

University of Windsor

Scholarship at UWindor

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

2004

The anti-corporate globalization movement: An exploration of its intellectual lineage.

Ghada Chehade
University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

Recommended Citation

Chehade, Ghada, "The anti-corporate globalization movement: An exploration of its intellectual lineage." (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 3762.
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/3762>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email (scholarship@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

THE ANTI-CORPORATE GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT:
AN EXPLORATION OF ITS INTELLECTUAL LINEAGE

By
Ghada Chehade

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
through Communication Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2004

© 2004 Ghada Chehade



Library and
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

ISBN: 0-494-00134-8

Our file *Notre référence*

ISBN: 0-494-00134-8

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

1020574

The Anti-Corporate Globalization Movement:
An Exploration of Its Intellectual Lineage

By

Ghada Chehade

APPROVED BY:

J. Wittebols
Thesis Defense Chair

V. Scatamburlo-D'Annibale
Thesis Advisor

P. Boin
Departmental Reader

T. Basok, Sociology & Anthropology
Outside Reader

Sept.22, 2004

ABSTRACT

Since its “coming out party” which took place in Seattle during the 1999 protests against the WTO, the “anti-corporate globalization movement” has become the subject of investigation for scholars and activists alike. Some have suggested that the “movement” represented a turning point in history—one that signaled a departure from the single-issue and identity-politics focus which animated many “new social movements” of the 1970s and 1980s. Others have contended that the “movement” was/is quintessentially a “postmodern” phenomenon due largely to its decentralized, non-hierarchical form and its seeming lack of ideological coherence. Through a qualitative analysis of documents produced by actual activists involved in the anti-corporate globalization movement, this thesis explores its intellectual and historical lineage as well as its contemporary influences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
I. GENESIS OF THE ANTI-CORPORATE GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT	
<i>1.1 Globalization and Anti-Globalization</i>	8
<i>1.2 Zapatistas as Catalyst</i>	18
<i>1.3 'Battle in Seattle'</i>	23
II. INTELLECTUAL/THEORETICAL INFLUENCES ON THE ACGM	
2.1 Radical Modernity	
<i>2.1.1 Marxism</i>	27
<i>2.1.2 Anarchism</i>	29
<i>2.1.3 Libertarian Socialism</i>	32
2.2 Postmodernity/Postmodernism	
<i>2.2.1 History and Suppositions</i>	35
<i>2.2.2 New Social Movements</i>	37
<i>2.2.3 Identity Politics</i>	39
2.3 Debates Between Advocates of Post-al Theory and NSMs and their Radical Modernist Critics	
<i>2.3.1 Class and Identity Politics</i>	41
<i>2.3.2 The End of Historical Metanarratives?</i>	46
III. RESEARCH FINDINGS	
3.1 Methodology Explained	50
<i>3.1.2 Benefits of Qualitative Analysis</i>	52

3.2 Form/Structure of ACGM	54
3.2.1 <i>ACGM Strategies</i>	57
3.3 ACGM Content	60
3.3.1 <i>Anti-capitalism and/or the need for class-analysis</i>	61
3.3.2 <i>Social Change</i>	66
3.3.3 <i>Humanism/Universality</i>	71
3.4 Towards a New Understanding of Radicalism and the ACGM	75
3.4.1 <i>"Unity of Difference"</i>	76
3.4.2 <i>Employing Reform for Revolution</i>	80
IV. CONCLUSION	85
ENDNOTES	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	103
VITA AUCTORIS	114

INTRODUCTION

Finally, after years of disintegration and defeat on the Left, a new movement has erupted upon the political landscape. It is not organized around a single issue, identity based, or somehow “implicitly” radical. On the contrary, this movement directly attacks global capital's economic and political infrastructure with a radically democratic politics and a strategy of confrontation. It is bold, antiauthoritarian, and truly global.

Chuck Morse (2003) *New Formulation* Vol. 2, No.1

Morse's observations suggest that after decades of “leftist” retreat, years after the “end of history” proclamations and announcements about the “death of politics” and the “triumph of capitalism,” something is afoot. Just when it appeared as though the defeatist attitudes of disillusioned radicals of the past would allow capital to confirm that there was no alternative to its ubiquitous oppression, a voice of hope exploded across the globe. It is a voice that has dared to name the system--capitalism--which had been rendered virtually unintelligible by the dominant discourses which held sway for almost three decades (i.e. postmodernism, identity politics, etc.). It is a voice that dares to speak in universalistic tones, a voice that declares that another world is indeed possible for all of humanity--decades after narratives of emancipation had been deemed obsolete by the prophets of postmodernism.

This global eruption goes by many names and its exact origin is still highly debated. Its genesis will be chronicled in subsequent chapters, so too will its different names. However, for the purposes of this thesis, I adopt the title anti-corporate globalization movement (ACGM) to describe a social justice movement dedicated to combating (in many different and sometimes conflicting ways) the global spread of

corporate capitalism. While it will be argued in Chapter One that this movement has existed in the developing world for decades or perhaps even centuries, it made itself known in the West in Seattle 30 November 1999. As Danaher and Burbach (2000:7) claim, "November 30, 1999 marked a turning point in history." On that day, tens of thousands of ordinary citizens, from all walks of life (labour, environmentalists, human rights activists, gay rights activists, feminists, student activists and various indigenous peoples etc...), took to the streets of Seattle to pursue the common goal of shutting down a meeting of the World Trade Organization (WTO). Howard Zinn (2000) notes, that in one crucial way Seattle was a turning point in the history of the movements of recent decades--a departure from the single-issue focus of the 1970s and 1980s. In Seattle the common issue of class, here and all over the globe, bound everyone together. He states,

It was, at the least, a flash of the possible. It recalled the prophecy of A. Philip Randolph in November of 1963, speaking to an AFL-CIO convention shortly after the civil rights march brought 200,000 people, black and white, to the nation's capital. Randolph told the delegates: "The Negro's protest today is but the first rumbling of the underclass. As the Negro has taken to the streets, so will the unemployed of all races take to the streets" ("A Flash of").

Seattle did not make history because it succeeded in disrupting and/or halting the neo-liberal agenda for one day. Rather its legacy is that it helped to fuel what Danaher and Burbach (2000:9) are calling the first global revolution: "We can now envision the formation of a truly global movement capable of challenging the most powerful institutions on the planet ...Transnational unity on the grassroots level is strengthening, while transnational unity on the elite level is fraying." They explain that up until the current juncture, every revolution had been a national revolution,

aimed at seizing control of a national government. However, with this movement one can see the first global revolution beginning to form. The transparent corporate bias of global managerial institutions such as the WTO and World Bank has forced this “grassroots democracy movement to start planning a global revolution. It is a revolution in values as well as institutions. It seeks to replace the money values of the current system with the life values of a truly democratic system” (Danaher and Burbach, *Ibid.*).

Overall, the anti-corporate globalization movement (ACGM) is a loose coalition of many groups and because of its diverse membership and novel organizational structure it has often been identified as a quintessentially “postmodern” phenomenon or as a variation of the new social movements (NSMs) which characterized most of the 1970s and 1980s.¹ With its emphasis on structures that are decentralized, open and non hierarchical, some hold that the NSM paradigm provides an apt framework with which to examine the ACGM (Bates, 2002). New social movements are often said to be “postmodern” movements insofar as they presumably share postmodern values--values that include (i) a preference for differences over uniformity; (ii) a rejection of historical metanarratives; (iii) acceptance of incompleteness and uncertainty; and (iv) an emphasis on open-endedness, self-expression, pluralism and heterogeneity (Poldervaart, 2001).

Due to its seemingly postmodern structure (a point that will be revisited in Chapter Three), its emphasis on structures that are decentralized, open and non-hierarchical; a diversity of tactics; and, diverse membership--many view the ACGM as

a postmodern movement lacking any particular ideological direction. For example, Anis Shivani (2002:1) charges that the movement is one devoid of ideological orientation and as such is ultimately postmodern:

The anti-globalization movement is above all anti-intellectual... Already, this movement has degenerated into celebrating its tactics and strategies, its street theatre and performance art, even as it continues to evade anything resembling an ideological orientation with clear goals and arguments in sight. It justifies this evasion by making a fetish of localism... cultural pluralism, indigenous tradition, disinterest in overarching ideological cover, and resistance to hierarchy and vertical organization - in other words, it is fully postmodern according to its own self-presentation.

Just as several critics of “new social movements” (Harvey, 1998) have chastised such formations for their pseudo-radicalism and associated uncritical celebration of “difference” and all that is “cultural,” Shivani seems to suggest that the ACGM is also engaged in a degraded form of postmodernist pluralist politics. While the ACGM protests do possess a type of carnival-like atmosphere--a characteristic that many find refreshing (Shepard and Hayduk, 2002)--it may be unfair to denounce it as “wholly” anti-intellectual. The movement is very much alive both on and *off* the streets. As Callinicos (2003:9) contends, “this process of contestation involves more than... street protests... One reason why we can talk about a global *movement* is that it has found ideological articulation in a body of critical writing produced by a variety of intellectuals.” Similarly Starr (2000:100) maintains that these protests involve “significant scholarship and educational components.”

Given these and other claims; the purpose of this thesis is to examine and further explore the ideological/theoretical underpinnings (or lack there of) of the ACGM. This particular research focus has a long history. First of all, as an activist and long-time member of the ACGM, this movement is a personal passion. Also, as an undergraduate

student, I was asked to explore the “anti-globalization” movement as a “postmodern” movement. As I began my research it became evident that this assumption was somewhat problematic. While in many ways the form (organizational structure) of the movement seemed to fit with the major precepts of postmodern theory and the new social movement paradigm, what the members of this movement actually had to say--the ACGM's actual literature and/or content--seemed at odds with many of the underlying principles of postmodernism. Indeed, intellectual traditions with decidedly modernist roots (i.e. Marxism, socialism, anarchism, etc.) seemed to inform much of the rhetoric used by, and many observations made by, members of the movement.

Thus, as a graduate student I set out to explore the animating principles of the ACGM. Were they postmodern as some have suggested and if so, to what extent and on what levels? Or, were they somehow informed by presuppositions more closely aligned with modernism or, more precisely some radical variant of modernist thought? In order to investigate such questions, it was necessary to examine what participants in the movement were actually saying. Of course, with a social formation as global in scope as the ACGM, more traditional methods of discerning this (i.e. interviews) were simply not feasible. Additionally, time constraints and issues of funding also played a determinant role in choosing an appropriate methodological approach. As a result, I chose to conduct a qualitative document analysis of the movement's own literature (largely derived from Internet sources) in order to facilitate my exploration of the aforementioned intellectual/theoretical undercurrents of the ACGM.

My findings suggest that the positions articulated by many contemporary activists reflect something of a return to the politics of class and systematic critiques of capitalism which were largely marginalized within postmodern thought and the NSM

paradigm. This does not suggest some sort of ideological purity within the movement for there are, undoubtedly, a number of internal contestations within the ACGM--especially the debate over reform or revolution--which will be discussed in subsequent chapters. It does suggest, however, that this recent formation cannot simply be described as a "postmodern" phenomenon as so many have claimed.

The thesis is comprised of four chapters. Chapter One explores and defines both "globalization" and "anti-globalization." It also examines the origins of the ACGM, focusing on the Zapatista uprisings as a global catalyst. The second and lengthiest chapter will examine the competing ideological schools (modernity and postmodernity) that have been said to animate this ascending movement. Specifically, I examine (radical) modernist positions including those associated with Marxism, socialism, anarchism and libertarian socialism. I then critically explore the major claims of postmodern thought and the development of the NSM paradigm from a radical modernist perspective. It should be noted that in responding to claims that the ACGM is a postmodern and/or 'new social movement,' my research necessarily entails a critical analysis of "post-al" theory. In this vein, my research highlights many of the fallacies and internal contradictions of the type of postmodernism that has taken hold over the last three decades, especially the agenda of "identity politics."

In Chapter Three, I discuss the findings of my research--particularly those derived from the qualitative document analysis conducted for the purposes of this study. I then recommend that it is ultimately inappropriate to approach the ACGM as an issue of this *or* that type of movement--a competition between class and identity, modernity and post-modernity. Instead of one or the other, I assert that the ACGM is best understood as a "unity of difference" insofar as it combines the important issues of capitalist

critique/class analysis and identity, albeit in a way that does not succumb to “identity politics” and the concomitant uncritical valorization of difference. Moreover, my research suggests that it may be possible for the ACGM itself to move past the classic debate over “reform or revolution.” Some suggest that it is possible to expand the definition of radicalism to include the struggle for tangible reforms.

Chapter Four serves as a concluding chapter which (i) outlines what I perceive to be the major points and strengths of the thesis; (ii) discusses the limitations of my research; and, (iii) provides suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER I GENESIS OF THE ANTI-CORPORATE GLOBALIZATION MOVEMENT

1.1 Globalization and Anti-Globalization

“Globalization” is a word that dominates much political and academic discussion at the current juncture. Regretfully many have accepted the self-serving jubilations of neo-liberalists that this phenomenon is an inescapable and inevitable process. However, as recent protests in Canada, the United States, Europe, and around the globe have demonstrated, “there is considerable disagreement as to the significance of globalization and much popular opposition to the vaunted “New World Order” (Rupert, 2000:2). In the growing ACGM there are numerous narratives being contested by activists, one of the most significant of which is “globalization” itself.

James Petras (2001:11) holds “globalization” to be both a description and a prescription, “and as such, it serves as both an explanation--a poor one, it has to be said--and an ideology that currently dominates thinking, policy-making and political practise.” As a *description*, “globalization” refers to the widening and deepening of the international flows of technology, capital, trade and information within a single integrated global market. As a *prescription*, “globalization” entails the liberalization of national and international markets in the belief that the free flow of goods, capital and information will lead to economic growth and increased human welfare. Petras (Ibid.) argues that when this word is used, either to describe or prescribe, “it is usually presented with an air of inevitability and overwhelming conviction, betraying its ideological roots.” Similarly, Edward Herman (1999:40) depicts globalization as an active practice of corporate

expansion across borders as well as “an ideology, whose function is to reduce any resistance to the process by making it seem both highly beneficent and unstoppable.”

The proponents of “globalization” treat it as the ultimate and obvious remedy for what supposedly ails the world. The vision offered from leading advocates and beneficiaries of this ‘new world order,’ “...are unfailingly positive, even utopian: Globalization will be a panacea for all our ills” (Rupert, 2000:9-10). Corporate globalization, understood by Rupert as the spread of American-style capitalism, has been portrayed as the road to paradise, the inevitable unravelling of history. For example, Jerry Mander (1996:10) maintains that the passage of the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

...was celebrated by the world’s political leadership and transnational corporations as a sort of global messianic rebirth. They have proclaimed that these new ruling structures will bring on a \$250 billion expansion of world economic activity, with the benefits trickling down to us all. “The new rising tide will lift all boats” has become the dominant economic-political homily of our time.

In the realm of economics, globalization is understood as the increasing acceptance of free markets and private enterprise as the main mechanisms for promoting economic activities. “Its growing importance is captured in such indices as trade in goods and services, private capital flow in different forms, foreign investment, technology transfers, operations of transnational enterprises, business travel and communication...” (Lindberg and Sverrison, 1997:26). These economic conceptions of globalization find their manifestation in the globalization project. McMichael (2000:354) holds that the globalization project, which began in earnest in the mid 1980s with the creation of global managerial institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), reflects “a vision

of the world and all of its resources as a globally organized and managed free trade/free enterprise economy pursued by largely unaccountable political and economic elites.”

Opponents reject this neo-liberal idea of “globalization” altogether, insofar as they believe its *material* manifestation to be detrimental and oppressive to a vast majority of the world’s population and the environment. For non-industrialized and impoverished parts of the world, economic globalization often manifests itself in the form of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), which, critics maintain, are harmful to the world’s poor. Some assert that SAPs are predatory programmes, which involve comprehensive economic reform as a condition for loans from Bretton Woods’ institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Ibid: 361). While each SAP is designed to be suited to a particular country, one may identify some general SAP conditions.

Each SAP entails a policy of trade liberalization, of devaluation, privatization of public enterprises and elimination of government price intervention (government food and health subsidies, controls, price ceilings and so on) (Lindberg and Sverrison, 1997:132). Such neo-liberal prescriptions have had devastating consequences for those peoples forced to comply with their mandate. These various peoples constitute some of the world’s poorest, and without government subsidies of food and medicine they simply will not live. Thomson (2000:177) maintains, “...the most contentious social consequence of structural adjustment...was the removal of state food subsidies. The urban poor, in particular, had come to rely on these subsidies simply in order to survive.”

For example, in a Human Development Report on the effects of globalization in South Asia produced by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) researchers analyzed the process of globalization from the perspective of its impact on

people. Overall, the Report found “that the globalization process in South Asia has focused on integrating markets without improving the condition of the vast majority of South Asians; globalization has not been accompanied by a reduction in poverty or an improvement in human development” (UNDP, 2001: xxi).

“Globalization” has had disastrous ecological effects as well. Indeed, even the Pentagon is now secretly admitting the destructive environmental effects of the hyper-industrialization and waste production associated with corporate globalization. Whereas the Bush administration has repeatedly refused to even admit that climate change is a reality, a recent Pentagon Report found otherwise. The document predicts that climate change or global warming will bring the planet to nuclear war, and that the “threat to global stability vastly eclipses that of terrorism” (Townsend & Harris, 2004). If even the Pentagon, arguably one the authors and beneficiaries of corporate globalization (see “Movement Gears Up”), is admitting that global warming is the biggest concern to the planet, it may be time for neo-liberalists to reassess the globalization project.

Another criticism commonly taken up against economic globalization is that it is oppressive and undemocratic. The major concern is that economic globalization empowers non-elected bodies and institutions such as the WTO, far beyond governments and citizens (McMichael, 2000; Thomson, 2000). Indeed many contend that “globalization” as it exists today is the result of *intentional* policies designed to make the rich more so, while being presented as a natural and inevitable phenomenon. Mander (1996:3) asserts that one must not be readily seduced by the forged inevitability of globalization and recognize it as a deliberate outcome of neo-liberal policies: “One of the main challenges is simply convincing ourselves that the ill effects of globalization can be fought - that it is not some historically inevitable, suprahuman result of new technology

and the collapse of the Soviet Union...Rather the inexorable corporatization of the world is the result of specific policies imposed by politicians and corporate decision-makers.”

From a critical perspective we can and must locate globalization historically. Rupert (2000) adopts Karl Marx’s theory of historical materialism in order to understand globalization as well as the system that spawned it--capitalism--as historical social products. It is important to note that, “...historical materialism is not univocal and is itself continuously contested and redefined.” (Rupert, 2000:2). However, for Rupert the rich and varied tradition of historical materialism serves an explanatory function insofar as it places seemingly natural systems such as capitalism and (capitalist) globalization in their historical context. Rupert (Ibid.) explains that

...to treat historically specific social relations and social self-understandings as if they were natural or necessary is to abstract them from the social and historical processes, which produced them, and then to reify this abstraction, to treat it as if it were itself an objective reality, a given constraint upon all of social life.

Marx and later neo-Marxists like Gramsci recognized the powers of human social agents to construct or reconstruct the world in which they live, yet realized that this power must be understood in the context of their specific social and historical circumstances. Ultimately Rupert stresses that one must view “globalization” as a product of historically situated social agents, struggling over alternative possible worlds and suggests that, “globalization, then, should be seen as not a condition, but as an open-ended process, the content and direction of which are being actively contested” (Rupert, 2000:3).

Samir Amin (2001:4) maintains that “globalization” has existed for centuries insofar as it is more or less synonymous with imperialism. Moreover, he explains that imperialism is not a stage of capitalism but part and parcel of its continued existence:

“Imperialism is not a stage, not even the highest stage, of capitalism: from the beginning, it is inherent in capitalism’s expansion.” Similarly, Scott Marshall (2001) asserts that imperialism and globalization are more or less synonymous, and that they are not merely “bad policies” of the capitalist class. Rather they are the “natural” development of capitalism, unchecked and unregulated. He emphatically maintains, “they are developments of the capitalist system itself and thus are not subject to change simply by changed policies. The system itself must be changed” (Marshall, 2001:2).

Amin (2001:3) holds that the imperialist conquest of the planet was carried out in two phases and is entering a third.ⁱⁱ Amin (2001:4) explains that, “the objectives of dominant capital are still the same--the control of the expansion of markets, the looting of the earth’s natural resources, the superexploitation of the labor reserves in the periphery.” However, the ideological discourse designed to secure this latest phase has been refurbished and is now founded on a “duty to intervene” that is supposedly justified by the defence of “democracy,” the “rights of peoples,” and “humanitarianism” (Ibid.). Indeed “protecting human rights” can be said to be the new Western rationale for intervening in the affairs of other states. While this rationalization may be convincing to some, a critical and rigorous thinker must challenge the likelihood of such claims bearing full--if any-- truth, for it is surely not unthinkable that governments would appropriate the language of humanitarianism to pursue their own interests.

Amin (2001) explains that under the contemporary “globalization” (imperialist) project, the United States is carrying out a systematic strategy designed to ensure its absolute hegemony. Moreover, “American ideology is careful to package its merchandise, the imperialist project, in the ineffable language of the ‘historic mission of the United States’ (Amin, 2001:5). Americans have long had a dualistic view of the

world as America the righteous, versus the “world of darkness”--all those evil outside forces not dedicated to peace and liberty (Rupert, 2000: 22)ⁱⁱⁱ. This dualistic world view has been influential among American leaders and in public political rhetoric since before the American Revolution and especially during and after the Second World War (Ibid.). Woodrow Wilson was its most articulate spokesperson. In the years that followed their war victory, he told Americans that... “our objective is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world...” (Wilson cited by Rupert, 2000:23)

A war time propaganda campaign of unprecedented proportions attempted to ingrain this vision into the common sense of Americans in order to mobilize them behind a project of global order. However, it was not fully successful, and it was not until:

the socio-political transformations wrought by Fordism and the world-order struggles of the mid-twentieth-century...that this world-view--and its corresponding self-understanding of Americans as “champions of the rights of mankind”--became deeply rooted in the popular imagination...the dualistic world-view had come to associate liberty with prosperity and a world order supportive of American-style “Fordist” capitalism. (Rupert, 2000:23).

