about British society, and she really does not know, she says, what these people mean by British society, because the only thing she can see in real life is British individual family. It is very symptomatic that she can get away with saying such an unusual thing. She relies upon the sense of individualism without the traditional liberal civic spirit, a type of cynical post-modernism in which collectivity of social agency itself is put into question. We should better think of the possibility that not just class and other social movements but collective actions in general would become something that is certainly not increasing in importance but would be much weakened by the structural fragmentation, flexibilisation and disorganisation of social actors. So these two considerations are certainly explained by our chairman very accurately: there is some shyness for the term and concept of Socialism in this regard.

I think many people, if you insist, share one or two or three or even four following intuitions. First, we do not know what Socialism is. Second, even if we knew what it is, we do not know how to get there. Thirdly, even if we knew how to get there, no one would join us. And fourthly, even if a sufficient number of people joined us, it would not work. Given these circumstances, it may be a good idea to come back to a formula that was popular and in fact politically very productive prior to the First World War, the formula of *socialisme ou barbarie*, and to draw the consequences from this formula that the prevention of disaster is what the social movements are trying to accomplish. The prevention of disaster is a great revolutionary accomplishment we could possibly achieve these days.

PROFESSOR CASTELLS

I feel very familiar in this session because it is clearly a Californian type of therapeutic session, in which after the tension of all the debates and self-depression we are finally allowed to say whatever we want without much consideration for the content and substance of the empirical basis of what we say. I think that is wonderful. All the meetings and all the international symposiums should end that way for your amusement and for our self-realization. However, I fear excessive fantasy, so I will structure my own free willing thought along the lines suggested by Professor Tsuzuki, although in a different order.

Concerning Reaganism and Thatcherism, I do think myself that these have been the cases of fundamental restructuring of the capitalist system. The adoption of the new policies that meant fundamental, economic, technological and social restructuring as well as ideological restructuring has put the left and liberals on the defensive for a long period. And in that sense, for instance, one of the things that have been achieved has been a fundamental defeat of organised labour by organised business, that is permeating down to all levels of society. And I would say more and I would say that Thatcherism and Reaganism are practised in all advanced capitalist countries including the countries with a Socialist government.

In that sense, I think it is a very important restructuring. Also at all dimensions, and less on the surface, the fundamental realignment of military strategy is linked to high technology and to new strategy of which 'star war' is one of the expressions.

Therefore, on the basis of this restructuring I do think that the world capitalist system has obtained new dynamism. If we understand by the world capitalist system the market economy, which I do not personally, I think that the market economy is going to be given to our society for a long historical period, because all the major political forces have accepted the market economy as the basis of functioning of economy, including Socialist countries, through the process of internationalization of economy. The issue that I think has to be traced concerning the immediate future of this world capitalist system, is the version that this new dynamic period of restructuring is going to take. It is going to be what I call a bad version and a good version. In the bad version we could see retrenchment of the system in the countries of the OECD areas leaving aside most of the population of this planet that becomes largely irrelevant to the new system of accumulation. The better version is integration of the entire periphery in order actually to provide a new breathing space to the system of accumulation. And I think this is something that would be beneficial for the majority of the population of the world, even if it would give a new lease of life to the capitalist system. This second alternative has a little problem. It can only work with Japan incorporated precisely into that system, because only if the surplus that has been accumulated mainly in Japan is to be mobilized to open up markets in the entire planet, the whole system could be expanded and restructured. By the way this should be a good idea for Japan, because otherwise in this retrenched market between Japan and the United States and Western Europe Japan would suffer from protectionism. So the only way for Japan to survive the protectionist threat is to open up the game to the entire planet.

And this of course leads to the final point about Socialism. I have a materialistic theory of history and I take it seriously. I think that Socialism is what has been produced historically as Socialism. I think that the immediate future of Socialism as a historical reality could be divided into four groups. And I can see four tendencies for each one of them. First, Socialism is surrealistically existing; it is going to abandon definitely the Socialist ideology so as to be able to survive and to compete and to be integrated dynamically into world economy. In China, Russia, and Hungary, although the Communist parties are in power, they are fundamentally altering their ideology and historical horizon, and they are becoming fully integrated into world economy which is the market economy and becoming increasingly part of the same system at all levels. Secondly, we have Socialism in non-Socialist countries, especially in the west. An exception to the EC prediction that the communist parties will sooner or later disappear in advanced western societies is the Italian Communist Party which happens to be called Communist but is a Social-democratic party. Thirdly, the Socialist parties of the west are confronted with the key issue of being able or not to operate the transition from traditional capitalism to a new form of social reform under dynamic capitalism. I am to some extent challenging. Are the Socialist parties going to be able to integrate the pressures and demands of the new social movements? The articulation between the western Socialist parties and the new social movements is really the key for the process of transformation in advanced capitalist countries. And finally, the national liberation movements that have become the national governments in most of the third world are going to be squeezed between the realities with national bureaucracies

living on the back of their own people. In fact they have mobilized these people in order to survive in the world which is shrinking dangerously and in which they cannot be able to continue to distract the minimum level of surplus they used to. The possibility of the Social-democratic left covering the west in alliance with the national liberation movements and governments could be an element for substantial change in the immediate future. And in that sense I believe a new plateau of social reform could be reached. I think, revolution in fact never comes, and revolution is only the ideological need that leads to successive elements or stages of social reform to which mankind makes progress.

PROFESSOR YAZAWA

Firstly I would like to say that we need a global outlook, and unless a social movement or Socialism is regarded from a social perspective, the theory of social movement is not valid. Secondly, if we take some social values out of the third world and try to make them universal, these would not become universal, because social values in the third world countries and in the advanced capitalist nations are totally different. And I do not think that we can succeed with either formula applied to the other since neither formula has been completely successful in their own milieu. The third world type of social movements is the kind I advocate because of the mobilization of the people and the organization of the people they have achieved. A social movement in Japan will have to be typically Japanese, but it is important to learn lessons from the social movements in the third world. Thirdly, I have some optimism about Socialism and social movements, as I believe that in our life-style we cannot survive into the future without Socialism. When mankind go through a period of self-criticism and self-reflection, it will definitely move in the direction of Socialism. In actual life-style we have not been able to survive without some socialistic values which we have seen very clearly in our history and in the history particularly of the third world. Since we do not know what the future entails, why should not we be optimistic about it?

We can think about socialist values, about humanistic and universal values in our daily life on a practical basis without far-fetched theories or any fantasy of movements. Even if these are old movements, the old can support the new. How the old movements can support the new movements, and how the new movements the old—it is our major task to examine this key question and help.

THE CHAIRPERSON

I think all of you will agree that the topics of the previous four sessions are now very well linked and our understanding of the problems deepened through additional comments and remarks. I am personally very much encouraged to hear positive views about the future and even about utopias. As I bring to an end this session and the symposium, I would like to say a few words on behalf of the organizing committee. We are very grateful to you the panellists, eminent professors and active researchers who came from all over the world to make this symposium a real success, a great success. I would also like to extend our gratitude to the audience who helped us and encouraged us by keen interest and lively interventions.

PROFESSOR CHANDRA

As the oldest member of the guests I would like to thank on behalf of all of us Hitotsubashi University authorities and the organizers of the symposium for giving us this wonderful opportunity to participate in this seminar, and also for their wonderful hospitality and the audience for their very good listening. Thank you.