Thus, most Americans came to understand both their country and themselves as mission bound to “save” the rest of the world by making others more like them. It was through the spread of their politico-economic system across the globe that this supposed salvation was to occur. In time, infinite and inevitable progress and/or development became the rationalization and rhetoric for the new world order.

“Anti-globalization” activists differentiate between economic/corporate globalization and useful and/or positive globalization--which will be discussed in subsequent sections. They emphatically maintain that they are opposed to the former and not the latter (“Revolutionary Anarchism”). Thus those involved in the “anti-globalization” movement actually resent being characterized as ‘knee-jerk’ opponents to

globalization. While commonly referred to as such, the term “anti-globalization” is a pejorative phrase coined by the establishment media and is in fact rejected by most members and/or supporters of the movement. “All the activists reject it, not least because it offers ammunition to opponents (“How can you be against Globalization? Are you against air travel? The Internet? Cheap international phone calls?”) (Ibid.). Moreover, Callinicos (2003:13) asserts that applying the phrase *anti-globalization* to this movement is “plainly an absurd appellation for a movement that revels precisely in its international character and that has been able to mobilize highly effectively across national borders on all five continents.”

Over the years and in different contexts, this movement has gone by other names. These include the ‘Civil Society Movement,’ the ‘Global Justice Movement,’ the ‘Fair Trade Movement,’ ‘the Movement of Movements,’ the ‘Anti-Capitalist Movement,’ the ‘Citizens Movement for World Democracy’ or simply ‘the Alternative Movement’ or ‘the Movement’ (“Anti-globalization movement”). While people associated with this movement have yet to agree on a single and appropriate name for it, it is unanimously held, among them, that the term “anti-globalization” distorts and ultimately misrepresents what they believe.

People at the forefront of this movement have rightly distanced themselves from this label. For example, at the first World Social Forum at Porto Alegre in January 2001 Susan George stated: “we are ‘pro-globalization’ for we are in favour of sharing friendship, culture, cooking, solidarity, wealth and resources” (cited in Callinicos, 2003:13-14). Overall, while this movement is commonly referred to as the *anti-globalization* movement, “it might more correctly be referred to as the *anti-corporate* globalization movement” or ACGM (“The Protests of”). Those engaged in the

movement are combating the corporate/government alliance and their corporate globalization agenda (Ibid.). They are opposed to the global concentration of economic power and the spread of American style capitalism worldwide (Rupert: 2000). Hence the opponents of globalization can be said to reject only a particular manifestation of “globalization” as it exists today. One anarchist activist states:

“Anti-globalization” is a vague term that opens the resistance to capitalism to all sorts of pitfalls. Many aspects of globalization-if by this we mean the creation of an increasingly integrated world economic, political and social system-should be welcomed by anarchists. The breaking down of closed national cultures, greater international contact, a consciousness of being “citizens of the world”, concerns for developments halfway around the world...all are positive developments (“Revolutionary Anarchism”).

In his article, David Graeber (2000), activist and Yale Professor, maintains that anti-corporate globalization activists are in fact the true proponents of globalization. He explains that in the aftermath of the many massive protests against the IMF/World Bank meetings, pundits of neo-liberal domination have been painting demonstrators as enemies of “globalization.” However, Graeber attests that, from the protesters' perspective, *the truth is precisely the other way around*. He states, “if ‘globalization’ means the unfettered movement of people...and ideas, then we're the ones in favour of it. You didn't see any banners denouncing ‘globalization’ in Washington; what you saw were denunciations of *corporate* globalization” (Ibid: 4). Moreover, Angela Modugno, student and political activist, proclaims that, “for me, there’s no difference between what business does in Nicaragua or the US or Kenya. We’re all connected now. We are not anti-globalists. We are the true globalists” (“Because Something”, 2000:5). It is important to note that those who protest globalization, with the exception of the far right, protest the globalization of concentrated wealth and power, and not the globalization of people. Yet under so-called

“globalization” today, “corporations ...have global rights; people still do not” (Starr, 2000: vii).

Some activists are drawn to the distinction between two kinds of globalization- “globalization-from above,” which reflects the collaboration between leading states and the main agents of capital formation, namely multinational corporations (Callinicos, 2003:14), and “globalization-from-below,” described as an array of transnational social forces animated by human rights, environmental concerns, hostility to patriarchy, and a vision of a human community based on the unity of diverse cultures seeking an end to oppression, dispossession, poverty, humiliation and collective violence (Falk cited in Starr, 2000:83).

Starr (2000:83) explains that the basic idea of “globalization from below” is that people all over the planet are commonly threatened by abuse of human rights, environmental degradation and lax enforcement of labour standards, “and that powerful global alliances can be formed to make corporations and governments accountable to people instead of elites.” This alliance is understood by many as a ‘global civil society’ that will “develop a democratic global consciousness rooted in authentic local communities” (Barnet and Cavanagh cited in Ibid.). These movements stress the need to globalize resistance to match the globalized structure of neo-liberal exploitation. Starr maintains that this approach to “anti-globalization”--one arguably taken up by much of the ACGM--is consonant with Marxist and international humanitarian expectation: “Workers of the world--that is, all those dispossessed by the ravages of corporate hegemony--unite and rebuild the world!” (Starr, 2000:83). This, she continues, is a “hopeful vision that assumes the possibility of international, democratic, non-violent revolution to be achieved by the rising up of peoples’ movements everywhere” (Ibid.).

1.2 Zapatistas as Catalyst

On 30 November 1999 tens of thousands of citizens took to the streets of Seattle to protest a meeting of the WTO. Their agenda was to stop the WTO from conducting “business as usual”--making rules for the entire planet that mainly serve the interests of large corporations (Danaher and Burbach, 2000). Many contend that out of this day a movement was born (“Because Something”, 2001). However, others proclaim that this was the culmination of a struggle many decades in the making, not its inception.

Mark Rupert (2000:1) maintains, “while the sort of coordinated mass of opposition...in Seattle was unprecedented...it was in fact the product of historical-structural transformations and political struggles which have been unfolding for years”. As Rupert (Ibid: 31-33) succinctly explains, there has been resistance to “the liberal narrative of globalization” and the inconsistencies and inequality that underlie it since they started becoming apparent in the mid 1960s. Moreover, many point to the Zapatista uprisings of 1994 as the first manifestation of the ACGM.

On 1 January 1994, when the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect, a hitherto unknown group of revolutionaries, the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN), rose up from the Lacadon Jungle and seized four police stations in the Mexican state of Chiapas. “In a well- planned and armed uprising, 3000 Zapatistas briefly occupied seven towns in the state of Chiapas declaring ‘Ya basta!’ - Enough is enough!” (Chesters, 2001). This was the beginning of what has come to be known as the “war against oblivion,” a war against the certitude of poverty, hunger and environmental desecration, a process that NAFTA had already begun to accelerate. For the Zapatistas, the central problem with the NAFTA was that free trade as interpreted in this agreement meant the reform of Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution. Chesters

explains that Article 27 had been one of the outcomes of the Mexican revolution, the catalyst for 75 years of agrarian reform and the foundation of the *ejido* system of communal land ownership. “With this legal ‘barrier’ to trade removed, the way would be open for transnational agro-industries to purchase what had previously been communally held lands” (Ibid.).

However, their grievances went far deeper and much further in time than the NAFTA. In the First declaration of War (EZLN, 1993) the Zapatistas proclaimed that they were

a product of 500 years of struggle... we have nothing, absolutely nothing, not even a roof over our heads, no land, no work, no health care, no food nor education. Neither are we able to freely and democratically elect our political representatives, nor is there independence from foreigners, nor is there peace nor justice for ourselves and for our children. But today we say, ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!

On the day of the uprising, “Canada and the USA came into force and President Carlos Salinas celebrated Mexico's new status as a First World country” (“The Zapatista Movement”). For decades the aim of the Mexican government had been to attract foreign investors, to portray an image of democratic stability, to show tourists the ancient Mayan ruins, and the beautiful clothing and crafts of the indigenous people. Ultimately, to become part of the globalization project.

The Zapatistas, on the other hand, sought to reveal the real Mexico and real Chiapas: “the Chiapas where the native population has systematically been pushed off their lands for over 500 years to make way for more profitable business” (Ibid.). In Chiapas, the government and a handful of foreign and domestic corporations extracted all the wealth- the oil, electric energy, tropical timber, cattle, corn, cocoa, coffee and bananas. The Zapatistas exposed this government-corporate alliance for what it really was. Instead of bringing “development” they left behind landlessness, death and disease,

divisions within communities and loss of culture. The article holds that, such realities would, “only be intensified under NAFTA, which the Zapatistas have denounced as a ‘death sentence’ for the indigenous and farming population of Mexico” (Ibid.).

But just as the Zapatista movement has its roots in 500 years of oppression and dispossession; it also has its roots in 500 years of resistance. The article explains that, “from the start, they have situated their struggle within a long history of indigenous resistance” (Ibid.). They take their name from revolutionary hero Emiliano Zapata, who took up arms in 1911 in the state of Morelos. Zapata fought for what is known in Mexico as *tierra y libertad*-- common ownership of land and the right of small farmers to control their own villages and crops (Ibid.). This fight has been reignited by the EZLN in these times of contemporary globalization.

The EZLN was formed in 1983 and grew out of movements active in Chiapas since the 1970's and consisted of “both popular organizations defending agrarian reforms and worker's rights, and those resisting the extreme discrimination suffered by indigenous communities” (Ibid.). It began as a self-defence force, and the reason behind armed training was to protect villagers against the violence of the cattle ranchers' armed security and paramilitary forces in clashes over land and resources. Its growth accelerated during the 1980's and early 1990's, triggered by a number of critical events and changes that led to the decision in 1993 to organize offensively (Ibid.).^{iv} It is important to note that for the Zapatistas, the decision to take up arms was a last resort --the only way in which to have a voice, to be heard, to speak for themselves. One Commandante (cited in Ibid) told reporters that:

The fundamental base of our organization is the dire situation our people have been enduring, people who have struggled peacefully with the government, trying to gain the same things as other peoples who have struggled: land titles, housing and other

basic needs. But instead of solving these problems, the government responded with repression. Our leaders have been beaten, assassinated, exiled, jailed. And so we decided that there was no other option but to organize and rise up this way in armed struggle.

The EZLN try diligently to avoid the typical top-down nature of previous revolutionary movements, and the appointment or recognition of any one “leader.” In practice the individualities of the speakers inevitably do come through, as in the best-known case of Subcommandante Marcos, “around whom something of a personality cult has grown. In many ways this has been fuelled by the mainstream media which depict him as “the leader” of the Zapatistas” (Ibid.). However, it is arresting that in the Mexican and activist communities he is seen rather as another *companero* who is respected but not hero-worshipped.

The organization of the EZLN is based on the ideal of collective and democratic decision-making and the army itself is viewed as a *temporary* tool to be eliminated as quickly as possible, acting in the meantime as a guarantor for the creation of new political spaces. Indeed it is maintained that, the success of the EZLN “in the creation of these alternative spaces and the power of the Zapatista civilian base has already led to the demotion of the Zapatista Army to a largely symbolic role” (Ibid.).

This year (2004) marks the tenth anniversary of the Zapatista uprising and many mainstream media accounts portray them as having fallen short of their dreams. However, the Zapatistas did not seek a military victory. Instead, they hoped to inspire the downtrodden--both in Chiapas and the world at large--to organize and empower themselves, creating “an intercontinental network of resistance against neo-liberalism” (Downing, 2001: 221). Thus understood in its proper context, the uprising has been hugely successful. Weinberg (2004) maintains, “...this rebellion of poorly armed Maya

Indians in an obscure corner of Mexico has rippled across the globe, sparking a movement that has concretely slowed corporate globalization.”

It is important to note that while on many levels the Zapatistas are a local movement driven by issues of indigenous emancipation, at the same time, they are very much an internationalist movement that transcends the local and connects global capital to a corrupt Mexican regime. Weinberg (2004:1) states, “...the Zapatistas emerged in response to globalization, not just to Mexico’s internal dictatorship...the Zapatistas were the world’s first guerrillas to explicitly take up arms in response to a trade agreement.” In another article (“Resistance to Globalization”) the authors similarly explain that while the Zapatista uprising is rooted in local problems, it occurs against the backdrop of anti-imperialist sentiments centuries old: “the marginalization of the indigenous population of Chiapas dates back to the Spanish invasion over 500 years ago, when the structures for the exploitation of the native population, and of natural resources to be exported to the ‘First World’ were established.” The EZLN fully understand the destructive effects of capitalist development and expansion on their cultures and environment. These effects have only been intensified by the implementation of NAFTA and the onset of various neo-liberal economic reforms since the 1980s, which triggered the uprising.

In response to corporate globalization, the EZLN launched a scathing critique of neo-liberal policies as applied throughout Mexico and across the globe. One article explains that, “Zapatista communiqués repeatedly highlight the reality of deepening inequalities and concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands, and the deterioration of social services and cuts in food subsidies leading to increased marginalization and hunger” (“Resistance to Globalization”). Moreover, the EZLN frequently accentuate the

increasing domination over the world of a small group of states and transnational corporations. For the Zapatistas, globalization is indeed the new colonialism.

1.3 'Battle in Seattle'

While in many ways the Zapatista uprising of 1994 marked the beginning of the ACGM, it is difficult to deny that the protests in Seattle did represent the largest anti-corporate globalization *demonstration* up until that point (Mander, 1996). Also, Seattle helped make the ACGM a truly *transnational* movement. "The success of the protest helped give millions of people around the world the confidence also to challenge neo-liberalism" (Callinicos, 2003: 5). Moreover, it is now a fact that Seattle changed both political culture and political dissent forever. Even a mainstream paper like *The New York Times* (Dec 8, 1999) admitted that Seattle was "one of those critical incidents in the political culture... after which the language of public debate" would never be the same. The article cited a statement made by Naomi Klein in an earlier article for *The Times*. Like Klein, they declare that Seattle was the "coming out party" of a long evolving coalition: one that includes environmentalists, trade unionists, workers and students (Ibid.).

David Moberg (1999) aptly maintains that "the battle in Seattle," as it has come to be known, "ended in a striking victory for a popular movement that emerged with a stronger, more focused voice and a broad, sympathetic world audience." He explains that this victory went much further than obstructing the opening meeting of trade ministers from 135 countries and interrupting other WTO functions and ceremonies. Of equal or greater importance, the Seattle days of action gave increased clout and longevity to a mounting social movement, and forced many essential issues onto the "official agenda." Moberg (1999:2) holds, "after Seattle it will be difficult for any politician to talk about

global economics without addressing links to labour rights, human rights, food supplies and the protection of both consumers and the environment.”

However, for many the greatest success of the protests in Seattle was their ability to bring together people and activists from every walk of life forming a coalition of dissent never before seen or felt. Indeed at Seattle and many protests since, issues on the table included: gay rights; animal rights; ecological rights; indigenous peoples' rights; women's rights; worker's rights; student rights; youth rights; and, human rights.

However, it is imperative to understand the nature of such diversity. One must look at whether these activists have come together *because* of such diversity (to celebrate it) or *in spite* of such diversity (to transcend it) focusing on issues that unite them. Moberg maintains that, “with great regularity, whatever their own primary issue, protesters made it clear that their ultimate targets were corporate power and the tyranny of the market...” (Ibid.). This coalition against a common enemy (c.f Starr, 2000; Martinez, 2002; Callinicos, 2003) may be indicative of a return to the avant-garde politics of the 19th and 20th centuries, and a shift away from the fragmentary single-issue politics associated with ‘new social movements’--a point that will be discussed in Chapter Three

Still, so many have claimed the ACGM as an identity-based postmodern movement. Indeed some hold that the Zapatista movement, a movement I have identified as the spearhead of the ACGM, is a postmodern movement concerned solely with the emancipation of indigenous peoples and the celebration of their cultural differences. For example, LaFranchi (2001: 1) asserts, “it is... Marcos's postmodern prose...that have earned him hero status”. He continues, “Marcos's praise of difference appeals to those who oppose a standardization of cultures”.^v

However, such arguments fail to grasp the nature of this struggle. Moreover, “particularly disconcerting is the manner in which claims regarding the postmodernity of the EZLN are repeated by people on the left” (Nugent, 1997: 166). Far from being postmodern, this movement’s organization dates back to the pre-modern. Nugent asserts it is difficult to understand how a peasant army cognisant of itself as the product of 500 years of struggle against dispossession, that demands work, land, food, housing, education, health, independence, democracy, justice and peace for the people of Mexico, can be called a postmodern movement. He (1997:167-168) states, “...how can the EZLN move *beyond* the politics of modernity when their vocabulary is so patently modernist, and their practical organization so emphatically pre-modern?”

This is not to suggest that the Zapatista movement is not about indigenous emancipation, for on *many* levels it is. However, there is nothing particularly postmodern about such a mission. For example, Nugent (1997: 168) explains that while the EZLN fights to end the persecution of Indians by centuries of western modernization ... “there is nothing particularly ‘postmodern’ about struggling to that end”. He also holds that it is necessary to examine what “western modernization” is. If one understands “western modernization” as the spread of *capitalism*, then it is counter-intuitive to consider any movement that struggles *against* it, postmodern--a point I will revisit in Chapter Three (see Wood, 1995). Nugent (Ibid.) aptly poses some provocative questions: “What is the ‘modernization’ that the...Zapatistas are resisting? Does it have something to do with capitalism? Would any anticapitalist struggle be “postmodern”?”

Nonetheless post-al theorists readily identify the “anti-globalization” movement as a postmodern movement, insofar as its proponents evoke the same postmodern criticisms against modernity (Poldervaart, 2001:8). According to postmodern thought, the

limitations of modernity include: the dominance of a white, heterosexual, middle-class, male discourse, excluding all other voices; the emphasis on high culture, excluding popular and other cultures; the emphasis on homogeneity and durability; and, the emphasis on capitalism and materialism (Ibid.). While it may be possible to argue that ACGM activists invoke many of the same criticisms against modernity as those listed above, this may not necessarily make the ACGM a “postmodern” movement. For although criticisms of modernity *do* find expression in post-al narratives, they also find expression in a type of *radical* or counter-modernity and/or Enlightenment.

CHAPTER II

INTELLECTUAL/THEORETICAL INFLUENCES ON THE ACGM

2.1 Radical Modernity

In this section, I examine different radical modernist ideologies—Marxism (socialism), anarchism and libertarian socialism--that may (or may not) be said to animate the ACGM. It must be acknowledged that these traditions have their roots in *Enlightenment* thought. It is fallacious to perceive the Enlightenment and the work that derived from it, as postmodernists tend to, as univocal and monolithic. While there was a dominant Enlightenment narrative, there was at the same time, forms of counter-Enlightenment or radical Enlightenment that were competing for influence within the dominant strain of the 19th century. For example, Karl Marx attempted to radicalize Enlightenment ideas.^{vi} (Callinicos, 1989:171). As Palmer (1997:66) asserts, “it was the purpose of Marxism, as the maturing worldview of the emerging proletariat, to materialize and radicalize Enlightenment rationality, extending its potential not just to this or that privileged sector of society, but to all of humanity...”

2.1.1 Marxism

Karl Marx was a 19th century philosopher, journalist and revolutionary who drew upon and critiqued several Enlightenment thinkers and ideas to construct his own subversive version of Enlightenment thought. “Marx drew on Hegel's philosophy, the political economy of Adam Smith, Ricardian economics, and 19th century French socialism to develop a critique of society which he claimed was both scientific and revolutionary” (“Marxism”:1). Hegel, one of the most noted Enlightenment philosophers,

was very influential to Marx; but Marx turned Hegel on his head. Hegel proposed a form of idealism in which ideas gradually developed in history. Marx retained Hegel's emphasis on history, but reversed the analysis by positing that *material circumstances shape ideas*, instead of the other way around (Ibid: 2). Marx summarizes his material theory of history, known as historical materialism, in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will...The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation...to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness... It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness (cited in Ibid.).

In *The Communist Manifesto* or to use its original name, *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* Marx (along with Engels) charts the history of class struggle. Murray Bookchin (1998:1) explores this work in its historical context, “before Marxism was overlaid by reformist, postmodernist...and psychological commentaries.” Bookchin claims that when one reads the *Manifesto* on its own terms what emerges is not a “text” to be academically “deconstructed” but rather the doctrine of a party that confronted the existence of capitalism and its underlying class makeup: “The *Manifesto* directly faced the exploitative social order of its time and intended to move a class--the proletariat--to revolutionary action against it” (Ibid.). Indeed in the opening page of the *Manifesto* one finds the definitive declaration that “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles” (Marx & Engels, 1992: 3).

Before both class and capitalism were completely abolished, Marx theorized that the working class would have to take political power from the bourgeoisie and society would pass through a phase known as the “dictatorship of the proletariat” (“Dictatorship

of the proletariat”: 1). The ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ is defined within Marxist theory as the forceful use of state power by the working class against its enemies during the passage from capitalism to socialism to communism, entailing control of the state apparatus and the means of production (Ibid.). Marx never articulated how such a dictatorship would be implemented. Moreover, the notion of a proletariat dictatorship is one of the main issues of contention between Marxism (socialism) and anarchism, a point to which I will return.

In the article “What is Communist Anarchism?” the author(s), writing from an anarchist perspective, assert that there are several variants of Socialists. These include Fabian Socialists, National Socialists, Social Democrats, Christian Socialists and other labels. However, they maintain that not all of these are akin to true socialism--which they define as Marxist socialism. True Socialism, they assert

teaches that the conditions of labour cannot be essentially bettered under capitalism; on the contrary, it shows that the lot of the worker must steadily get worse with the advancing development of industrialism, so that efforts to ‘reform’ and ‘improve’ capitalism are directly opposed to Socialism and only delay its realization... It would therefore serve no purpose to discuss those schools of Socialism (improperly so called) that do not stand for the abolition of capitalism and wage slavery (“What is Communist”:2).

Anarchists, it is argued, echo the desires of *true* socialism: “These views of socialism are... in full accord with the ideas of most Anarchists” (Ibid.).

2.1.2 Anarchism

There are, undoubtedly, similarities in the ideas articulated by both socialists and anarchists; however they tend to diverge on issues of the state. Most anarchists are emphatically against the state and government; they have always held that real socialism cannot be created using a state (“Have Anarchists Always?”). According to many anarchist writers the rationale is quite simple; it requires that one address the notion of

power and the unequal power relations that result from governance. The article explains that, “socialism implies equality, yet the state signifies inequality--inequality in terms of power” (Ibid.). Anarchists hold this to be true because a defining aspect of the state is its hierarchical nature, a delegation of power into the hands of a very few. This always necessitates unequal power relations because those who govern in a state have more power than those who elected them (Ibid.). The authors cite Malatesta and Hamon who state in *No Gods, No Masters* that “it could be argued with much more reason that we are the most logical and most complete socialists, since we demand for every person not just his (or her) entire measure of the wealth of society but also his (or her) portion of social power” (Ibid.).

Indeed all the earliest anarchists were vocal against the state and government. Pierre Joseph Proudhon, a French anarchist of the 19th century, considered by many to be the father of anarchism, was a socialist who rejected Communism (“Pierre Joseph Proudhon”:1). He is most noted for his *tirades* against government and governmental communism. In his famous essay on *what is government* he holds that, “to be GOVERNED is to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so...(Ibid: 3).

Advancing the work of Proudhon was Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin. He was a well known Russian anarchist contemporaneous to Karl Marx. Bakunin is best known as one of the first generation of anarchist philosophers, and like Proudhon, is considered among the “fathers of anarchism” (“Mikhail Bakunin”:1). He was exiled and imprisoned for his political beliefs and his fiery tirades against Russian government repeatedly

throughout his life. Like Proudhon, Bakunin opposed governing systems in any form and label, “from the idea of God downwards; and every form of external authority, whether emanating from the will of a sovereign or from universal suffrage” (Ibid.). Bakunin furthered the ideas of Proudhon proposing the possibility of worker-run councils responsible for the operation of the cooperative community.

However, Bakunin was far more radical than Proudhon. He helped construct “the action plans of the most radical forms of anarchism, encouraging secret societies, violence and assassinations” (Ibid.). It was also during the time of Bakunin that the anarchist movement became most closely tied to socialism and communism, although they would ultimately diverge over issues of violence and other more theoretical concerns. Anarchism and socialism congregated when Marx and Bakunin respectively joined the International Workingmen’s Association (I.W.M.A).^{vii}

Internal factions and dissensions in The International were wrapped up to a large degree in differences of ideology. Marx and Bakunin represented the ideological wings of the International, and Marx ultimately expelled Bakunin and his anarchist followers from the First International. However, anarchists maintained then and still do today that Marx had more or less hijacked the International in the interest of Marxists (“History of the International”: 2).

Marxists, however, tell a different story. While Bakunin thought Marx too conservative, content to let his scientific theories play out and awaiting the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat,’ Marxists condemn Bakunin as being too extreme. They assert that he was an ultra radical, advocating direct and immediate action, which included extreme violence. “It was these values that would eventually contribute to the anarchists (along with Bakunin) being expelled from the First International by Marx” (“Anarchism,

Libertarian Socialism”:2). Bakunin was impatient and wanted nothing to do with Marx’s dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is perchance because Marx did *not* lay out the details for *implementation* of the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ that it has come under attack by anarchists and other critics. However, it is imperative to note that Marx did not believe the socialist state to be permanent. Rather, the dictatorship of the proletariat was, in Marx’s vision, meant to serve only as an intermediate socialist state *prior to the dissolution* of the state (“Mikhail Bakunin”:2). Nonetheless hardcore anarchists such as Bakunin opposed altogether the idea that such an intermediate state was necessary. Overall, “although Bakunin accepted Marx’s class analysis (acknowledging Marx’s genius), he thought Marx was arrogant, and that his authoritarian methods would lead to totalitarianism, which would compromise a communist revolution...” (Ibid.).

2.1.3 Libertarian Socialism

Libertarian socialism, also known as anarcho-communism or socialist anarchism, represents the best parts of the two aforementioned ideologies, and is arguably what one sees evidenced most in the ACGM today. One article (“Libertarian Socialism”: 1) explains, “the basic philosophy of libertarian socialism is summed up in the name; adherents believe that management of the common good (socialism) is necessary, but that this should be done in a manner that preserves individual liberty and avoids concentration of power or authority (libertarianism)”^{viii}. Contemporary libertarian socialists usually call themselves anarchists except when necessary to disambiguate or disassociate themselves with others who use the same term (Ibid.). Thus in the media and academia the radical

elements of the ACGM are readily identified as “anarchists” although they more appropriately should be understood as libertarian socialists or anarcho-communists.

In the ACGM, the similarities between radical anarchists and radical socialists are more important than their seeming differences, and this is why one may incorporate them into a single category--radicals and/or revolutionaries. It is interesting to note that while anarchism is often considered a separate ideology from socialism, anarchism is quite related to socialism. However, it is the libertarian tenet of no-government interference that marks the major distinction and contention between anarchism and traditional socialism (“Anarchism, Libertarian Socialism”:1). Many anarchists perceive an inconsistency or contradiction between the concepts of socialism and socialism as historically manifest. The contradiction for anarchists lies in a prescription of revolution through statism.

Nonetheless, socialist thinkers such as Gramsci and especially Marx himself have always informed anarchists. However, anarchists make no exceptions for the allowance of a state, whether socialist or other. Anarchists simply believe that government is not necessary for the maintenance of order, and is in fact harmful to the well being of people and societies (“What is Anarchism”, 2001:1). But anarchism is much more than a resistance to government. Anarchist L. Susan Brown states:

While the popular understanding of anarchism is of a violent, anti-state movement, anarchism is a much more nuanced and subtle tradition than a simple opposition to government power. Anarchists oppose the idea that power and domination are necessary for society, and instead advocate more co-operative, anti-hierarchical forms of social, political and economic organization. (Brown, cited in “What is Anarchism”, 2001: 1)

It should also be noted that anarchists are not *only* opposed to government, they oppose all forms of hierarchical control—be that control by the state or a capitalist (Ibid.). “An-archy” comes from the Greek words meaning “contrary to authority” (Ibid.). For anarchists this includes domination by the state, capital or the church (Ibid: 2). A major myth identified by anarchists and anarcho-communists is that the state has been the *victim* of capitalist globalization (“Revolutionary Anarchism”, 2001: 2). They maintain that the *capitalist* nation state is not the victim of globalization, but one of its main authors and its ally (Ibid.).

The political sphere (State) in capitalism has a special character. It is the coercive force which supports capitalist exploitation (Rupert, 2000:3) Dr. Shiva, of the International Forum on Globalization, explains that the rights and economies of local people are handed over to global companies by their governments (“This is What”, documentary film, 2000). Thus, under capitalism, and even more so under global capitalism, corporations and industry (the private sector) have enormous control over people and the environment yet no responsibility/accountability to either. Ultimately, libertarian socialists believe that non-elected institutions now have all the power but none of the responsibility of “elected” governments (Ibid.).

Overall, in examining the traditions of socialism, anarchism and libertarian socialism, it is not my intention to take up old theoretical debates. While it cannot be refuted that these ideologies diverge on many levels, I am more interested in how their similarities animate the ACGM. This is not to suggest that there are no factions within the ACGM. However, the prominent cleavages are not *between* the different types of revolutionary or radical traditions but between radicals in general and those groups that seek only to reform the system. This cleavage is discussed in Chapter Three.

2.2. Postmodernity/Postmodernism

Over the last three decades there has been a growing trend among left intellectuals, particularly in the west. This trend is known by many different names. They include post-structuralism; post-industrialism; post-Marxism; and, post-modernism. Taken as a whole, we may refer to it simply as post-al theory. This trend marks the left's flight from concreteness and radicalism, and in many ways is characterized by two reallocations in the left's stance (Reed, 2000).

The first is the tendency of much of the left intelligentsia to recoil into defeatist thinking. For example: "the knee-jerk reaction against critiques of contemporary capitalism, the trite motto that 'there is no alternative' (TINA)" (Saad-Filho, 2003:3). Reed (2000: xi) explains that a second form "of the left's flight from concreteness is distinct from, but grew organically within the defeatist environment prepared by, the first." The notions of cultural politics developed in university circles, which gained currency in the 1980s and 1990s, characterize this second form (Ibid.). James Petras (1997) has argued that much of post-al theory falls under the rubric of what is known as post-Marxism. Moreover, it is held that most post-Marxists are indeed *former* Marxists who grew disenchanted after the political fallout of 1968 (Callinicos, 2003). Disillusioned, many former Marxists turned to post-al theory and began to declare that Marxism and the interrogation of capitalism in general were obsolete. The subsequent sections attempt to explain and critique the aforementioned trend(s).

2.2.1 *History and Suppositions*

Callinicos (1990:2) explains that postmodernism represents the convergence of three distinct cultural trends. The first involved certain changes in the arts over the past three decades, especially with respect to architecture. Secondly there was a current in

philosophy giving conceptual expression to the transformations in the arts. Callinicos explains that this was a group of French theorists who became known in the 1970s by the shared label of 'poststructuralism.' In particular, this group included Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida and Michael Foucault. Callinicos (Ibid) holds that despite their numerous differences, "all three stressed the fragmentary, heterogeneous and plural character of reality, denied human thought the ability to arrive at any objective account of that reality and reduced the bearer of this thought, the subject, to an incoherent welter of sub-and trans-individual drives and desires"

Third, Callinicos (Ibid: 3) explains that these trends in art and philosophy *appeared* to reflect changes in the social world. The theory of postindustrial society developed by sociologists such as Daniel Bell provided an image of the transformation supposedly undergone by the West. According to this school of thought the developed countries of the West were "experiencing the transition from one economy based on mass industrial production to one in which systemic theoretical research is the engine of growth..." (Ibid.).

Callinicos explains that Lyotard's book *The Postmodern Condition* enjoys a definitive status in reflections on postmodernism because it synthesizes Postmodern art, poststructuralist philosophy and the theory of postindustrial society. For Lyotard the postmodern is defined simply by contrast to the modern. Lyotard (1979: xiii-xiv) understands the modern as "any science that legitimates itself with reference to a metadiscourse...making an explicit appeal to some grand narrative, such as...the emancipation of the rational or working subject". By contrast, Lyotard defines the "postmodern as incredulity toward metanarratives" (Ibid.).

2.2.2 New Social Movements

Albert Melucci coined the term 'new social movements' in 1980, in observation that dominant movements since the 1960s appeared to be "mobilized around symbolic and informational issues rather than material ones" (Starr, 2000:30). NSM "theory" emerged largely in response to Marxism's presumed economic reductionism, and the belief among many academics that traditional social movement theories could not effectively explain the glut of street protests that occurred during the 1960s and 1970s. The longevity of new social movements seemed to confirm the hypotheses of mainstream social scientists that class conflict was no longer the central factor in explaining social conflict and, furthermore, that capitalism had educed the capacity to "resolve its inner contradictions without the mediating variable of working-class based social revolution" (Phillion, 1998:79).^{ix}

Larana, Johnston and Gusfield (1994) maintain that in the last two decades social movements have shifted from a focus on ideology and class mobilization to identity. Smith (1994) similarly explains that many, who once looked to the working class movement as key to social change, have shifted their focus toward the new social movement and the organizing principle of "identity politics." She (Ibid.) holds that among many on the New Left this way of organizing is perceived as common sense: "it should go without saying that those who are oppressed should fight for their own oppression." However, this is a pessimistic notion; one that Smith (1994) argues forms the theoretical basis for identity politics--a point to which I will return.

With its emphasis on structures that are decentralized, open and non-hierarchical, some hold that the NSM paradigm provides an apt framework with which to examine the ACGM (Bates, 2002). The NSM paradigm stresses that issues of identity and difference

often become intertwined with social movements (Pichardo, 1995:411). New social movements are often said to be “postmodern” movements insofar as they share postmodern values. Postmodernist values include: a preference for differences over uniformity, a rejection of historical metanarratives, acceptance of incompleteness and uncertainty, an emphasis on open-endedness, self-expression, pluralism, heterogeneity, restlessness, and relativity. George Steinmetz (2001:2) defines new social movements as movements that,

- focus on goals of autonomy, identity, self-realization, and qualitative life chances, rather than divisible material benefits and resources;
- are as much defensive as offensive in orientation and are often directed toward limited demands which allow little or no negotiation;
- are less oriented toward social-utopian projects, formal political theories, or metanarratives of progress;
- adopt a decentralized, leaderless framework devoid of an agreed-upon ideology.
- do not appeal or mobilize along class lines, but cut across them...giving way to identities that are more permanent and ascriptive than class.

It should be noted that Larana, Johnston & Gusfield (1994:6) explain that the term ‘new social movements,’ is often misused or misunderstood. They maintain that there is a “tendency to use this term very broadly, as if it captures the ‘essence’ of all new forms of collective action.” However, in reality the concept is more of an approach or paradigm to understand new social movement formations around identity, while postmodernism is more of a formal theory.

New social movements have been traced to the *late* 1960s. Larana, Johnston and Gusfield (Ibid: 26) maintain that, “as analysts of new social movements...sifted through the soil of postmodernism, they have located the first sprouts of new social movements among the relatively recent mobilizations of students and the New Left in the late 1960s.”

However, this is a point that requires some clarification insofar as the 1960s movement can be said to have actually *originated* as one radical coalition movement that *later* splintered off into several, often conflicting, single-issue struggles. Indeed Best and Kellner (“Postmodern Politics And”) maintain that,

The modern emphasis on collective struggle, solidarity, and alliance politics gave way to extreme fragmentation, as *the “movement” of the 1960s* [emphasis mine] splintered into various competing struggles for rights and liberties. The previous emphasis on transforming the public sphere and institutions of domination gave way to new emphases on culture, personal identity, and everyday life, as macropolitics were replaced by the micropolitics of local transformation and subjectivity.

2.2.3 Identity Politics

Ultimately, by the 1970s this unified “movement” broke off into “new social movements” with many different groups--which included feminist, black liberation, gay and lesbian, and peace and environmental groups--each fighting for their own interests. Best and Kellner (Ibid.) maintain that eventually NSMs became transformed into “identity politics” by the 1980s and 1990s. It is important to note that while “identity politics” has its origins in the new social movements of the 1970s (Ibid.) the two are not synonymous. The phrase “new social movements” is more or less a description of a process and a type of social movement while “identity politics” refers to a particular strategy or organizing principle--one which nonetheless dominates new social movements (Smith, 1994).

The theoretical underpinnings of “identity politics” are heavily influenced by a particular offshoot of postmodernism known as post-Marxism, “for which the explicit rejection of the centrality of class is somewhat of an obsession” (Smith, 1994). This is important to note because “identity politics” and “postmodernism” are often used

interchangeably when in reality, “identity politics” is merely *one variant* of postmodernism (Postmodern Politics And”).^x Overall, “identity politics” can be said to bear the influence of postmodern theory, which Best and Kellner (Ibid.) maintain is evidenced “in the critique of modern reductionism, abstract universalism, and essentialism...”

However, while postmodern theory typically attacks essentialism, there is a type of essentialism in several modes of identity politics which privilege race, gender, or sexual preference, etc. as *the* constituent of identity. Moreover, through fetishizing a single all-defining personal identity (black, woman, gay, etc.), identity politics also diverges from the insight of postmodern theory that “identities are multiple and socially constructed, and that they need to be reconstructed in an emancipatory, autonomous, and self-affirming fashion” (Ibid.). Similarly Giltin (1994:153) asserts that “identity politics” *de facto* seems to glide towards the position that social groups have essential identities. He states that, ironically, “those who set out to explore a fixed definition of humanity end by fixing their definitions of blacks or women.”

Poststructuralists especially take issue with identity politics. Heyes (2002:3) explains that for poststructuralists the dangers of “identity politics,” are that it portrays as authentic to the self or particular group an identity that in actuality is defined by its opposition to an Other. Reclaiming such an identity as one's own merely reinforces its dependence on this dominant Other, and further reinforces and internalizes an oppressive discourse. Moreover, much philosophical discussion around identity politics has centered on a tension between identity and difference, and the possibilities for solidarity when these opposites are transposed to political contexts. Heyes (Ibid: 5) explains that,

“postmodern critics have suggested that alterity from dominant norms and within and between marginalized group members are a better descriptive and normative social ontology.” Thus rather than identity politics, many postmodernists take up “difference politics.” Furthermore, some postmodernists call for a reconceptualization of “identity politics;” one that does not depend on a “static” and fixed” notion of identity. For example, Gilroy (1996: 238) maintains that,

We can build upon the contributions of cultural studies to dispose of the idea that identity is an absolute and to find the courage necessary to argue that identity formation--even body-coded ethnic and gender identity--is a chaotic process that can have no end. In this way, we may be able to make cultural identity a premise of political action rather than a substitute for it.

2.3 Debates Between Advocates of Post-al Theory and NSMs and their Radical Modernist Critics

The aforementioned nuances notwithstanding, post-al theory, the ‘new social movement’ perspective, and the strategy and/or organizing principle of “identity politics” all converge in their resistance to class analysis and mobilization. Moreover, they share many criticisms of the Enlightenment beliefs in universal emancipation/progress, grand truths, and the existence of historical metanarratives. Thus they are often treated as a single category by their radical modernist--particularly socialist--critics.

2.3.1 Class and Identity Politics

Ellen Meiksins Wood (1995) contends that the assumption by many left-wing (postmodern) intellectuals that Marxism and capitalist critique are at a crisis point and perhaps even reached their demise is quite bizarre given capitalism’s present ubiquity. She maintains that, “there is something odd about the assumption that the collapse of Communism represents a terminal crisis for Marxism...in a period of capitalist

triumphalism there is more scope than ever for the pursuit of Marxism's principal project, the critique of capitalism" (Wood, 1995: 1). In a similar vein Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren (2004: 27) contend that far from being dead or obsolete, at the present juncture Marxist class analysis assumes even greater import since "its enduring legacy lies in its indictment of capitalism."

Moreover, we can make claims of "post-Marxism" only, if and when, we arrive at "post-capitalism" so to speak. Indeed, Marx's major work was *Capital*, "a study not of 'existing socialism' which actually did not exist in his day, but of capitalism—a subject that remains terribly relevant to our lives. It would make more sense to declare Marxism obsolete if and when capitalism is abolished, rather than socialism..." (Parenti cited in Ibid). Similarly, it makes little sense to do away with discussions of *class* so long as capitalism still exists. For Petras (1997:3) the greatest contradiction of post-Marxism is that it denies class while embracing capitalism. Under post-Marxism and post-al theories generally, we witness the radical displacement of class analysis and an emphasis on identity. However, many contend that is the material degradation caused by capitalism that increasingly unites people the world over, not cultural symbols.

In *Naming the Enemy* Amory Starr explores the problem with identity politics. Starr (2000:32) maintains, "identity-based movements have come to be seen as a threat to class-based organizing." Yet in actuality, "identity-based" movements such as African Diasporas or Black Power movements in the U.S. are more concerned with class than identity. Starr (Ibid.) explains, "Diasporic connections among Africans have been a political formation for over a century and, while partly organized by the vibrancy of cultural commonalities, are most strongly realized by the shared experience of dispossession..." This is not to suggest in any way that identity^{xi} is not a relevant issue; it

is, and it animates Diasporas and other social movements on several levels. However, it is imperative to note that formations of identity cannot be conflated with the agenda of “identity politics.”

Amin (Ibid: 5) asserts that it is because democracy has failed us, because the credibility, effectiveness and legitimacy of democracy have eroded that “human beings take refuge in the illusion of a particular identity that could protect them.” This gives way to an agenda of identity politics, what Amin calls “culturalism”--the claim that each of these different communities (ethnic, sexual, religious or other) has its own irreducible values--that is, values devoid of any universal significance. He explains that, “by ‘culturalism’ I mean the affirmation that the differences in question are ‘primordial,’ that they should be given ‘priority’ (over class differences, for example), and sometimes even that they are ‘transhistorical’ (Amin, 2001:6). For Amin culturalism (or identity politics) is not a complement to democracy, “a means of applying it concretely, but on the contrary a contradiction to it” (Ibid.).

This is not to suggest that diversity is a bad thing. On the contrary the question of community identity is a central question of our time. Amin asserts that the basic democratic principle, which implies real respect for diversity, can tolerate no violation. And the only way to respect and appreciate diversity is to practice genuine democracy^{xii}--which cannot exist under current capitalism. Similarly, Eagleton (1996:121) asserts that diversity cannot flourish so long as people languish under forms of exploitation; “and to combat those forms effectively implicates ideas of humanity which are necessarily universal.” Furthermore, where there is an absence of real democracy and an abundance of exploitation, diversity inevitably becomes an *instrument* that the adversary can use for their own ends. For example, when one examines the interventionist foreign policy of

hegemonic states, there is a blatant double standard that makes their supposed concern for the plight of ethnic groups an absurdity: “The rights of peoples are sacred in certain cases (today in Kosovo, tomorrow perhaps in Tibet), forgotten in others (Palestine, Turkish Kurdistan...etc.)” (Amin, 2001:6).

For Eagleton (1996) the most serious charge against postmodernism is that the so called concern for/focus on identity is often little more than a dangerous diversion from political and economic conditions and the need for political/social change.^{xiii} Eagleton (1996:23) charges that postmodernism’s

...single most enduring achievement—the fact that it has helped to place questions of sexuality, gender and ethnicity so firmly on the political agenda...was nothing more than a substitute for more classical forms of radical politics, which dealt with class, state, ideology, revolution, and material modes of production.

Such identity fetishism actually helps to sustain the status quo insofar as it reshapes the terrain of politics toward the cultural, the discursive, etc., and away from class and material politics (the terrain on which change is activated) and cultivates a type of historical amnesia that erases classical instances of human struggle and revolution out of the popular imagination. As a result, people become incorporated into the capitalist machine, pitted against one another due to their various “identities.” Indeed Phillion (1998: 100) warns that “identity politics” is nothing more than a capitalist scheme of divide and conquer.

In an era of *hyper*-capitalism (not post-capitalism), we must not be seduced by the agenda of “identity politics.” While we may *differ* in pigmentation and gender, we more readily share an experience of class oppression under the ubiquity of capital. “Class as...an agency of activism, has thus reasserted its fundamental importance” (Palmer, 1997: 71). Harvey (1998:29-30) notes, “...none of the New Social Movements...can

confront capitalism on its own terms...they have all foundered on the barrier reef of class...In fact, many of those swept up in the politics of identity have made their peace with capitalism and have prospered accordingly..."

All this notwithstanding post-al theory remains fixated on "culturalism" and/or identity politics, and suspicious of any form of class analysis. The rationale for such a displacement is that class-analysis, and Marxism in particular, obscures the equal or more significant importance of cultural identities like gender and ethnicity (Petras, 1997:4).

However, Petras holds that this is not the case:

Marxists have never denied the importance of racial, gender and ethnic division within classes. What they have emphasized, however, is the wider social system which generates these differences and the need to join class forces to eliminate these inequalities at every point...what most Marxists object to is the idea that gender and race inequalities can and should be analyzed and solved outside of the class framework (Ibid.).^{xiv}

Indeed Marx held that under capitalism all labour would be exploited, even that of 'women and children'. In doing so he was not negating the disadvantaged status of women and youth compared to that of men. Rather he appeared to be lamenting the *lack* of differentiation between these categories under the *capitalist* system; lamenting that alas no one would be safe from exploitation under capitalism. Marx (1992:16) noted that "...the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labour of men superseded by that of women. Differences of age and sex no longer have any distinctive social validity...all are instruments of labour, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex."^{xv}

Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren (2003: 151) assert that it is necessary to reconceptualize "difference" in order to understand its historical and material facets. They charge that postmodern "narratives have stressed the cultural dimensions of difference

while marginalizing and, in some cases, ignoring its economic and material dimensions”. In such postmodern understandings of difference the “cultural” is approached as a distinct and autonomous realm, “severed from its embeddedness within sociopolitical and economic arrangements” (Ibid: 152). Post-al theorists pit class and “culture”/ “identity” against one another as if they are two separate and completely unrelated points of departure. However, from a radical modernist perspective, we realize that we must acknowledge the former to properly explain the latter and vice-a-versa. In an appropriate historical materialist explanation, for example, “culture” is not the “other” of class, but rather constitutes part of a more comprehensive theorization of class relations in different contexts” (Ibid: 153).^{xvi}

By viewing class as a mere abstraction or after thought, by removing it from all determinate historical content and the landscape of broader social relations, post-Marxists forget rather conveniently that the “vast majority of the working class consists of women and people of colour” (Foster cited in Petras, 1997.). While the day-to-day experiences of capitalist exploitation are certainly gendered and racialized, it is important to critically examine the particular ways in which capitalist social relations *produce and organize* various forms of oppression. Only the traditions of radical modernity, such as Marxism and anarchism, situate class in its proper context, allowing us to locate its historical specificity and materiality alongside that of the system that produces it--capitalism.^{xvii}

2.3.2 The End of Historical Metanarratives?

It has already been stated that in the general sense, postmodernism is defined as incredulity toward historical metanarratives. However, according to radical socialists and anarchists alike, such incredulity toward metanarratives poses a multitude of problems.

Bookchin (1995) holds that postmodernists, by virtue of their premature negation of history, necessarily negate the entire legacy of human resistance and radicalism as well as any real hope for it in the future. He maintains that in the United States and abroad academics and self-styled postmodernist intellectuals have nurtured an entirely new “ensemble of cultural conventions that stem from a corrosive social, political and moral relativism... This relativistic ensemble is pitted against coherent thought as such and against the ‘principle of hope’... that marked radical theory of the recent past” (Bookchin, 1995: 1).

In their warped understanding of radical theory^{xviii} post-al theorists, it is held, revel in their deconstructive intellectualizing; hailing relativism as the theoretical armament with which to challenge the status quo (Zagorin, 1999). Yet it is the postmodern denial of history and the history of anything to do with radical politics that serves to *reaffirm* the status quo. Indeed Eagleton (1996:23) states, “the political illiteracy and historical oblivion fostered by much postmodernism... must surely be a cause for rejoicing in the White House.” For when we deny history we not only erase the history of radical politics and human emancipation but we also erase the history of human oppression, thus alleviating the *oppressors* from all blame.

Eagleton (1996) also illustrates many of the inconsistencies and ambivalences of postmodernism. There is one in particular that is worth stressing: the very existence of postmodernism as a thought structure undermines its main thesis. Eagleton (1996: 21) maintains that while postmodernism claims to contest the reality of ideas and history, its very existence contradicts the repudiation: “Is not such a narrative merely another instance of the linear, historicist, reductionist teleology which postmodernism itself

rejects out of hand”? Sweetman (1999: 2) is equally perplexed and frustrated by this fact. He suggests that deconstruction (which shares most of the postmodern sensibility) calls all worldviews into question; however, in the same breath it also posits a worldview--that there is no universal truth. Thus by extension it necessarily calls itself into question as well. For if all worldviews can be called into question this necessarily includes the worldview of “postmodernism” itself.

Ironically, the postmodern resistance to metanarratives--which originally grew out of despair and frustration with the excesses and failures of liberal modernism, has been co-opted by the status quo, as a convenient way to avoid critically addressing the dominant neo-liberal agenda. This co-optation has been employed to render neo-liberalism and capitalist expansion invisible and therefore unchallengeable. Sadly, in their nihilistic abandonment of hope and their belief that resistance is futile, postmodern intellectuals surrendered to this co-optation--and many argue have been pacified with illusions of prosperity--when resistance is needed most. For example, Wood (1995: 1) argues that the intellectual “left” has abandoned critical analyses and recoiled into the world of postmodernism and post-al theories at the very juncture “when a critical understanding of the capitalist system is most urgently needed.”

Ultimately socialist and anarchist scholars maintain that much of the “postmodern intellectual” Left has abandoned its critique of capitalism (see Ahmad, 1998; Eagleton, 1997; Wood, 1995). Rather than directly contesting and confronting capitalism, *they have found a space to exist within it* (Wood, 1995:2). This postmodern Left reduces politics to little more than an intellectualized and de-centered radicalization of liberal pluralism. For many this is a mere intellectual loop hole: “What better escape, in theory,

from a confrontation with capitalism, the most totalizing system the world has ever known, than a rejection of totalizing knowledges?" (Wood: Ibid.).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Document and ideological analyses of various ACGM literature/language has revealed some common themes that are recognizably associated with the values and rhetoric of radical modernity. These include *anti-capitalism/need for class analysis*; *social change*; and, *humanism/universality*. These themes will be subsequently discussed. Before discussing the ACGM's content, however, it is useful to look at its form (and strategies). It is imperative to remember that the purpose of this thesis is to uncover the ideological undertones of the ACGM, which reflects an overall focus on the movement's content. Content (i.e. beliefs/values, grievances, worldviews etc.) is something altogether different than a social movements form (organizational structure). It may be that a particular paradigm is appropriate for understanding one but not the other. However, before I discuss either form or content, it is necessary to explain my chosen methodology in greater detail.

3.1 Methodology Explained

Generally speaking, I employed qualitative analysis--known as qualitative document analysis-- of communicative texts as my research methodology. Qualitative research is a means for describing and endeavouring to comprehend the observed consistencies in what people do, or in their documented experience (Silverman, 2000). Through this methodology I hope to have discerned the ideological undertones of the ACGM.

Qualitative document analysis is superior to traditional "content analysis" inasmuch as it goes beyond the traditional objective study of message characteristics, placing specific statements in their proper context for analysis (Altheide, 1996). A

document is any symbolic representation that can be retrieved or recorded for the purpose of analysis (Ibid: 2). Altheide defines document analysis as “an integrated and conceptually informed method...for locating, identifying and analyzing documents for their relevance, significance and meaning” (Ibid).

I examined electronic documents produced by various ACGM groups and anonymous activists. Moreover, my research employed primary documents, for the most part, and some secondary documents. Primary documents include magazines, TV newscasts, newspapers and diaries (Ibid.). With the ubiquitous nature of the Internet, one may include online documents in this category. The primary focus was on North American ACGM groups such as CLAC (the Anti-capitalist Convergence), NEFAC (the North-Eastern Federation of Anarcho-Communists) and OCAP (the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty); however, I did also examine literature produced by important groups functioning outside of the North such as the EZLN.

It is useful to focus on some of the more active North American anti-corporate globalization groups for two reasons. First, due to its nature as a transnational movement (see Starr, 2000), various groups associated with the ACGM tend toward convergence in their worldviews, grievances, organization and tactics. Thus an analysis of the electronic documents produced by North American groups does provide much insight into the larger movement manifesting itself across international borders. Second, and more imperatively, it is useful to give special attention to North American (especially Canadian) groups because these groups have been among the most vocal and active across the globe. This is especially true of Canadian neo-liberal reform groups such as the Council of Canadians (COC) and the Polaris Institute.

Qualitative document analysis also encompasses some degree of ideological analysis. White (2000:3) explains that ideological analysis is based on the assumption that texts (or cultural artifacts as she calls them) are produced in specific historical and social contexts by and for particular social groups with particular values and worldviews. Equally important for my research focus were the values, ideas and beliefs that the documents were contesting, denouncing, resisting and/or advocating. For example, documents that were blatantly anti-capitalist supported the assertion that the ACGM represents a return to some variant of capitalist critique associated with the ideological traditions of radical modernity--such as socialism, anarchism or libertarian socialism.

3.1.2 Benefits of Qualitative Analysis

In the past, approaches to content analysis were grounded in traditions that equated 'true knowledge' with numbers and measurement, focusing on the collection of *quantitative* data (Altheide, 1996:5). Qualitative analysis, on the other hand, does not rely on numbers and empirical measurement. In many ways, this makes the researcher's task more arduous inasmuch as there are no ready-made formulas for "testing" one's findings. However, Altheide asserts that qualitative document analysis is superior to traditional quantitative content analysis because while the major tact of the latter is merely to verify or confirm hypothesized relationships, the former is concerned with the discovery of new or emergent patterns (Ibid: 16).

Ultimately qualitative analysis is a much more nuanced approach for analyzing content. Categories and variables initially guide the study, but others are allowed and expected to emerge throughout the study (Altheide, 1996:16). These categories and

variables are more or less a series of questions and descriptions that guide the analysis of the documents in questions, and comprise what is known as a *protocol*. Altheide (1996:26) explains that, “a protocol is a way to ask questions of a document; a protocol is a list of questions, items, categories, or variables that guide data collection from documents.”

From the previous discussions (Chapter Two) on radical modernity and postmodernity, I derived a protocol/set of questions with which to examine the documents’ ideological undertones.^{xix} Altheide (1996) explains that since qualitative document analysis relies mostly on text, narrative and descriptions rather than numerical measurement, the selected protocol tends to be fairly short, employing a limited number of questions. The following questions served as a back drop against which the selected documents were analyzed. It should be noted that I report only the common themes and major differences that were observed in the process of document/ideological analysis. Naturally, it would be far too time consuming to take the reader through each article as I applied each of the following questions. The protocol questions that guided the document and ideological analyses are:

- 1) What appear to be the animating principles of the document?
- 2) Does the document articulate a particular set of values, beliefs or ideology?
- 3) What specific issue(s) does the document address?
- 4) Does the document address the political economy of globalization and/or global capitalism? If so, in what manner?
- 5) Does the document recommend social action? If so, what kinds of actions are encouraged?

3.2 Form/Structure of ACGM

An examination of the ACGMs form revealed many similarities to the NSM paradigm. Overall, the structure of NSMs is quite different from typical or traditional political organizations, due to their decentralized, non-hierarchical and anti-institutional foundations. Ultimately, NSMs attempt to reproduce in their own organizational structure the type of government, system or world they desire (Pichardo, 1997). NSMs, to the best of their ability, rely upon rotating leadership, flexible networks, and communal decision-making (Offe, 1985). Moreover, Offe maintains that NSMs occur almost entirely outside of the boundaries of institutional politics. Many of these organizational characteristics are directly applicable to the ACGM.

To date the ACGM's most visible and largest mode of organizing is mass, decentralized, non-hierarchical campaigns of direct action and civil disobedience ("Brainy encyclopaedia-- Anti-globalization movement"). The article argues that, "this mode of organizing...serves to tie many disparate causes together into one global struggle" (Ibid.). The article maintains that this organisational model is notable--"despite (or perhaps because of) the lack of formal coordinating bodies, the movement manages to successfully organize large protests on a global basis" (Ibid.). Moreover, while the ACGM is often criticised for its ad hoc and amorphous structure ("Because Something"), to others this is one of its strengths. After all, it is much harder for officials to quell a force that lacks formal structures, with official heads and leaders (Klein, 2003).

One activist ("The Anarchist Ethic") explains that the ACGM's particular mode of organization is known as *informal organization*: "We call organization that lacks the formality and authority which separate organizers and organized, informal organization"

(Ibid). The document identifies two characteristics of informal organization: informal organization lacks offices and hierarchical positions and, informal organizations dissolve when their goal is achieved or abandoned, “they do not perpetuate themselves merely for the sake of the organization if the goals that caused people to organize have ceased to exist” (Ibid.). To coordinate involvement in demonstrations, ACGM protestors organize themselves into “affinity groups,” a non-hierarchical group of people typically living close together who share a common goal or political message. It is held that in most cases many things can be done easier with an affinity group because, “higher levels of organization just make the decision-making process cumbersome...” (Ibid.).

Informal organization is usually based on an ethic of *autonomous* action. The document defines “autonomy” as refusing to obey or give orders, “which are always shouted from above or beyond the situation” (Ibid.). It is maintained that autonomous action is necessary to prevent the formation of relations of authority. Also, autonomy allows decisions to be made in and during the time of their necessity. It should be noted, however, that *autonomy* as understood by ACGM groups is something quite different than the principle of autonomy that typically characterizes ‘new social movements.’ As discussed in the previous chapter, ‘new social movements’ tend to organize on the basis of ‘autonomy’ from other single-issue movements as well as from any form of class struggle (Smith, 1994:1). The ACGM understanding of autonomy refers to autonomy from any authority structures--both from outside or within their social movements.

It should be noted, however, that while informal organization is necessary to prevent hierarchical structures, as well as for spontaneous decision-making during demonstrations, activists maintain that:

This does not mean to say however that we shouldn't think strategically about the future and make agreements or plans. On the contrary, plans and agreements are useful and important. What we are emphasizing is a flexibility that allows people to discard plans when they become useless. Plans should be adaptable to events as they unfold. It can be dangerous during a demonstration or action to hesitate to change plans when events take an unexpected turn, because one's group had originally planned otherwise ("The Anarchist Ethic").

An examination of statements made by ACGM groups reveals characteristics that are commonly associated with the NSM paradigm described above. For example, CLAC explains that it is an "an anti-authoritarian organization, affirming autonomy, decentralization and opposition to all hierarchies" ("Basis of Unity"). Moreover, much like the new social movements' organizational structure, those chosen by ACGM groups, serve as a model of the alternative world they wish to create. Indeed, NEFAC assert that, "...we believe that the structure of our federation should reflect the kind of society we want to live in: democratic, participatory, accountable, and anti-authoritarian" (Ibid.). Similarly, another ACGM member concludes that, "the movement itself is a model of what the movement is trying to create, an environmentally friendly and socially just group of people that eliminates domination and uses consensus-based decision making in a non-hierarchical, anti-consumerist and anti-capitalist organization" ("The Protests of", 2001: 3).

Overall, the NSM paradigm is, on some levels, a relevant organizational framework with which to examine and understand the *form* of the ACGM. However, the notion that the movement's decentralized, anti-institutional and non-hierarchical structure reflects a distinctly "postmodern" posturing is problematic. Indeed, the preference for decentralized and non-hierarchical forms of organization has a much lengthier historical and philosophical lineage derived from anarchism ("The Anarchist Ethic"). Moreover, the

NISM organizational paradigm does not apply to all groups in the ACGM. In fact, the neo-liberal reform groups remain quite conventional in their organizational structures and tactics. Unlike the radical groups, the reform groups are organized in a traditional top-down fashion. Moreover, because the reform and revolutionary groups have different end-goals, they adopt different strategies--which will be explored in the following section.^{xx}

3.2.1 ACGM Strategies

The neo-liberal reform groups do not want to do away with capitalism all together, they merely want to reform many of its oppressive institutions such as the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF (Burbach & Danaher, 2000). These are the groups that are demanding “fair trade” or “trade with a human face” (“After Genoa”), and to date, they constitute the majority within this movement (“CSIS Report”)--although this is arguably rapidly changing. Included in this reform category are the AFL-CIO, liberal non-governmental organizations, Global Exchange and many trade unionists and environmentalists (“Know Your Enemy”). Canadian neo-liberal reform groups include the Council of Canadians and the Polaris Institute. These groups want to reform organizations like the WTO so that profit based institutions; especially American multinational corporations--for whom many believe the WTO to be a gate keeper--will have less ubiquitous power and presence.

Some neo-liberal reform groups can propose very radical change such as the cessation of all logging. However, what differentiates the neo-liberal reform groups from the radicals/revolutionaries is that “they propose to achieve their goals through regulations imposed within the existing system” (“The Protests of”). They use traditional

political channels to effect traditional political change. These include lobbying the government and attempting to influence elections. Ultimately, these groups are traditional, hierarchical, top-down organizations; although they are scathingly critical of institutions such as the WTO. They argue that an institution fundamentally concerned with money should never be allowed to supersede elected governments.^{xxi}

The other faction is comprised of more revolutionary or radical groups. The revolutionary groups challenge the Establishment through engaging in unconventional politics. Unlike the neo-liberal reform groups, the revolutionaries have no desire to reform capitalist institutions such as the WTO, for they do not view these institutions as the real problem. Rather these institutions are understood as the logical outcome of the current system; the problem truly lies in the *capitalist system* that gave rise to them. Therefore, these groups "...seek to cause the social change required to create a society where capitalism and consumerism do not reign supreme. No more re-plastering, the structure is rotten..." ("The Protests of"). The revolutionaries ultimately think it futile to combat capitalism or its institutions *within* the perimeters set up by the very system in question (Ibid.).

The revolutionary groups are fundamentally against hierarchy and top-down change, thus, they cannot consider creating change by having it legislated and forced down upon the people. One ACGM member explains that they "are trying to cause change by educating people so grassroots groups will rise up and take action. In this way they hope to promote bottom-up solutions." ("The Protests of"). Participating in mass demonstrations that attract public attention is one way in which revolutionaries hope to educate and engage people. They embrace Gandhi's non-violent civil disobedience (ahimsa) as a protest strategy.^{xxii} Gandhi believed that engaging in non-violent civil

disobedience such as mass marches or locking down (physically) at a government building or industrial development site, “says to people and the authorities that...I care so much about this particular issue or injustice that I am prepared to go to jail contesting it...” (“Gandhi’s Swadeshi”). Furthermore, contemporary radical activists point out that engaging in civil disobedience (and being arrested for it) calls attention to the increasing criminalization of political dissent in so called democratic and free societies such as the USA or Canada.^{xxiii}

Overall, the aims of revolutionary involvement in the ACGM are two-fold. The first aim is to *promote the self-management of struggle*. For example, it is suggested that radicals “must fight for organizational forms, protest forms, and decision-making forms that rest upon the active involvement of the working class and provide an opportunity for the class to self-manage the struggle” (Ibid.). The second aim is *fighting the government* (Ibid.). While this may sound violent, it is important to understand what it actually means. As discussed in the previous chapter, radicals reject the idea that the [capitalist] State is the victim of capitalist globalization. Rather they “recognize that the state is one of the main authors of [capitalist] globalization...The IMF, World bank, and WTO are organizations made up of member states, as is the United Nations. It is the State that has implemented neo-liberal attacks on the working class the world over...” (Ibid.).^{xxiv}

On the whole, revolutionary groups hope to use eye-catching demonstrations and civil disobedience to create a social/political/economic/cultural revolution and change the framework of our capitalist system in three ways (“The Protests of”). First: *causing social change by educating uninformed people*. They create and use media catching

situations such as protests to broadcast information on the problems in society, as well as their anti-capitalist solutions. Second: *causing decision makers to behave in different ways by raising the social cost of deleterious actions to them*. This cost may be in the form of property damage inflicted during protests, which is the driving force behind the Black Bloc for example. However, this cost may also be in the form of lost business, “either directly from the duration of the protests or from public opinion resulting from the protests” (Ibid.). There is also the cost that governments have to put out to suppress dissidents such as increased police officers etc.

The third and final point made by revolutionaries is that *protests can create global solidarity of a model movement through actions* (Ibid.). Uniting groups through actions such as the WTO protests creates an international network of autonomous groups. During the Seattle protests, demonstrations were being held in Mexico City; Amsterdam; New Delhi; Lisbon; Bangalore; Paris; Geneva; Rome; Berlin; Ankara; Baltimore; Toronto; Philadelphia; Nashville; Manila; Wales; Boston; Cairo; Milan; and, Israel in solidarity with those protesting and being arrested on the streets of Seattle. “All over the world, people were sending out the message that they were willing to ‘go to jail for justice’ (*This is What Democracy Looks Like*, 2000: Film).

3.3 ACGM Content

From the above discussion on the ACGM’s form and strategies, one can already see hints of the type of language employed by ACGM activists. The following section will demonstrate that while the organizational structure of those groups considered revolutionary arguably fits within the new social movement paradigm, the language of reform and revolutionary groups alike (though to varying degrees) resurrects such radically modern ideals as a critique of capitalism and the need for working class

revolution, social change, and universal emancipation and justice. In the following section I present the common themes I extrapolated from primary and secondary documents.

3.3.1 Anti-capitalism and/or the need for class-analysis

Several of the activist documents I examined were explicitly anti-capitalist. One group that falls into the revolutionary/radical category is CLAC. On their website one can find a document dedicated to explaining their “Basis of Unity.” CLAC members state, “the Anti-Capitalist Convergence [CLAC] is opposed to capitalism... We reject a system driven by an exploitative logic that sees human beings as human capital, ecosystems as natural resources, and culture as simply a commodity.” In another document produced by NEFAC, similar statements are made. NEFAC is an organization of revolutionaries from Quebec and New England who, in their words, “identity with the communist tradition within anarchism” (“Aims and Principles”). The group explains on their website that, “we seek to abolish all forms of capitalism; whether it be free-market capitalism or so-called ‘socialist’ state capitalism” (Ibid.).

In Toronto in the fall of 2000 a meeting was held to unite activists in a mission to “rebuild the left” by developing a structured movement against capitalism (“About the Socialist Project”). Though the first Toronto initiative waned, a group of independent socialists continued to meet with other socialists in Ontario in an effort to find a way forward. Out of this effort the Socialist Project was formed. In an article in *Canadian Dimensions* the group expresses its resistance to capitalism and a commitment to universal justice:

Our political project is defined by the struggle to move beyond capitalism. To be for equality and democracy, to be for justice and solidarity, to be for the end of all oppressions and the full and universal development of individual and collective capacities- - to be for all this is to be against capitalism... (“About the Socialist Project”).

In another article obtained from *A-Infos*^{xxx} one activist writes that, “to be against globalization, you must be against capitalism, the state and the nation. This opposition necessitates a proletarian perspective: To be for the working class and for the working class revolutionary self-organization...” (“Increased Unity”). One revolutionary activist (who goes by the pseudonym Reverend ChuckO) emphatically holds that while it is important to contest particular trade agreements, activists must not lose sight of the broader picture, which requires an explicit interrogation of capitalism. He states, “capitalism is organized crime...while it is important to oppose the FTAA [Free Trade Area of the Americas], we must not lose sight of the broader forces at work. Globalization is merely the latest stage of capitalism...” (Burning and Looting All Illusions”).

In a similar tone, activist Erico Malatesta (2000) maintains that the ACGM must move away from a focus on reforming the current system “into a kinder, gentler, oppressive force” (Malatesta, 2000). He asserts that institutions such as the WTO cannot be reformed and instead of focussing on reform, the ACGM should adopt the radical theory of anarchism, which calls for the abolition of capitalism. He states, “we need to look for the root cause, we need to look at the virus that spawned the disease of globalization...in order to oppose corporate power and globalization, we must oppose capitalism” (Ibid.).

And addressing protesters at a recent demonstration in Cancun, Mexico, Subcomandante Marcos (1993) of the EZLN described “globalization” as a scheme to conquer the entire world--as a war of invasion on the planet by capital:

As if at war, the high command of the multinational army that wants to conquer the world...meets behind a system of security that is as large as their fear...That is what this is all about. It is war. A war against humanity. The globalisation of those who are above us is nothing more than a global machine that feeds on blood and defecates in dollars...This is a world war of the powerful who want to turn the planet into a private club that reserves the right to refuse admission...protected by armies and police forces.

I have quoted Marcos at length to demonstrate that, while the EZLN is very much a movement about indigenous oppression and emancipation of the Maya Indians of Chiapas, “the Zapatista proposal for autonomy has to be understood in the context of economic globalization” (“Resistance to Globalization”).

Moreover, for many ACGM activists, a revolutionary anti-capitalist agenda necessitates a return to a focus on ideology. For example, NEFAC maintains that it is time for revolutionaries to wage the “battle of ideas” (“This is NEFAC”). It argues that radical ideologies such as anarcho-communism must be reignited in order to lead the working class to revolution. It states that a successful working class revolution, “must be preceded by organizations able to radicalize mass movements and popular struggles...act as a forum where ideas...can be discussed, and provide a vehicle for the maximum political impact of anarcho-communist ideas within the working class...” (Ibid.).

The above statements by ACGM members reflect the anti-capitalist values associated with radical Enlightenment traditions such as socialism (Marxism), anarchism and libertarian socialism. In many ways such overt resistance to capitalism and a commitment to class struggle are indicative of what was defined in the Chapter Two as “true socialism.” The authors of “What is Communist Anarchism” explain that true

socialists acknowledge that in order to be free, the workers must abolish capitalism. Moreover, they maintain that “true” socialism, is by necessity *radical* and *revolutionary* insofar as it goes to the very root of social trouble; “it wants to change things from the very bottom” (Ibid.). At the same time, such anti-capitalist sentiments seem to contradict the central tenets of the new social movement perspective (discussed in Chapter Two)--that class conflict is no longer a prime factor in explaining social conflict and, furthermore, that capitalism has managed to resolve its internal contradictions without the mediating variable of working-class based social revolution (Phillion, 1998).

The aforementioned ACGM documents are a sign of the changing climate of social movements since the 1990s. Evidenced in these documents is a return to ideology and ideology critique^{xxvi}. Indeed Martinez (2002) maintains that many of the concerns of politicized youth in social justice movements today are ideological. He asserts that in the “anti-globalization movement” in particular, rebuilding-the-left groups work to organize many ideological sectors of the movement into an anti-capitalist coalition. Ultimately, Martinez (Ibid.) points out that “identity politics” is on the decline, and in its place one sees an increasing consciousness of anti-capitalism, or at least an interrogation of corporate power. He concludes,

Social movements, however, are increasingly shifting away from ‘identity politics’ as a driving force, and we will probably see this trend decline even further in the future. Indeed, one positive aspect of emergent youth politics is the recognition that *one* institution--the economy--dominates all others, and that its leaders, the multinational corporations must be stopped. They may not recognize capitalism as the root of inequality, but they understand that corporate power is the biggest barrier to social change.

In a similar fashion Callinicos (2003:14) asserts that, in his opinion, the ACGM is best described as anti-capitalist. However, he points out that this is not because most

activists in the ACGM think “it is possible or perhaps even desirable to replace capitalism altogether.” But because it reflects what Giovanni Arrighi, Terence Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein call an *anti-systemic movement*.

That is, it does not simply campaign over specific grievances or issues—say, to do with free trade or the environment or Third World debt—but is motivated by a sense of interconnection between an immense variety of different injustices and dangers...representative of a movement from the specific to the general... (Callinicos, 2003:15)

What this means is a movement that is conscious of the system—a movement that recognizes the connectedness of a myriad of grievances borne of and/or perpetuated by the particular system in question. Callinicos (Ibid.) holds that already, at Seattle, Gerald McIntee, leader of the public sector union AFSCME, revived the early 1960s slogan: “We have to name the system... and that system is corporate capitalism.” He further asserts that the fact that this is coming from a union leader who was committed strongly to supporting the Clinton administration (in other words, that such radical rhetoric should come from a neo-liberal position), “is a sign of the changing ideological climate” (Ibid.).

Fotopoulos (2001:2) maintains that the anti-systemic movement is different from other social movements because it is characterized by a crucial extra element^{xxvii}--“it explicitly or implicitly challenges the legitimacy of a social-economic system.” He explains that an anti-systemic focus defined many of the social movements of the 19th and 20th centuries. For example, he holds that, “the communist and anarchist movements were clearly anti-systemic preaching the revolutionary change of society” (Ibid: 3). Moreover, while Fotopoulos (2001:2) argues that today we are facing the end of “traditional” anti-systemic movements “because of penetration of postmodernist ideas”; he does point (very reluctantly I should add) to parts of the ACGM as the last vestige(s)

of anti-systemic politics. He (Ibid: 4) states, “in fact, the only significant anti-systemic forces today, which directly challenge the ‘system’ (i.e. the market economy and representative democracy) are some currents within the anti-globalisation movement.”

3.3.2 Social Change:

Revolution

A second theme that was quite common among the documents was the need for social change--something postmodernists long abandoned when they gave into the defeatist motto that ‘there is no alternative’ (TINA). It should be noted however that the call for social change within the ACGM is not in the least univocal. This category can be divided, once again, along the lines of reform and revolution. The radical groups prescribe all out revolution while the more mainstream groups prescribe social change through reform of the capitalist system but not its abolition. I will look first at the revolutionary appeals for change followed by the more moderate demands for reform.

CLAC denounces any efforts to merely reform the capitalist system calling instead for complete social change. They state: “The CLAC is non-reformist, and adopts an attitude of confrontation and struggle for a radical and profound societal change. The CLAC refuses lobbying that legitimizes the authority of the state” (“Basis of Unity”). The Zapatistas also call for all out revolution. Moreover, they stress that what makes them radical is that they are not interested in obtaining power for themselves, but justice and self-realization for everyone. Marcos has stated that,

We do not struggle to take power, we struggle for democracy, liberty and justice ...It is not our arms which make us radical; it is the new political practice which we propose and in which we are immersed with thousands of men and women in Mexico and the world: the construction of a political practice which does not seek

the taking of power but the organization of society...is there anything more radical than to propose to change the world?" ("What is it that is different about the Zapatistas?").

Reform

While social change was a common theme in all of the documents I examined, there were differences with respect to the type of "social change" prescribed. These differences reflect the main cleavage within the ACGM. The aforementioned groups prescribed some form of revolutionary social change. The groups discussed in the following section call for reform--they seek to change the effects of capitalism and limit the power of corporations and the global managerial institutions that exist to facilitate its expansion across the globe (the WTO, IMF and World Bank, for example).

However, even the reform groups' language seems to invoke universalistic beliefs in global justice, hope and the radical-Enlightenment commitment to human emancipation, eschewed by post-al theory in general. Walden Bello (2002) explains that that around the globe thousands upon thousands of people, "galvanized by the slogan 'Another world is possible,' have staged a counteroffensive against corporate globalization. And in a document produced by the Third World Network (TWN)--a group not readily considered "radical", it is held that "in the midst of financial crises, corporate scandals...and ecological crises, there is much hope, too. 'We the peoples' have always spoken out and acted when there is injustice" ("We the Peoples"). For this reason, the TWN launched a global campaign; in solidarity with other ACGM groups/activists entitled "We the Peoples Believe Another World is Possible" (Ibid.).

The Council of Canadians (COC) is another popular reform group. Overall, mainstream groups such as the COC, “tend to adopt an anti-corporate view but are not as explicitly anti-capitalist...” (Stinson, 2002). However, while it is far less radical than the aforementioned groups the COC has been quite vocal and active in the fight against corporate-globalization. Indeed Stinson (Ibid.) maintains that their “membership has grown significantly over recent years as the organization has become a stronger voice of popular opposition to corporate takeovers and to maintain national sovereignty.” The COC ultimately calls on government to create policies that will reverse some of the effects of corporate globalization and limit the power of corporations. Moreover, it stresses the need for people to mobilize against corporate power and promotes citizen participation in an effort to bring about social change. On its website, the COC explains that, “democracy flourishes when people organize to protect their communities and rights and hold their elected officials accountable. It is through the dynamic processes initiated by civil society that the social climate for real political change will occur” (“Vision Statement”).

Another Canadian neo-liberal reform group is the Polaris Institute. This organization grew out of years of struggle against free trade agreements. Like the COC, this organization “fights for democratic social change in an age of corporate driven globalization...” (“The Origins of the Polaris Institute”). The Polaris Institute has also been quite active, and successful, in the fight against corporate globalization. For example, the organization was instrumental in organizing against and halting the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) when it obtained a copy of the confidential MAI draft and leaked it onto the Internet for worldwide circulation in 1997. Moreover,

the organization explains that, “over the next eighteen months, Polaris played a key role in helping to build a national and international campaign that eventually proved to be effective in scuttling the MAI” (Ibid.).

It is evident from the above statements that both the revolutionary groups and the neo-liberal reform groups have a desire to change the present socio-economic system. At the same time, it has been demonstrated in previous chapters that proponents of postmodernity have in many ways abandoned any hope for social change. In this respect, the ACGM groups cannot be considered postmodern. Indeed postmodern incredulity toward historical metanarratives by definition disables any agenda for social change. For example, Zagorin (1999) charges postmodernists with negating the process and possibility of human emancipation via denunciations of historical metanarratives. He critically contests postmodernism’s bearing upon historiography, and challenges the postmodern claim that the world has undergone an epochal metamorphosis from the modern to the postmodern age. This postmodern presupposition, he (1999: 3) holds to be a fallacious repudiation of the course of human resistance:

In the most general sense, postmodernism stands for the proposition that western society in recent decades has undergone an epochal shift from the modern to a postmodern era said to be characterized by the final repudiation of the Enlightenment’s legacy of belief in reason and progress and by a pervasive incredulity toward all metanarratives imputing a direction and meaning to history, in particular the notion that human society is a process of universal emancipation.

However, one must differentiate the types of social change that the ACGM prescribes along the lines, once again, of reform and revolution. Many maintain that while calls for revolution stand in direct opposition to postmodern nihilism, desires to merely reform capitalist institutions may actually reflect postmodernism’s reconciliation with capitalism. Several socialist scholars (see Wood, 1995; Eagleton, 1996) maintain that postmodernists

have made their peace with capitalism, and have found a space to exist within it. Similar charges have been made against the neo-liberal reform groups by their revolutionary counter-parts. The neo-liberal reform groups are against some aspects and institutions of capitalist “free trade” but not capitalism or international trade altogether. The revolutionary groups are highly critical of this agenda accusing reform groups of merely wanting a piece of the capitalist pie. Overall the revolutionary groups have two major criticisms of the “Fair Trade” movement: its *leaders* are suspect and harbour their own agenda; and, its *followers* are naïve. With respect to the former, one revolutionary commented “... They don’t want to destroy capitalism; they want to reform it for their profit interests” (Ibid.). And with respect to the latter, the following is maintained:

Suppose your anti-WTO/IMF actions succeeded in producing ...fair trade? How much of a difference will these reforms actually make...Corporations will still exist to extract surplus value from workers and transfer it to investors-owners. Corporations will still produce for profit and not human need... (Ibid.).

These criticisms, notwithstanding, it cannot be refuted that while the reform groups do not want to abolish capitalism altogether, they are still very critical of it and wish to achieve some form of social change. In this respect, they still believe in the ‘principle of hope,’ something postmodernists no longer give credence to (see Chapter Two). Moreover, Orton (“Globalization from Below or”) points out that reform groups such as the COC are becoming more rather than less radical. Indeed in the following section it will be demonstrated that much like the revolutionary groups, reformists also invoke the language of humanism and universality, and as such do not perceive themselves as a single-issue or identity-based movement, but rather as part of a global solidarity movement for universal justice.

3.3.3 *Humanism and Universality*

In all of the documents analyzed, there was one theme especially that applied to both revolutionary groups as well as reform: the *humanistic* and *universalistic* language characteristic of radical-modernity. For example, the EZLN (1996) make several appeals to the notion of a single humanity entitled to universal ideals and practices of freedom and justice. Marcos maintains that under the terror of neo-liberalism, under the ubiquitous machine of capitalist expansion, we are told lies to make us powerless: “A new lie is sold to us as history. The lie about the defeat of hope, the lie about the defeat of dignity, the lie about the defeat of humanity.” Marcos demands that in the face of the global spread of such lies, we must raise the “international of hope.” He continues, “hope above borders, languages, color, cultures, strategies, and thoughts, of all those who prefer humanity alive” (Ibid.).

In another address by Marcos (“What is it that is Different”), he argues that the Zapatistas fight not merely for themselves but for all of human kind. Indeed he explains that since the beginning of their uprising, the EZLN have been offered bribes and riches to abandon their struggle but have refused to sell themselves because they fight for all of humanity. He states, “we chose not to sell ourselves...because we are fighting for something...for good... homes, food, health, a good price for our work, good lands, good education, respect for the culture...liberty, independence, justice, democracy and peace....but for everyone, not just for ourselves...”

These appeals to universal justice and humanity are echoed by neo-liberal reform groups. Indeed, while rightfully considered reformist, the Council of Canadians (COC) has grown much more “radical” and universalistic in its rhetoric over its life span, and is

conscious of this fact. The COC is quite self-reflexive and has attempted to chronicle and understand its own nuances. In a document entitled “Vision Statement Backgrounder,” the COC explains that it has had two distinct phases in its past and is now entering into a third. The first phase was National Sovereignty. At its inception, the COC was founded around concerns about, “the future of Canada as a nation-state on the North American continent.”

Having lost the struggles against the FTA (Free Trade Agreement) and the NAFTA the COC shifted its focus to Popular Sovereignty, which was the second phase. Here the most important role of the COC was perceived as the need to “fight the fall-out of these trade deals.” However, the COC was shifting in some other crucial ways. For example, “we were becoming a grassroots movement instead of a collection of well-known individuals...we were clear that these were not just rights of Canadian citizens, but of all peoples of the earth” (Ibid.). Thus the organization’s focus was becoming more universal in scope.

The third phase, the one currently occupied by the COC, is Global Social Justice. However, the events of 9/11 in the United States and the ensuing draconian atmosphere, which has increased threats to Canadian civil liberties and national sovereignty, have created pressure on the COC to return to its “nationalist” roots. While the COC admittedly feels it is at a difficult cross road, the organization insists that it must remain committed to Global Social Justice while being conscious of the threat to Canadian sovereignty: “Are these two paths mutually exclusive, however? The old nationalism of the 1970s and 1980s failed to include an analysis of class, youth and colour, or to see the issues that Canadians were fighting for from an international perspective...”(Ibid.).

Overall the COC's rhetoric suggests that at the current juncture it is deeply dedicated to universal justice, not merely justice for Canadians. It aims to "create a compelling civil society movement in search of social justice both here in Canada and internationally whose core mandate is the creation of participatory, living democracy for all the peoples of the world..." ("Vision Statement"). Basically the COC has come to a realization long before held by radicals--that we are all connected as people, and thus our struggles are connected. In an article obtained from *Popstar Liberation Front*, an online punk rock magazine dedicated to radical/anarchist politics and activism, it is maintained that while there are different groups in the ACGM, the strength of the movement comes from mixing the different groups together in a coalition. Also, the document asserts that more and more people and groups in the ACGM are making the necessary connections:

The bottom line is that in the complex world we live in, everything is connected. More and more individual groups and people are waking up to this fact. The struggle for environmental justice is the struggle for human justice. The struggle for true democracy is the struggle for equality. As the charismatic Zapatista commander remarked on the issues he and his people were struggling for, 'We are all Zapatista'...In the end it's all about this: 'One Humanity, One Struggle.'

Such appeals for universal justice for a single humanity completely contradict the rhetoric of post-al theory. Indeed Post-al theory has long abandoned any belief in the possibility for universal justice. Yet at the same time, postmodernists claim to be dedicated to equality for particular groups and/or identities--such as racial equality or gender equality. However, Malik (1997) explains that postmodernist's incredulity toward universal ideals, and the politics of "difference" that they often prescribes, actually undermine the issues they claim to address such as race and gender equality. For starters, the fundamental principles of postmodernism do not enable it to address issues of equality: "The capacity of postmodernists to challenge racist discourse is undermined by

their own belief in the relativity of meaning” (Ibid: 119). Moreover, and more importantly, postmodernist *anti-foundationalism* actually disables any anti-racist project. For example, if one endeavours to argue that certain racist interpretations of history are not valid, this implies that one must accept that there are some *standards* against which we can judge them. Thus a true commitment to anti-racism requires a commitment to universal equality and humanity. Ultimately, “it is very difficult to support respect for difference without appealing to some ‘totalizing’ universalistic principles of equality or social justice” (Ibid: 120).^{xxviii}

This does not mean that universalism and humanism have not been used as pretexts or been put to coercive practices. Indeed, “historical experience suggests that the demands of justice divide more than they unite. But this does not necessarily mean that they are invalid” (Callinicos, 2003:114). Rather than do away with these ideals out right, we can attempt to radicalize them. For instance, Ahmad (1998) looks at Marx's radically new way of approaching humanism and universality. Marx radicalized the liberal notion of human nature as static, eternal and given to us by nature. For Marx, we must understand human essence in a social and historical context. In this respect, man is a product of himself and his own activity in history (Ahmad, 1998).

Marx’s reinterpretation of humanism is not as determinist as liberal notions; rather it depends on a belief in human agency-the ability of humans to transform their circumstance and essence through their own actions. This is ultimately a radical reinterpretation because it lays the grounds for social change. Postmodern anti-essentialism on the other hand throws the baby out with the bathwater and ultimately disables any anti-racist, anti-oppressive project, because we need to agree that there are

some “universal” standards with which we can demand or justify a fight against such oppression.

We can and must critique liberal/conventional/capitalist practices of humanism while holding onto such ideals as equality, truth, justice and emancipation. While there is no denying that the **practice** of humanism under European colonialism, for example, contradicted the **ideology** of humanism, this does not mean that we must do away with these notions altogether, as postmodernists have. Rather we can radicalize these notions, stripping them of their racist, Eurocentric aspects like Fanon has (in his book *Wretched of the Earth*, 1963). It is apparent from the above mentioned ACGM quotes that this is the type of humanism and universality promoted by the movement--a radical humanism which seeks universal justice for all of humanity through human agency.

3.4 Towards a New Understanding of Radicalism and the ACGM

Overall, the document and ideological analyses have revealed that the rhetoric adopted by and observations made by the ACGM signifies a return to the organized critiques of capitalism and the politics of class which have been largely marginalized within post-al theory and the NSM paradigm. Ultimately the ACGM cannot be understood as anti-intellectual insofar as it has reinvigorated much of the ideology and ideology critique associated with the radical traditions within modernity and the Enlightenment. This is not to suggest that there is some ideological purity within the ACGM for it has been shown that there are internal contestations. However, it does suggest that the ACGM cannot simply be reduced to another manifestation of ‘postmodern’ social movement formation. What this implies is that this movement is a

truly complex and unique movement, one which may not fit “nicely” into one paradigm. Indeed in the following section(s) I wish to explore two new ways of approaching the ACGM and contemporary radicalism in general.

3.4.1 “Unity of Difference”

First, it is misleading to approach the ACGM as an issue of this *or* that type of movement--a competition between class and identity, modernity and post-modernity. Instead of one *or* the other, the ACGM’s literature implies that the movement is best understood as a “unity of difference.” While it is my assertion that these revolutionary groups have transcended the single-issue politics associated with ‘new social movements,’ this does not mean that issues of race, gender, sexual orientation etc. are unimportant to them. Quite the contrary, they are of crucial importance. However, these groups understand that such forms of oppression cannot be eliminated without transforming the entire socio-economic system in which they function and are perpetuated. And to do this all struggles for liberation must join forces.

NEFAC stresses the need to unite “different” struggles (i.e. feminist movement, black liberation etc.) under the common goal of human liberation insofar as one particular group can never be liberated if all groups are not liberated. For example, they state that “only by uniting both the revolutionary class perspective of anarchism and the feminist critique of patriarchy can anarchism and feminism reach their common goal of human liberation. There will be no revolution without women’s liberation. There will be no women’s liberation without revolution” (Ibid.).

This seems to suggest that it is not a competition, so to speak, between class and identity. Indeed the debate over “class politics” *or* “identity politics” creates false

antitheses in many ways. Rather it may be more appropriate to combine them, since these two categories are each fundamental dimensions of justice. In many ways the ACGM has done just that--combined class-analysis with the important issues of diversity and representation, albeit in a manner that does not succumb to the agenda of "identity politics." Indeed Starr ("Special Section on Anti-Capitalism") maintains that the ACGM has brought groups "fragmented by identity politics back together to fight common enemies in a 'unity of many determinations.' Similarly others have described the ACGM as a "unity of difference" (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren, 2003). I found this theme repeatedly implied in many of the ACGM documents.

A prime example of this "unity of many determinations" or "unity of difference" is the EZLN. Postmodernists readily celebrate Subcommandante Marcos for his appeal to difference. Indeed he says in one communiqué that the Zapatistas want "a world where many worlds fit." ("Marcos to the Underground Culture"). He explains that when the Zapatistas say this, "they are not discovering anything new, they are simply saying what the 'other' and 'different' who walk the worlds of below have already said...more or less, 'everyone does his own thing' (Ibid.). However before Marcos is canonized in the world of post-al theory, one need relay the rest of his message. He continues that,

It so happens then that, because we are different, we are the same. We are the same persecuted, the same despised, the same beaten, the same imprisoned, the same disappeared, the same assassinated. And it is not ours who are persecuting, despising, beating, imprisoning, assassinating us. It is not even the "others" from below. It is the Power and their names (Ibid.).^{xxix}

For some, invoking such universal language and harbouring a belief that ideals of justice and democracy are to be universally accepted may seem to "contradict the priority that is widely attached to difference and diversity within the anti-capitalist movement"

(Callinicos, 2003:112). However, as Callinicos explains, universalism and a respect for difference are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Moreover an awareness of difference and diversity is not the same thing as identity politics. Callinicos (2003:113) explains that during the 1980s “this consciousness of difference”-which is not negative in and of itself and is indeed quite necessary-“hardened into identity politics-that is, into the belief that possession of a particular identity had replaced all other bases of collective action.”

Callinicos continues that this belief was regularly validated through an appeal to cultural relativism, according to which universal principles are mere rationalizations of the stance of a particular group. He maintains that, “politics, on this view, is reduced to a clash of rival particularisms” (Ibid.). The ACGM, however, has transcended identity politics by seeking to fashion a new form of internationalism. But, Callinicos asserts, “in a rather Hegelian way, this transcendence has involved *incorporating* [emphasis mine] much of the content of identity politics, albeit now set in...a universal context” (Ibid.).

Indeed it may be possible to argue that the ACGM is not at odds with the many ‘new social movements’ that exist, insofar as it actually comprised of them. For example, Amin (2001:5) asserts that we are entering a new phase of struggle “involving the working people who are victims of the system.” At the same time, these working class struggles will surely be very pluralistic, which is one of the positive characteristics of our time. Moreover, he explains that such pluralism no doubt “stems from the accumulated results of what has sometimes been called the “new social movements”--women’s movements, ecological movements, indigenous peoples’ movements, democratic movements.^{xxx}

In fact in many ways, the stress on the internal diversity of the ACGM is part and parcel of this movement and its growing success. This is why, Callinicos argues, the Zapatistas have struck such a powerful chord by championing the rights of indigenous peoples. He explains that to speak as Marcos does, about a world in which there is room for numerous worlds “is to seek a universal framework in which diversity can flourish” (Callinicos, 2003:113). Callinicos stresses the need to properly understand universalism. Properly understood, an egalitarian conception of justice is inclusive rather than exclusive and homogenizing. It is “not about the imposition of uniformity but about giving everyone an equal opportunity to live the life that *they*-as a specific individual, with a particular...cultural background and range of needs-have reason to value” (Callinicos, 2003:114).

He aptly concludes that equality and difference are not at odds, but interdependent values. Post-al theorists, on the other hand, pit class and “culture”/ “identity” against one another as if they are two separate and completely unrelated points of departure. By doing so they forget that that the majority of the world’s workforce is made up of women and ‘people of colour.’ Overall, identity politics, as an awareness of a specific form of oppression by a direct group can be an appropriate point of departure. However, “...this understanding...will become an ‘identity prison’ (race or gender) isolated from other exploited social groups unless it transcends the immediate points of oppression and confronts the *social system* [emphasis mine] in which it is embedded” (Petras, 1997:4). The ACGM has done just that; combined an appreciation of identity with an understanding of its connection to class and the system that perpetuates all forms of exploitation.

3.4.2 Employing Reform for Revolution

The second suggestion I wish to make is that while the debate over reform or revolution has existed in almost all social movements historically, as activists, we must be careful not to let this internal tension divert us from our ultimate common goal of social justice. The most important reason for attempting to overcome our internal division is that it gives ammunition to our enemies. One activist has explained that, “the ruling class is aware of this split and has sought to buy off reformists and to increase their strength by providing hundreds of thousands of dollars...to large numbers of ‘non-governmental organizations’ (“Thoughts on the”). Ultimately this activist writes that the ruling elites have succeeded to a certain degree in co-opting the liberal mainstream elements of the ACGM into a “loyal opposition” limited to critiques “of the worst excesses of the system and proposing only mild reforms” (Ibid.).

However, Epstein (2001:9) holds that the goals of reform and revolution do not necessarily have to be at odds.^{xxxii} Indeed the same claim is even made by some radicals within the ACGM, who believe that radicals need to provide tangible results and alternatives if they wish to ‘convert’ the rest of the ACGM and society to anti-capitalism. For example, one radical ACGM member holds that many within the movement have not embraced a radical anti-capitalist critique because the radical groups have yet to offer people a liveable alternative to capitalism: “We are skilled at making bold statements against the system. We’re quite adept at making a scene and manipulating it to be a soapbox for our opinions, but we’re not so good at initiating, organizing and partaking in struggles that win tangible concessions for our communities (“Fighting to Win”).”

He suggests a strategy of “unreformable reform.” This entails fighting for reforms the system cannot provide without collapsing--such as universal housing or an end to poverty (Ibid.). He explains that, “an unreformable reform such as calling for universal housing is both something the system can’t provide and something people think they should have” (Ibid.). He goes on to argue that radicals must maintain their explicit anti-capitalist and anti-authoritarian positions while taking an area of focus that affects people's lives on a massive scale. He looks to the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty (OCAP) as a working, and successful, example of this strategy:

The Ontario Coalition Against Poverty fights for an unreformable reform and wins many gains in the process. Poverty is a key aspect to capitalism; it cannot be done away with while the system is still in place, as it is capital's lifeblood. OCAP is a broad-based, explicitly anti-capitalist coalition of workers, students, First Nations people, homeless folks and the poor in general. On Oct. 16, 2001, OCAP successfully organized an action to shut down much of Toronto's financial district. This action was the culmination of a campaign against the conservative anti-poor policies of Ontario's Premier Mike Harris. The day of this action, Harris resigned due to "personal matters." Many believe it was OCAP and an OCAP related coalition called the Ontario Common Front that drove him out of office.

This activist asserts that winning tangible victories has been OCAP’s goal since its inception in 1990, and that OCAP is an ideal model of success to be emulated by other groups in the ACGM. Ultimately he suggests that, “victories, no matter how small are the foundation of revolutionary struggle...People are genuinely inspired to fight when they can win concessions that make their lives better and more fulfilling in the present.

OCAP’s motto says it all: Fight To Win” (Ibid.).^{xxxii}

Moreover, as Epstein (2001:11) has argued, while “the main target of the anti-globalization movement is corporate power, not capitalism...these perspectives do not necessarily exclude one another.” She explains that depending on how one defines the limitations to be imposed on corporations and corporate power, the line between

regulation and abolition, reform and revolution, can evaporate (Ibid.). Indeed while some ACGM activists oppose any calls for reform; others believe it may be possible to use short-term reform as a means to long-term revolution. In this respect, it is often the case that one finds activists with quite radical ideologies working with and for mainstream reformists groups or NGOs (“The Protests of”). For example, Stewart (2003:1) asserts that,

I find it easy to imagine that I am part of the anti-capitalist movement while getting tear-gassed in Quebec City at the Summit of the Americas...But I also think I'm doing my bit for making a better world possible in my day job, where I work for an environmental group, often on such 'reformist' projects as fighting for the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol.

He explains that while ratifying the Kyoto Protocol obviously will not bring capitalism crashing down, this and other such successes are still big wins for the good guys. Moreover, Stewart maintains that if one were to spend time with many environmentalists working for various mainstream NGOs, they would find that issue-specific solutions are usually couched within a larger and broader context. He explains that ultimately, no matter one's individual daily struggle, most recognize that it is all connected, and that there is a single enemy--even if that enemy has many names and many faces. Stewart (2003:4) asserts,

At the risk of over-generalizing...I would argue that there is a widespread recognition within the environmental movement...that there is system that is lighting all these fires (climate change, deforestation, toxic contamination...etc.) that we spend all of our time running around trying to put out...Most days I label this system capitalism, but others might call it patriarchy, spiritually empty consumerism, racism, or simply big mean corporations. And none of us would be wrong.

He emphatically maintains that, “to dream of a movement that suddenly overthrows the existing order and replaces it with a socially and environmentally superior alternative without having won any victories along the way to inspire the collective imagination and from which to learn practical lessons is ludicrous” (Ibid: 5). Overall he concludes that when one actually listens to what environmentalists and other “reformists” have to *say*--when one examines their content and language--“words like justice, compassion, responsibility and a sense of humility vis-à-vis humanity’s place in the web of life are often invoked as the values that should inform our long-term vision of a desirable future” (Ibid: 6).

This notwithstanding, I intentionally focused on the literature produced by revolutionary groups, and I ultimately believe that it is these groups that should be given priority when looking at the ACGM. For while it is still true that, with respect to numbers, the neo-liberal reform groups comprise the majority within the ACGM, it is the radical “minority” that have been the heart and fire of this movement. Indeed, Epstein (2001:9) maintains that during the Seattle protests of 1999, “the young, radical activists who engaged in civil disobedience were greatly outnumbered by trade unionists and members of mostly liberal environmental organizations. But it was the young radicals who blocked the meetings of the WTO.” Also, Epstein (Ibid) asserts that, overall, “it is the young radicals who have pushed the anti-globalization movement forward.”

While the radical groups within the ACGM could benefit from a strategy which employs short-term reforms as a vehicle for long-term revolution, this is not to suggest that the end goal of the ACGM--revolution--should be replaced by its means. It is useful to examine briefly Rosa Luxemburg’s classic work *Reform or Revolution* (1900).

Speaking of the Social-Democratic movement, she (1900: 2) holds that “the struggle for reforms is its means; the social revolution, its aim.” She denounces those thinkers that confuse the goal of a movement with its vehicles. For Luxemburg (Ibid: 4) the question of reform or revolution is not a question of binary oppositions, “it is not a question of this or that method of struggle, or the use of this or that set of tactics, but of the very existence of the...movement”. Reforms may at best impose on capitalist exploitation the “normal” limit of the moment; however, social reforms lack the power to suppress exploitation itself, not even gradually (Ibid.).

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Overall I hope to have demonstrated three broad points in this thesis. First, while it is true that since the 1970s social movements shifted their focus from issues of class and capitalist critique to issues of identity and representation, the ACGM represents, at least on some levels, a resurgence of class analysis and capitalist interrogation. Looking at the shift from ideology to identity, which characterized the ‘new social movements,’ it helps to know the following: On the whole, in the *late* 1960s to mid 1970s, social movements began to splinter into single-issue struggles that left the entirety of social relations unchallenged (“The Anarchist ethic”). This was, in many ways, reflected in a shift in the form of imposed social relations, occurring in retort to the struggles of the 1960s and early 1970s, and was marked by a change from a Fordist system of accumulation to a regime of flexible accumulation (which began to dismantle the welfare state, break unions and open borders to the free flow of capital). In many ways this shift coincided with the academic shift to postmodernist theory, “which privileges the fractured, the floating, and the flexible” (Ibid.).

However, it is possible to argue that there has been *yet another* shift which began in the 1990s, with the Zapatista uprisings. The ACGM ultimately represents a shift away from identity and back to a focus on ideology, specifically some variant of anti-capitalist ideology and/or class analysis. This shift has been described as a type of resurgence of revolutionary style struggles--a shift that originated in the third world and has quickly spread all over the West. While the growth of single-issue groups and movements were often cited as evidence of the defeat of anti-capitalist struggle, in

the 1990s we have witnessed the reconvergence of struggles that are beginning to confront capitalism as a totality. Thus the revolutionary current of the exploited and excluded has recently emerged in a cycle of confrontations that began in the third world and have spread to the first world of London, Seattle and Prague (Ibid.).

Indeed Epstein (2001:13) asserts that while radicalism had been on the decline for several decades, the ACGM “holds out more hope for a revival of the left than any other movement has over the last two decades.”

The second major point is that while the *form* of the ACGM resembles the NSM paradigm and postmodern suppositions, its rhetoric does not. Rather in many ways, the language of the ACGM represents values more closely aligned with radical modernist schools of thought--such as Marxism, socialism, anarchism, and especially, libertarian socialism. In particular the document and ideological analyses revealed that the ACGM’s literature is animated by three themes. They include anti-capitalism/need for class analysis; social change; and, humanism/universality. The radical ideology that prevails among “its core activists represents a soft fluid form of anarchism [and]...Marxist political economy”(Epstein, 2001:8). Similarly, Morse (2003:3) asserts that, “many anarcho-syndicalists and communists link the anti-globalization movement to revolution by affirming the analysis of capitalism advanced by late 19th and early 20th century socialists.”

In this respect, the thesis has attempted to challenge those who have suggested that the ACGM is a quintessential “postmodern” movement or one animated by the principles of “identity.” For, as demonstrated through the document analysis, the ACGM has redefined “enemies in ways that do not depend on identity as the basis of understanding and allies in ways that do not depend on a subtle and fragile ‘politics of

difference' ... What is at stake is political economic" (Starr; 2000:166-167). As such, conceptualizations of difference and identity, "may no longer be the most important organizing principle for social movements; instead, they "speak with clarity about the enemy," that is, neo-liberal, globalized, corporate capitalism (Ibid.). Rather than challenge the existing status quo, post-al theorists have succumb to the numbing logic that "there is no alternative" (TINA).^{xxxiii} This is completely opposed to the mantra of the ACGM--"another world is possible" (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale & McLaren, 2003: 167). Overall, it is disingenuous for any theory grounded on TINA to lay claims to a movement that openly acknowledges and *actively fights* for an alternative.

This is not to suggest, however that the ACGM can be reduced to simply another socialist or anarchist social movement for example. Nor can one assume that there is some form of ideological purity within the ACGM. This leads to the third and final point demonstrated in the thesis: The ACGM is a truly novel social formation which cannot be fully comprehended using old theories, models or labels. Thus one must introduce new and innovative conceptualizations of radicalism in order to fully appreciate the nuances and complexities of the ACGM.

I suggested that it is necessary to move beyond dualistic notions such as "class versus identity" when examining the ACGM for such dichotomies are often false and limiting. As I have argued, it is more apt to describe the ACGM as a formation which reflects a "unity of difference" or "unity of many determinations." The ACGM places issues of identity (i.e. race, gender, etc.) in their proper social and historical contexts, uniting the many "different" struggles into a common fight against the socio-economic system that perpetuates marginalization and discrimination--global capitalism. Rather than fetishize difference and identity, as postmodernism tends to, however, the ACGM

attempts to reconceptualize identity as part of the broader struggle for real social change through direct confrontation with capitalism. Postmodernism, on the other hand is governed by the notion that the terrain of politics is “within and between the fragments of capitalism, especially in the academy, where discourses and identities can be deconstructed and proliferated without material constraints” (Wood, 1995: 2). Ultimately, while ACGM activists support representation of different identities and a diversity of tactics and strategies, they have developed a coalition of “diverse” struggles united through a common fight against the system.

Moreover, it is ultimately counterproductive to situate reform and revolution as binary oppositions for two reasons. First this division has allowed elites to co-opt, to some degree, the reform elements within the ACGM, further dividing the movement. Second, the rigid oppositional stance of radicals toward any attempts at reform stops them from seeing that, sometimes, those who work for small immediate reforms within the system, still harbour an agenda of long-term revolution. Many activists believe that at the current juncture, a “radical” is merely anyone willing to stand up and say “No” to the status quo. Thus some hold that the ACGM may be able to transcend this internal cleavage by applying short-term reforms for long-term revolution.

As with any research endeavour, this work is limited. While readers may find other limitations, I have identified at least three. The first limitation has to do with my sample or input. It goes without saying that a researcher can only work with the information available to them. For the thesis I examined theories of radical modernity, post-al theory, and the anti-corporate globalization movement (ACGM). With respect to the first two topics, one finds an abundance of information. However, the ACGM is a recent phenomenon, or more appropriately scholarship on this particular social movement

has only recently emerged. It is interesting to note that the thesis is actually a response to this limitation. Thus my research means bordered on investigative or ‘academic journalism.’ While I was unable to interview ACGM members directly, primarily due to economic factors, I was able to take advantage of the Internet in order to access unlimited amounts of primary documents about the ACGM. This is especially true of the ACGM because the Internet is its main source for mobilization and communication.

The second limitation has to do with the functional limitations of each of the three topics. I have already explored the limitations of both radical modernity and postmodernity. There have been volumes written on the functional limitations of both of these schools of thought. (Radical) Modernity, especially Marxism, is often charged as being economically “reductionist” and materialist. Postmodernity is often said to be internally contradictory and ultimately nihilistic and defeatist. In adopting the former (radical modernity) as my theoretical lens, I thus open myself up to the limitations inherent in the Marxist and/or libertarian socialist critique.

The ACGM’s functional limitation, in many ways, reflects its so-called self-representation. Indeed the ACGM is very ad hoc, non-hierarchical, amorphous etc. All of these are traits that have linked it to postmodernism. However, this description applies mainly to its form/organizational structure. In many ways I have attempted to give form to something that is seemingly formless. For when one examines its content/rhetoric, the ACGM begins to take very recognizable and solid ideological shape--as was explored in Chapter Three. Indeed, even its amorphous organizational structure can be seen as a benefit. Because it lacks a “form,” because it is an oppositional force without a head it has been able to survive (Klein, 2003). Its seemingly functional limits are that it appears to lack a definable form, which I attempted to reconcile in the body of the thesis.

The third limit has to do with output or my research findings. Because I obtained my primary ACGM resources from the Internet and because this movement is relatively young and constantly defining and redefining itself--issues I explored in the thesis--my findings are subject to the ravages of time. One cannot possibly account for *all* of the nuances that exist, and those which will develop in the future, in this dynamic movement. This is especially true with respect to gathering information from the Internet. For example while I quote Chuck Morse (2003) in the beginning of the thesis praising the ACGM as the first radical anti-capitalist movement to emerge over the last three decades, writing just one year later ("The Life or Death") Morse maintains that,

Revolutionary movements come and go....The anti-globalization movement has also come and *gone*. It leapt to world attention during the Seattle protests against the World Trade Organization and died with ...mobilizations against the World Economic Forum in New York City....Signs of its demise are everywhere. The movement is no longer capable of stirring fear among the ruling class or even generating significant media attention...

One possible solution would be to examine different electronic documents produced by ACGM groups over a much longer period of time. In this respect, one would have to examine the ACGM's rhetoric for many years in order to discern solid patterns. Moreover, the ACGM's values evolve with the changing political atmosphere. Thus one would have to constantly revisit the movement in order to examine how, if at all, the movement responds to current political affairs. An excellent example is 9/11.

The events of September 11, 2001 in the United States, and the environment of political repression that has developed in their aftermath have had serious implications for the ACGM. This topic is too broad in scope to have been treated in any great length or with the necessary rigor in this particular thesis. However, it is imperative for scholars of

contemporary social movements as well as ACGM activists to explore the effects of 9/11 on the ACGM and political dissent in general.

Specifically one may examine the different ways that the ACGM has reacted to the atmosphere of repression and the criminalization of dissent post-9/11. In the aftermath of 9/11 there have been increased efforts in the US and Canada to stifle dissent. These range from media depictions of protest as unpatriotic in times of “national distress” to the draconian “anti-terror” legislations that were swiftly put on the table in each country. In Canada these include Bill C-36. Stinson (2002) explains that this bill takes away our civil liberties, and while officials and police claim that it is not intended to target protestors it can easily be used to silence political dissent. Ultimately,

The legislation provides drastic new powers to police to arrest and detain suspected terrorists for long periods of time without recourse to a lawyer, suspending normal rights of due process. Despite police claims that the legislation was not meant to be used against domestic protestors, it contains such a broad and sweeping definition of a terrorist that it can be used against the Left (Stinson, 2002:5).

In light of this dramatically altered political landscape, the groups making up the ACGM coalition are perusing markedly different agendas (“Anti-Globalization, Pro-Peace”). While many groups have quickly diverted their attention to resisting American wars of aggression arising from the pretext of combating “terrorism,”^{xxxiv} other groups have retreated from the movement. Specifically, the movement has been further fragmented along its revolutionary and reformist elements.

Many fear that that the ACGM is losing ground and popular support in the post-9/11 atmosphere. One article (“Thoughts on the”) maintains that “it is clear that after a string of successes...the anti-globalization movement has lost ground in its ability to mobilize large numbers in North America in the wake of September 11th and the attendant

‘war on terrorism’ launched by US imperialism.” However, the revolutionary elements within the movement stress that, now more than ever, the movement has to increase mobilization and its resistance to the status quo. Rather than give into the absurdity that ‘protest in unpatriotic’ they urge the ACGM to make the necessary connection between the “anti-globalization” and pro-peace movements.

One radical activist maintains that people must realize that globalization needs an army to ensure its continual expansion. Hey states, “what does the anti-globalization movement and anti-war forces have in common? Imperialism. U.S. imperialism to be more precise” (“Movement Gears up”). In this respect, radicals stress that activists must not view anti-war and “anti-globalization” as separate agendas. Instead the ACGM must put opposition to the US war drive front and centre. Radicals conclude that, “the just battle against the International Monetary Fund, World Bank and the World Trade Organization is inextricably bound to the fight against U.S. military aggression around the world and repression at home” (Ibid.). With the impending presidential “election” in the United States, it remains to be seen if the “war on terrorism” will continue, and if the ACGM will fragment further or make the necessary connections between resisting corporate globalization and resisting American wars of aggression and/or imperialism.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ The New Social Movement paradigm will be subsequently discussed in Chapter Two.

ⁱⁱ For Amin (2001:7), "the first phase of this devastating enterprise was organized around the conquest of the Americas, in the framework of the mercantilist system of Atlantic Europe" in the fifteenth century. He continues, "the second phase of imperialist devastation was based on the industrial revolution and manifested itself in the colonial subjection of Asia and Africa" (Amin, *Ibid.*). This second phase was based on a new type of globalization, different from that of the system of 1492.

ⁱⁱⁱ Very few would deny that this Manichean world view has been reiterated and amplified in the current Bush administration.

^{iv} These events include the electoral deception of the 1988 elections, and the growing disillusionment of indigenous communities with the system of representative democracy – "the charade of voting once every six years while continuing to experience brutal exploitation and oppression" ("The Zapatista Movement"). Second, the effects of liberalization and economic cutbacks and government spending, such as cuts in subsidies and provisions under NAFTA for reducing the price paid for crops produced by Mexican farmers.

^v Marcos in fact makes/has made "universalistic" claims that fly in the face of such assertions. Indeed a defining trope of the Zapatista movement is "We are you". (Klein, 2003:211) Marcos tells those who seek him out that his black mask is a mirror, reflecting each of their own struggles. He proclaims that a Zapatista is anyone anywhere fighting injustice. Moreover, it appears that while Marcos does recognize and speak of *different* struggles, he does so in order to transcend the seeming differences and make apparent the common thread that runs through them. Most famously, he once told a reporter: "Marcos is gay in San Francisco, black in South Africa, an Asian in Europe... an anarchist in Spain, a Palestinian in Israel, A Mayan Indian in the streets of San Cristobal, a Jew in Germany, a gypsy in Poland, a Mohawk in Quebec, a pacifist in Bosnia, a single woman on the Metro at 10 P.M., an unemployed worker, an unhappy student, and, of course, a Zapatista in the mountains" (cited in Klein, *Ibid.*).

^{vi} While Marx was one of the most forceful critics of the Enlightenment, he nonetheless wanted to save the essence of Enlightenment from its critics--particularly its conservative critics. Marx, in short, was not willing to throw the baby out with the proverbial bathwater. Charles Taylor (1979:141) notes that Marx's work reflected radical Enlightenment in at least two senses: first "in his notion that man comes to shape nature and eventually society to his purposes," and secondly, "in his critique of the inhumanity" which existed in his day. The starting point of his philosophy was the revolt against the irrationality and inhumanity of established bourgeois society, its liberalism, and its false universalistic claims.

^{vii} The International Workingmen's Association, also known as the First International, was founded in London, September 28, 1864 at an historic meeting at St. Martin's Hall. Its constitution was adopted at the first congress convened in Geneva, September 3-8, 1866 ("History of the International": 2). In an article obtained from the Anarchy Archives (<http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/search.html>), it is argued that living in England, Marx was a relatively obscure refugee journalist until he was invited to the formation of the First International ("International Workingmen's Association":2). Invited at the last minute as a representative of German workers, Marx ultimately was among the two mainstays of the International, from its inception to its end. While initially a silent member of the International, Marx's intelligence and spirit soon proved him a natural 'leader'. Saul Padover (cited in *Ibid.*) notes that, in the introduction to a volume of select works written by Marx for The International,

so powerful was his intellectual ascendancy and certainty of purpose... henceforth Marx was to remain its predominant spirit and the indomitable personality that held the disparate International Association together for eight difficult and often stormy years, until it was shattered by bitter internal dissensions ...

^{viii} At the same time, however, it is important to understand that libertarian socialism is something altogether different than *libertarianism*, and should not be confused with the latter. The distinction between them rests on the concept of private property; libertarian socialists (anarcho-communists) promote freedom while denying the legitimacy of private property. Libertarians, on the other and, hold the protection of private property to be essential to liberty. Libertarians ultimately advocate a Lockean form of liberty, while libertarian socialists advocate Marxian notions of common possession, therein lays the distinction.

^{ix} It is useful to list some of the reasons that such a belief may be attributed to. They include the inability of both capitalism and socialism/Marxism to address and derail our environmental crisis; great changes to the blue-collar work force. For example, in the west many blue-collar workers are now part of the "middle class" with respect to higher wages, especially in the automotive industries. Thus, while part of the working-class, they nonetheless often feel detached from working-class consciousness and its grievances; the creation of a generation of mini-capitalists since the 1980s (via mutual funds and other investments including union pension funds that invest in some of the worst corporate offenders-weapons, tobacco etc...); not to mention, media's success-mostly at the service of major corporations-in removing labour issues from the public discourse.

^x Smith (1994) explains that an assortment of postmodern theories bloomed in the last two decades. Moreover, she maintains, "postmodernism is not easily defined because many of its chief proponents disagree as to what it means." Indeed Best & Kellner ("Postmodern Politics And") identify at least five variants of postmodernism. There are the anti-politics of Baudrillard and his followers, who exhibit a cynical, despondent rejection of the belief in emancipatory social transformation. The flip-side of a nihilistic and negative postmodern politics is an affirmative postmodern politics. Such positive postmodern positions, Best & Kellner maintain, range from an apolitical New Age^x life-style postmodernism to a self-conscious oppositional postmodernism, a postmodernism of resistance. Another form of affirmative postmodern politics also rejects traditional modern politics and attempts at large-scale social transformation, focusing instead on piecemeal reforms and local strategies. Best and Kellner explain that is the position of Foucault, Lyotard, and Rorty, all of whom reject a global politics of systemic change in favour of modifications at the local level designed to enhance individual freedom. A fourth type involves a reconstructive postmodernism that combines modern and postmodern politic. Best and Kellner (year, pp) explain that this form of reconstructive postmodern politics, "advanced by Laclau and Mouffe, among others, stakes out a position between the modern and postmodern, in order to use postmodern critiques of essentialism, reductionism, and foundationalism to reconstruct Enlightenment values and socialist politics through a logic of contingency and plurality." For Laclau and Mouffe nothing in the radical political project is mislaid with the rejection of foundationalism and everything is gained through the liberating effects of a new logic of difference and contingency. This type of postmodernism is most readily understood as post-Marxism. However, critics such as Smith (1994) charge it with disavowing the main ingredients of Marxism like the revolutionary class--the proletariat. Thus for Smith, it is better understood as *anti-Marxism* rather than *post-Marxism*. Finally, there is another mode of affirmative postmodern politics known as "identity politics". Best & Kellner ("Postmodern Politics And") maintain that this is perhaps the most dominant form of politics today. They explain that "identity politics" refers to a politics "in which individuals construct their cultural and political identities through engaging in struggles or associations that advance the interests of the groups with which they identify." Ultimately they hold that this type of politics often has emancipatory aspirations but usually falls short of advancing systemic change and new forms of radical struggle.

^{xi} Identity may be defined as a subjective consciousness of belonging to a particular "group"-racial, ethnic, religious. It also includes gender and sexual orientation and a myriad of other "identities". Foucault argued that new subjectivists were the crucial liberatory combustible (cited in Starr,

2000:31). Similarly, Stuart Hall (1996, cited in Ibid.) argued that "identity emerges as a 'suture', the sewing together of internalized discourses and the potentially agentic forms of subjectivity created by processes of oppression." However, while the mobilization of subjectivity facilitates agency, it is hard to ever really know which mobilizations are genuinely agentic and which are merely the dominant structure 'speaking' through subjects. Starr (2000:32) maintains that postmodernists need not be concerned with the genuine if identify, the penultimate politics, is only ever constructed *through* structuring discourses (as Hall maintains), "so its every arousal is already infected." Indeed Fraser (2003:37) maintains that to date, theorists of recognition (postmodernists) have yet to "provide any principled basis for distinguishing justified from unjustified claims for recognition."

^{xii} Amin (2001:6) defines a genuine democracy as one in which the market does not dominate. He explains that while the status quo would have one believe that the market and democracy are complimentary, nothing can be further from the truth: "Democracy and the market supposedly engender each other, democracy requires the market and vice versa. Nothing could be further from the truth, as real history demonstrates." Amin (Ibid.) explains that when social criticism becomes fragmented and impotent, and consequently there appears to be no alternative to the dominant ideology, "then democracy can be emptied of all content that gets in the way of the market and is potentially dangerous for it." In this case, one can vote however they choose but in the end it will have no effect because "your fate is decided elsewhere, outside the precincts of parliament, in the market." Moreover, to understand the market and democracy as being incompatible rather than complimentary, it helps to examine the lofty separation of the political and the economic spheres of life under western liberalism. See endnote xx.

^{xiii} Indeed Fraser (2003:92) points out that identity politics seems to have supplanted economic issues at the precise moment when economic and class analysis are highly needed due to ever expanding capitalism and economic equality. She states that conflicts for recognition have acquired,

paradigmatic status at precisely the moment when an aggressively expanding neoliberal capitalism is radically exacerbating economic inequality...they are serving less to supplement...and enrich redistribution struggles than to marginalize, eclipse and displace them.

It is my argument that this is no mere accident. What better way to divert attention and blame from the greedy and destructive practices of global capital than to exasperate issues of culture, identity and political correctness. Not to mention pitting the working class against itself by dividing it into "cultural groups" that then blame each other for lost jobs and lower wages instead of the owners of the means of production.

^{xiv} Similarly Scatamburlo-D'Annibale and McLaren (2004:7) assert that historical materialism does not attempt to undermine the importance of the cultural. However, to treat culture as a mere theatre of significations and to disengage "cultural production from its basis in economic and political processes (as post-al theories are prone to do) *dis-embeds* culture from its constitutive *embeddedness* in the materiality of social life and can emasculate the very practice of radical critique". Indeed Aijaz Ahmad (1998:20) maintains that it is capitalism and not Marxism, which abolishes all types of "difference". For example, "it is not Marxism that recognizes no gender differences. These differences are at once abolished by capitalism, by turning women as much as men into instruments of production".

^{xv} At the same time, however, such differences are perpetuated under capitalism for the purpose of profit maximization. Ahmad (1998:22) asserts, "these differences are also maintained through cross-class sexual exploitation, not to speak of the differential wage, in which women are paid less than men for the same work". It appears that capitalism acknowledges and 'celebrates' differences only inasmuch as these 'differences' can be incorporated into the capitalist machine of production and exploitation.

^{xvi} Another major draw back of post-al theories' treatment of "difference" is their prescription for the reconciliation of such so-called difference. Rather than emancipation, post-al theorists call for

representation and inclusion into an already oppressive system. Indeed, in culturalist narratives, the answer to oppression often amounts to creating greater discursive/textual space for the formerly excluded to have their voices heard (represented). "Much of what is called difference politics, in this regard, is little more than a demand for inclusion into the club of representation—something which reinscribes a neo-liberal pluralist stance rooted in the ideology of free market capitalism" (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale & McLaren, 2004: 12).

^{xvii} This is not to suggest that radical modernist traditions such as Marxism or Marx's historical materialism, for example, are without limitations. For while historical materialism may be an apt framework with which to examine social change, and to critique those theories which may have given into the defeatist logic that 'there is no alternative,' it should be noted that many ACGM activists take issue with other aspects of Marxism and historical materialism. Thus it is imperative that one also employ historical materialism to critique itself so to speak. In *The Greening of Marxism* (1996:12) edited by Ted Benton, he explains that it is "widely held... that Marx failed to understand the economic importance of natural resources and so failed to anticipate the subsequent ecological problems of capitalism..." Moreover, John Bellamy Foster (1997:149) explains that historical materialism is often accused of being one of the main means by which the Baconian notion of the mastery of nature was transmitted to the modern world." However, Foster examines numerous works produced by Marx and Engels in an attempt to defend them against the "green" critique of Benton for example. He (1997:156) states, it is therefore wrong to argue, as Ted Benton has, that Marx and Engels "sustained and deepened *those aspects* of capitalist political economy which exemplified its hostility to the idea of natural limits to capital accumulation." While Foster does agree that Marx and Engels had very little to say about the *absolute* natural limits of the planet, he rebuffs Benton's claims arguing:

"Yet Marx and Engels were unusual in the degree of emphasis they placed on the natural conditions of production, and in their recognition of the fact that a sustainable economy demanded a sustainable relation to nature on a global basis. In this sense, natural limits are very much a part of their argument" (Foster, 1997:157).

Foster's rebuttal notwithstanding, to date there is a well-established and widely accepted "green" critique of Marxism. In the United States, anarchist Murray Bookchin has been a leading critic of Marxism from the stance of his "social ecology" (Benton, 1996:243). Moreover, Jonathon Porritt, a leading green activist from the UK has referred to capitalism and communism as "tweedledum and tweedledee." To him, both are equally hostile to green hopes and values. Many within the ACGM echo these concerns with Marxism.

There is another criticism against Marxism that is somewhat less common: the 'racism' of early Marx and Engels. Larrain (1994:20) maintains, "It is not usually known... that at an early stage in their careers Marx and Engels condoned the forcible subjection of backward nations for the sake of progress." This early racism was aimed particularly at the Mexicans whom Marx argued shared all the "vices, arrogance, thuggery and quixotism of the Spaniards to the third degree, but by no means all the solid things that they possess" (Marx cited in *Ibid.*). Larrain does point out that, in their later careers, Marx and Engels were much less bigoted. Indeed it is important to remember that Marxism "is itself an intellectual and political tradition *with a history*: that is to say, like all living traditions it is engaged in a dialogue with other traditions, responding to new problems and experiences, and critically evaluating and revising its own heritage as it does so" (Benton, 1996: 243). Nonetheless, Larrain (1994: 22) points out that even after Marx and Engels changed their stance and became critical of colonialism in the 1860s, Latin America continued to be neglected and its "basic social processes tended to be regarded as arbitrary and irrational..." How is one to account for this? Here one may use historical materialism to attempt to comprehend its own limitations. While Marx (and Engels) in many ways can be said to have radicalized much of Enlightenment thought (see Ahmad, 1998; Palmer, 1997), they were nonetheless a product of it. Thus while Marx made the critique of political economy and of Hegel, for example, he was still "deeply influenced by their views and shared with them the typical nineteenth-century concern with the emancipation of humankind" (*Ibid.*). However, we have to

place all ideas in their appropriate historical context. In the nineteenth century, "humankind" was perceived with a latent yet entrenched Eurocentrism. Overall, in order to be self-reflexive one must turn one's own theoretical framework on itself. In other words, we must locate Marx-and his nuances-historically and critically as well.

^{xviii} Left-wing intellectuals have abandoned theory as a means for critical analysis and radical change, celebrating instead the politics of complaint, symbolic representation and deconstruction. "Theory" has become a hot commodity, "but it is no longer valued for its explanatory power linked to social revolution against entrenched relations of exploitation or its potential to inform social change but rather for how it can be used to deconstruct or otherwise disrupt established meanings, signifying systems, and regimes of representations" (Scatamburlo-D'Annibale & McLaren, 2003: 149).

^{xix} While it cannot be refuted that postmodernism/postmodernity and (radical) modernism/modernity are in no way univocal traditions, it was still possible to arrive at some generalizations about each theoretical school, which assisted in the development of the protocol questions and/or descriptions. As a thought structure (I am not concerned here with postmodern understandings of art, architecture or literature) postmodernism is characterized by the following: incredulity toward metanarratives; rejection of totalizing theories or grand truths; scepticism of progress; belief in social and cultural pluralism; anti-essentialism, anti-humanism and anti-universality; an acceptance of the defeatist logic that 'there is no alternative' (TINA) to the current politico-economic system; and, a concern with symbols and interpretation over action/agency and (social) change. Sometimes, but not always, postmodern thought manifests itself in what has come to be known as new social movements (NSMs), thus there may be some overlap in their characteristics. NSMs are often characterized by the following: a turn away from class and ideology as an organizational basis and a new focus on identity; concern with single-issue politics; are less oriented toward social-utopian projects, formal political theories, or metanarratives of progress; and, adopt a decentralized, leaderless framework devoid of an agreed-upon ideology. Finally those traditions that fall under the rubric of radical modernity--socialism, anarchism, and libertarian socialism--are characterized by the following: an indictment of capitalism; a belief in class-analysis; a belief in historical metanarratives and totalizing knowledges; faith in progress and human emancipation; belief in (radical) humanism and universality; and, a belief in and desire for change.

^{xx} Throughout my qualitative analysis of ACGM documents, the debate over reform and revolution surfaced repeatedly. Callinicos notes that such divisions are nothing new; that they have surfaced historically in a variety of social movements. As the ACGM has developed it has "begun to confront some old problems...the ancient dilemma of reform or revolution: is the aim of the movement gradually to humanize the system or completely to replace...it?" (2003:86). These dilemmas, however, have very little to do with "postmodernism".

^{xxi} Those groups seeking to reform neo-liberalism list ten main reasons to oppose the WTO. First, *The WTO advances corporate managed trade at all costs* (Danaher & Burbach, 2000:98). Second, *the WTO is a stacked, secretive court*. (Ibid.). Third, *the WTO tramples over labour and human rights* (Ibid: 99). The fourth reason to oppose the WTO is that *its policies are widening the gap between the rich and the poor*. Fifth, *the WTO is anti-environment* (Ibid.). Sixth, *the WTO rules undermine public health*. The seventh reason to oppose the WTO, according to proponents of neo-liberal reform is that *it was undemocratically established* (Ibid.). The eighth reason is related to seventh, *the WTO is undemocratic and unaccountable* (Ibid: 101). Ninth, *the WTO hurts countries in the Global South*. And the final reason they give for opposing the WTO is that, *"the tide is turning against free trade and the WTO!"* (Ibid.) They point out that there is an increasing backlash against the WTO and the "corporate globalization over which it presides" (Ibid.).

^{xxii} It should be noted that many revolutionary groups also use Gandhi as guide for their alternative models. The alternative world envisioned by libertarian socialists/anarchists in the movement, in

many ways, may be compared to Gandhi's idea of a *Swadeshi economy*, also referred to as home economy. Furthermore, contemporary anarchist criticisms of capitalism/capitalist globalization and their protest tactics- non-violent civil disobedience-are also linked on some levels to the teachings of Gandhi, which were made very popular by activists involved in the non-violent direct action movement of the seventies ("The Protests of").

Gandhi's vision of a free India was not a nation-state but "a confederation of self-governing, self-reliant, self-employed people living in village communities... Maximum economic and political power... would remain in the hands of the village assemblies" (Kumar, "Gandhi's Swadeshi"). According to the principles of Swadeshi whatever is made in the local community must be used first and foremost by the members of that community. Trading among and between different regions should be minimal, "like icing on the cake" (Ibid.). Dr. Kumar explains that Swadeshi avoids economic dependence on external market forces that could make the village community vulnerable. The most important part of Swadeshi is that these villages or small communities must be self-sufficient. Each village must erect a strong economic base to satisfy most of its needs, and all members of the village society should give priority to local goods and services. "Gandhi considered these villages so important that he thought they should be given the status of 'village republics'" (Ibid.). An examination of various activist literatures shows their vision and/or model of an alternative society to be almost identical to Gandhi's Swadeshi economy. One revolutionary activist writes:

The solution is community empowerment through grass roots actions... economic reform should be localist... Communities should be self-sufficient with trade only for luxury items... This would result in an erosion of corporate and state power and an increase in the power of the people. The economic solution is intrinsically linked to the political solution. Local communities should be self-empowered to make the political decisions that effect them. Decisions made on the local level can actually be a reflection of a truly democratic system (which is defined differently by different groups, ranging from direct democracy to consensus based decision-making...) ("The Protests of").

Similarly, in an article entitled "*The leadership and direction of the anti-globalization movement*" posted on an Indymedia website the author states

Revolutionary anarchists and Marxians envision social power exercised through a wide variety of local social forms (such as general assemblies of people living together in a neighbourhood, or workplace assemblies...) organized horizontally rather than hierarchically into larger citywide, regional, or larger groupings. They propose forms of direct democracy to replace the bogus representational "democracy" so beloved of statist. To protect themselves from domination and exploitation people need to keep power in their own hands. When evenly distributed in this way power loses its power of coercion, while retaining its power of constructive application to the many tasks and problems of our planetary life.

Thus it is wrong to condemn, as many do, the ACGM for having no alternatives to capitalism. Indeed Amory Starr ("Special Section on Anti-Capitalism") maintains that it "is incumbent upon us to blockade any further perambulation of the claim that the anti-globalization movement doesn't know what it wants, has no alternative, or, worst of all, has 'no vision.'" Rather Starr insists that the ACGM has at least three major visions. She explains that,

Three kinds of alternativeness to capitalist globalization have been offered up by resistance movements... One set of movements seeks to mobilize existing democratic structures to subordinate corporate power. Another set attempts "globalization from below", in which corporations will be reshaped in service to new international democratic structures that will be populist, participatory and just. A third set of movements seek to delink communities from the global economy and re-build small-scale societies in which corporations have no role at all (Ibid.).

Starr asserts that the third alternative--the delinking/relocalization option—is the most well developed of the three. Moreover, she maintains that this alternative “is pretty much the same thing the anarchists [libertarian socialists] are talking about” in the ACGM (Ibid.).

^{xxiii} All of the radical groups are non-violent, “but there is some disagreement about what that means” (“The Protests of”). Some groups say that property damage is not violence, while others say that violence is violence whether directed against people or property. Still, other revolutionaries support a “diversity of tactics.” This means that while they personally may not engage in property damage, they respect the choice of other activists who do (Ibid.). Thus, one of the major intra-group divisions among radicals/revolutionaries centres on the issue of property damage as violence. Proponents of property damage maintain that the only way to stop corporations is to hurt them financially and property damage does just that (“The Protests of”). These groups are commonly referred to as the Black Bloc. The Black Bloc refers to a commonality in ideology, *not* a formal organization (“The Protests Of”). It is estimated in North America to number a few hundred. While most Black Bloc members are anarchists, most anarchists are *not* part of the Black Bloc. Physically, the group appears paramilitary. One member explains that, “our clothes are uniform issue and intentionally menacing: black, bandanas, ragged black army surplus pants, black hooded sweatshirts... and shiny black boots” (anonymous Black Bloc ‘member’ cited in “Letters From Inside”).

The Black Bloc first emerged in the U.S in the early 90s. It arose out of protest tactics in Germany in the 80s. One member argues that in part, the Bloc is a response to the “large-scale repression of activist groups by the FBI in the 60s, 70s and 80s...” who were forced to go underground and hide their identity when in public (“Letters From Inside”). The major thing that differentiates Black Bloc anarchists from other anarchists is that they do not consider property damage to be violence. One Black bloc anarchist said:

Violence is a tricky concept. I'm not totally clear what actions are violent, and what actions are not... I believe that using the word violent to describe breaking the window of a Nike store takes meaning away from the word. Nike makes shoes out of toxic chemicals in poor countries using exploitive labour practices. Then they sell the shoes for vastly inflated prices to poor black kids in the first world. In my view, this takes resources out of poor communities on both sides of the globe, increasing poverty and suffering. I think poverty and suffering could well be described as violent, or at least as creating violence (Ibid.).

^{xxiv} To these groups, the lofty separation of politics and economics under liberalism may be seen as an ideological trap that leaves power (over the people and production) and accountability (to the people) in two different hands. Governments increasingly are giving power over to corporations and international economic institutions, yet we cannot hold these same institutions accountable because they supposedly do not exist in the political sphere.

The political sphere in capitalism has a special character because the coercive power supporting capitalist exploitation is not wielded directly by the appropriator and is not based on the producer's political or judicial subordination to an appropriating master... This is the significance of the division of labour in which the two moments of capitalist exploitation-appropriation and coercion-are allocated separately to a private appropriating class and a specialized public coercive institution, the state: on the one hand, the “relatively autonomous” state has a monopoly of coercive force; on the other hand, that force sustains a private “economic” power which invests capitalist property with with an authority to organize production itself-an authority probably unprecedented in its degree of control over productive activity and the human beings who engage in it.

(Wood, 1995 cited in Rupert, 2000: 3)

Thus, when revolutionaries state that fighting the government is one of their aims in the anti-corporate globalization movement, what is meant is that these groups must argue against national protectionism, against calls for the state to "stand up" to capital, against pleas for nationalization. "Instead, our focus must be on promoting the self-emancipation of the working class through its own struggles, organizations and efforts" ("Revolutionary Anarchism"). Anarchists especially, and the revolutionary groups within the ACGM generally, stress the need to mobilize outside and against the state. (Ibid)

^{xxv} *A-Infos* (www.ainfos.ca) is an online resource which describes it self as, "a multi-lingual news service by, for and about anarchists." In their vision statement they explain that *A-Infos* is a project coordinated by an "international collective of anti-authoritarian, anti-capitalist activists, involved with class-struggle and who regard it as a total social struggle." They go on to explain that this program is organized by people who feel 'anarchism is a social theory, and that a revolution is necessary to bring about the new class-less social order, and that this revolution can only be made by the vast majority of the working people' ("A-Infos Vision").

^{xxvi} The notion of ideology critique is traced back to Marx and Engels. Ideology critique performs the twin tasks of emancipation and exposure. Simons & Billig (1994:1) hold that for Marx and Engels the purpose of ideology critique was "exposing ideological illusions, in the hope of emancipating those who are enslaved by those illusions." These authors assert that the general tenor of the times--the so-called postmodern age--undermines the possibility if confident criticism and/or ideology critique.

^{xxvii} Fotopoulos (2001:2) maintains that a social movement is characterised by a number of elements :

- some sort of organisation, which distinguishes it from spontaneous gatherings of people with similar ideas and values,
- a common outlook on society, i.e. a common world-view and
- a common set of values that include, on the one hand, the program, which is derived on the basis of a set of shared long-term goals with respect to society's structure and, on the other, the ideology, i.e. the body of ideas which justify the program and the strategy of the movement.

^{xxviii} Malik does point out that, in their own defence, postmodern theorists could easily argue that the principle of "difference" implies a truly radical egalitarianism insofar as it recognizes *no standard* by which to judge a certain group as better than another. However, for Malik, the salient point is that the principle of difference cannot provide any standards that *force* us to *respect* the difference of others. At best, it invites our indifference to the fate of the Other, and at worst, it allows us to hate and abuse those who are different. For why, after all, should we *not* hate and abuse them? On what basis can they demand our respect and vice-a-versa?

^{xxix} This is not to suggest, however, that there are no tensions over identity issues within the ACGM. Nor do I argue that all activists prefer to unify the different issues of struggle. Indeed it has been argued that the ACGM may suffer the same fate as the movements of the 1970s--that due to racial and gender tensions the movement will crumble. Moreover these claims are found both inside and outside of the movement. Larimore-Hall and McMillan (2001) have argued that

...for all its successes, the new student movement is facing some heady problems-and they're not exactly new ones. Activists' lack of attention to issues of race and racism, as well as a tendency toward de-emphasis of strategic, "broad picture" thinking in favor of action for action's sake, has generated growing debate within, and criticism from outside, the movement ("Growing Pains").

The authors maintain that the rift emerged full force when activists organized around the 1999 WTO meetings. They quote one student organizer from the U.S, Colin Rajah, director of the San Francisco-based global justice youth organization Just Act who states, "Seattle was organized with a particular culture, a very white culture..."(cited in Ibid.). The authors go on to explain that while many student activists talk about anti-corporatism as foundation of radical social change, others aren't so sure. Pari Zutshi, a 20 year-old activist with the Prison Moratorium Project, a national youth activist group focusing on prison justice issues asserts that, "what can be so frustrating about the anti-corporate movement is the disconnect. It ends up being 'It's the corporate people who oppress you,' instead of acknowledging that daily interactions are racist, sexist. Those things get sidelined, and it ends up being all about the corporations" (cited in Ibid). Moreover, it is held that this movement's 'racial blindspot' is more than a product of racism; it also highlights a serious lack of strategic thinking. "In a lot of ways, it's a matter of vision," explains one student activist. "When students are talking about changing the system, but not thinking about the process by which they're doing it, not being aware that when you're having a meeting and everyone who shows up is white, that's a huge problem." (cited in Ibid)Indeed there are also some anarchists/radicals from within the movement that are very critical of the disproportionate presence of people of colour in the ACGM. They maintain that while the movement is often seen as diverse with regard to focus issues, it lacks diversity of income and colour ("Europol Persecutes"). Lorenzo Komboa Ervin, a former Black Panther, well-known activist and self-proclaimed anarchist states:

people of colour...have even more reason to fight than middle class white kids, don't cut us out of our place and role in the movement... As the Zapatistas have told us all: This anti-capitalist resistance did not start in Seattle on November 30th in the West, and will not end here in the USA. This is a truly world wide campaign, but we must make room for all others of our class, especially poor folks and people of colour who, after all, are the majority of humanity...Don't fight in our name, fight along with us, we don't need any condescending saviours! (Ibid.).

^{xxx} Indeed many argue that, ironically, the NSM paradigm never really applied to the so called 'new social movements' (see Barry, 1992)

^{xxxi} This is not to suggest, however, that the debate over reform and revolutions is not a vibrant one within the ACGM. Indeed common among many of the documents I examined was some mention, and in some cases drawn out discussion, of this debate over reform or revolution. Some maintain that the reformist elements have given into post-September 11th intimidation and the increasing criminalization of dissent. Louis Proyect (2002) writes that the reform groups have more or less retreated from the ACGM after 9/11. He states, "There are growing signs that...NGOs...have buckled under to post-911war time pressures..." Proyect cites evidence of the 'retreat', which was presented in *The Village Voice*: "The reformist perspective is likely to retreat further with groups like the Sierra Club absent from WEF [World Economic Forum] week and the AFL-CIO presence reduced from a march to a rally..." (Cited in Ibid.)In another document produced by an activist who identifies as a 'radical socialist,' it is held that those who seek free trade with a "human face"-- reformists—"verge on an agreement with the imperialists whereby demonstrations could be replaced with round table discussions on how to combine profit-making for big corporations with some kind of social service programs for third world countries" ("After Genoa: Where is the Anti-Capitalist"). Ultimately, this activist laments that reformists would like to see the ACGM maintain its anti-corporate, anti-greed mood rather than build up a more radical anti-capitalist outlook.

^{xxxii} Indeed in a speech given at an OCAP gathering in Toronto, well-known Canadian activist Jaggi Singh expressed the need to connect large-scale demonstrations with local/community

resistance. In other words, there is a need to fight capitalism *locally* as well as globally. Singh explains that capitalism is alive and well despite large-scale mobilizations, and while we must not stop mobilizing globally, it is also necessary that we do not “lose the forest for the trees,” (“Anti-Globalization Movement and OCAP”). Structural adjustment Programs (SAPs) that have been imposed on a variety of countries by predatory institutions like the WTO and World Bank, Singh explains, are a common target of the ACGM. However, he maintains that Canada and Ontario specifically, has had its own Structural Adjustment Program, “but unlike the other Structural Adjustment Programs, Ontario’s was not enforced, but voluntarily undertaken by the government. Our Structural Adjustment Program is called the Common sense revolution, and it does exactly the same thing” (Ibid.). Ultimately he argues that we need to connect an analysis of what is happening in the South to what our governments are doing locally everyday.^{xxii} Ironically, it is the contention of some ACGM activists and other anti-war groups that the so called war on terrorism is actually a smokescreen or false front for legitimizing American wars of aggression, which have been part and parcel of US foreign policy for half a century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Barry. (1992). "(POST?) MARXISM AND NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol. 29, no. 1. (Wilson Web Search).
- Ahmad, Aijaz. (1998). "The Communist Manifesto and the Problem of Universality." *Monthly Review*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 12-23.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. (1997). "Culture, Nationalism, and the Role of Intellectuals." in *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*. Eds. Ellen Meiksins Wood & John Bellamy Poster. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1997, pp. 51-64.
- Altheide, David L. (1996). "Qualitative Media Analysis." *Qualitative Research Methods, Series 38*. London: Sage Publications
- Amin, Samir (2001). "Imperialism and Globalization" *Monthly Review* vol. 53, no. 2, (Wilson Web Search).
- Arrighi, Giovanni, Terence K. Hopkins and Immanuel Wallerstein. (1989). *Antisystemic Movements*. London: Verso.
- Bates, Joshua F. (2002). "From Protest to Politics: Globalization, Resistance and Possibilities for Change" *Dalhousie University Thesis Paper*. SOSA 4500--Supervisor Dr. Christopher Murphy.
- Bello, Walden. "Another World is Possible."
<http://www.yesmagazine.org/22art/bello.htm> [07/22/04]
- Benton, Ted. Ed. (1996). *The Greening of Marxism*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Best, Steven and Douglas Kellner. "Postmodern Politics and the Battle For the Future."
<http://www.uta.edu/huma/illuminations/kell28.htm> [11/07/04]
- Bloom, Alexander and Wini Breines. (1995). *Takin it to the Streets*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bookchin, Murray. (1998). "The Communist Manifesto: Insights and Problems." *New Politics*, vol. 6, no. 4, (Wilson Web Search).
- Bookchin, Murray. (1995). "History, Civilization, and Progress: Outline for a Criticism of Modern Relativism"
<http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist Archives/bookchin/hiscivpro.html>
[04/08/03]

Bourne, Jenny. "Racism, Postmodernism and the Flight from Class." in *Marxism Against Postmodernism in Educational Theory*. Eds. D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole and G. Rikowski. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books. 2002, pp. 195-210.

Callinicos, Alex. (2003). *An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Callinicos, Alex. (1990). *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Chesters, Graeme. (2001). "Planting the tree of tomorrow: the Zapatistas, land, liberty and justice." http://www.banc.org.uk/ecosarta/arts22_1/ecosart7.html [07/21/04]

Danaher, Kevin and Roger Burach {Eds.}. (2000). *Globalize This!* Monroe, MA: Common Courage Press.

Downing, John. (2001). *Radical Media*. New York: Sage Publishers.

Eagleton, Terry. (1996). *The Illusions of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Eagleton, Terry. "Where do Postmodernists Come from?" in *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern agenda*. Eds. Ellen Meiksins Wood & John Bellamy Poster. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1997, pp. 17-25.

Epstein, Barbara. (2001). "Anarchism and the Anti-Globalization Movement" *Monthly Review*, vol.53, no. 4, (Wilson Web Search).

Ericson, Richard and Aaron Doyle. *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 4, (December 1999) pp. 589-608.

Ervin, Komboa. Lorenzo. "Europol Persecutes Anarchists and Radicals: what to do?" http://www.infoshop.org/rants/lorenzo_europol.html [06/02/01]

Fanon, Frantz. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fotopoulos, Takis. "The End of Traditional Antisystemic Movements and the Need for A New Type of Antisystemic Movement Today." http://www.democracynature.org/dn/vol7/takis_movements.htm [7/16/04]

Gilroy, Paul. "British Cultural Studies and the Pitfalls of Identity." in *Black British Cultural Studies*. Eds. Houston Baker, Manthia Diawara, and Ruth Lindeborg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996, pp.223-239.

Giltin, Todd. "From Universality to Difference: Notes on the Fragmentation of the Idea of the Left," in *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Ed. Craig Calhoun. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994. pp.150-174.

Jimenez, M. (2001). "Marxism and class, gender and race: Rethinking the Trilogy." *Race, Gender & Class*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 23-33.

Gindin, Sam. "The Terrain of Social Justice." <http://www.canadiandimension.mb.ca/v35/354sg.htm> [04/04/04]

Graeber, David. (2000). "What Real Globalization Would Mean." <http://www.ainfos.ca/00/jul/ainfos00001.html> [06/14/04]

Hamel, Chris. (2001). "Ideological Analysis." <http://info-center.ccit.arizona.edu/~writprog/Materials/10-07.htm>

Harvey, David. (1998). "The Practical Contradictions of Marxism." *Critical Sociology*, vol. 24, no. (1/2), pp.1-36.

Herman, Edward S. (1999). "The threat of globalization." *New Politics*, vol. 7, pp. 40-60.

Heyes, Cressida, "Identity Politics." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2002 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2002/entries/identity-politics/>.

Klein, Naomi. (2002). *Fences and Windows: Dispatches From the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.

Kling, Joseph. (1995). "Narratives of possibility: Social Movements, Collective Stories and the Dilemmas of Practice" www.interweb-tech.com/nsmnet/docs/kling.htm [06/01/03]

Knight, Douglas M. (1989). *Street of Dreams*. London: Duke University Press.

Kumar, Satish. "Gandhi's Swadeshi-The Economics of Permanence" <http://squat.net/caravan/ICC-en/Krrs-en/ghandi-econ-en.htm> [04/01/02]

LaFranchi, Howard. (2001). "Out of the jungle, a global hero." *The Christian Science Monitor* <http://search.csmonitor.com/durable/2001/03/15/p1s4.htm> [09/03/03]

Larana, Enrique, Hank Johnston & Joseph Gusfield R. (1994). *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Larrain, Jorge. (1994). *Ideology & Cultural Identity: Modernity and the Third World Presence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lindberg, Staffan and Arni Sverrisson Eds. (1997). *Social Movements in Development*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Luxemburg, Rosa. (1900). *Reform or Revolution*. London: Militant Publications.
Obtained on line, www.marxists.org

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*.
Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Malatesta, Erico. (2000). "Anarchism, the TABD, and globalization"
<http://www.geocities.com/malatestaleague/> [06/04/04]

Malik, Kenan. "The Mirror of Race: Postmodernism and the celebration of Difference,"
in *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*. Eds. Ellen Meiksins
Wood & John Bellamy Poster. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1997, pp. 113-134.

Mander, Jerry. "The Dark Side of Globalization." *The Nation*, July 15/22, 1996, pp. 9-18.

Marshall, Scott. "Imperialist Globalization" [http://www.cpusa.org/PA
articles/Imperialist%20Globalization.htm](http://www.cpusa.org/PA/articles/Imperialist%20Globalization.htm) [07/21/04]

Martinez, Mauricio. (2002). "The Challenge of a New Ideology" *Canadian Dimension*,
vol.36, no. 1, pp.28-30.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. (1992). *The Communist Manifesto*. London:
Oxford University Press.

McMichael, Philip. (2000). *Development and Social Change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine
Forge Press

Moberg, David. (1999). "After Seattle."
<http://www.inthesetimes.com/issue/24/03/moberg2403.html> [07/21/04]

Morse, Chuck. (2003). "Theory of the Anti-Globalization Movement."
<http://www.newformulation.org/1antiglobalization.htm> [07/21/04]

Nugent, Daniel. "Northern Intellectuals and the EZLN" in *In Defense of History:
Marxism and the Postmodern agenda*. Eds. Ellen Meiksins Wood & John Bellamy
Poster. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1997, pp.163-174.

Offe, C. (1985). "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional
Politics." *Social Research*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp.817-868.

Orton, David. "Globalization from below, or ending industrial civilization?"
<http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/Globalization.html> [06/13/04]

Palmer, Bryan. "Old Positions/New Necessities: History, Class, and Marxist
Metanarrative," in *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern agenda*. Eds.

Ellen Meiksins Wood & John Bellamy Foster. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1997, pp. 65-73.

Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. (2001). *Globalization Unmasked*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Petras, James (1997/1998). "A Marxist Critique of Post-Marxists" *Links*, no. 9. (Wilson Web Search).

Phillion, Stephen. (1998). "Bridging the Gap Between New Social Movement Theory and Class." *Rethinking Marxism*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 70-104.

Pichardo, N.A. (1997). "New Social Movements: A Critical Review". *Annual Review of Sociology*. vol. 23, pp. 411-430.

Poldervaart, Saskia. (2001). "Aspects of Social Movements in Postmodern Times: Some Examples of DIY Politics in the Netherlands" *Utopian Studies* v12, no2, pp.143-163 (Wilson Web Search).

Proyekt, Louis. (2002). "Big Step Forward for the radical movement" <http://www.mail-archive.com/marxism@lists.panix.com/msg30692.html> [07/21/04]

Reed, Adolph, Jr. (2000). *Class Notes*. New York: The New Press

Roberts, E. Ron. (1971). *The New Communes*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Robles, Sebastian. "After Genoa: Where is the Anti-Capitalist/Anti-Globalization Movement Headed?" <http://www.infoshop.org> [06/13/04]

Rupert, Mark. (2000). *Ideologies of Globalization*. London: Routledge

Saad-Filho, Alfredo. (2003). *Anti-Capitalism: A Marxist Introduction*. London: Pluto Press

Scatamburlo-D'Annibale, Valerie and Peter McLaren. (2004, forthcoming). "Contesting the New 'Young Hegelians: Interrogating Capitalism in a World of Difference", in press.

Scatamburlo-D'Annibale, Valerie and Peter McLaren. (2003). "The Strategic Centrality of Class in the Politics of "Race" and "Difference". *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies*, vol.3, no. 2, pp. 148-175.

Shepard, Benjamin and Ronald Hayduk. Eds. (2002). *From Act Up to the WTO: Urban Protest and Community Building in the Era of Globalization*. London: Verso.

Shivani, Anis. (2002). "How the Left Can Matter Again." *Newtopia Magazine* www.newtopiamagazine.net/issues/v2issue4/features/leftcanmatteragain.shtml

[09/14/03]

Silverman, David. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. London: Sage.

Simons, W. Herbert and Michael Billig. (1994). *After Postmodernism: Reconstructing Ideology Critique*. London: Sage Publications.

Smith, Sharon. (1994). "Mistaken identity--or can identity politics liberate the oppressed?" <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj62/smith.htm> [7/11/04]

Starr, Amory. (2000). *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. New York: Zed Books.

Starr, Amory. "Special Section on Anti-Capitalism." *Socialist Review*
<http://www1.chapman.edu/~starr/socialistreview.html>

Steinmetz, George. (1994). "Regulation Theory, Post-Marxism, and the New Social Movements." *Comparative Study of Society and History* vol.36, no. 1, pp. 176-212.

Stewart, Keith. (2003). "If I can't Dance: Reformism, Anti-Capitalism and the Canadian Environmental Movement." *Canadian Dimension*
http://www.candiandimension.mb.ca/v37/v37_5ks.htm [04/04/04]

Stinson, Jane. (2002). "The Canadian Left is Alive and Kicking."
http://www.canadiandimension.mb.ca/v36/v36_2js.htm [07/21/04]

Sweetman, Brenden. (1999). "Postmodernism, Derrida, and Difference: A Critique." *International Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 5-18.

Taylor, Charles. (1979). *Hegel and Modern Society*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Thomson, Alex. (2000). *An Introduction to African Politics*. New York: Routledge.

Townsend, Mark and Paul Harris. (2004). "Now the Pentagon tells Bush: climate change will destroy us" *Guardian Unlimited*
<http://observer.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,6903,1153513,00.html> [06/14/04]

UNDP. "Human Development Report 2002" www.undp.org/hdr2002/mmb.html
[06/12/04]

Weinberg, Bill. (2004). "Zapatistas and the Globalization of Resistance"
<http://www.yesmagazine.org> [05/21/04]

White, Mimi. (2000). "Ideological Analysis and Television".
<http://jcomm.uoregon.edu/~Cybee/j388/ideological.htm> [06/14/03]

Wood, M. Ellen. (1995). *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, M. Ellen. "What is the 'Postmodern' agenda?" in *In Defense of History: Marxism and the Postmodern Agenda*. Eds. Ellen Meiksins Wood & John Bellamy Poster. New York: Monthly Review Press. 1997, pp. 1-16.

Zagorin, Perez. (1999). "History, the Referent, and Narrative: Reflections on Postmodernism Now." *History and Theory*, vol. 30, no. 1 (Wilson Web search)

Internet Articles: No known Author:

“About the Socialist Project.” <http://www.canadiandimension.mb.ca/extra/d1223sp.htm>
[04/04/04]

“After Genoa: Reform or Revolution?” <http://www.indymeida.org> [10/04/01]

“Aims and Principles.” <http://makhno.nefac.net/html/drupal/?q=node/view/104> [07/22/04]

“A-Infos Vision.” <http://www.ainfos.ca> [04/04/04]

“A Marxist Critique of Anti-Globalization Activism.”
<http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=02/02/19/1519221&mode=nested&tid=8>
[07/04/04]

“Anarchism, Libertarian Socialism.” <http://www.the-wood.org/socialism/anarchism.htm>
[04/08/03]

“Anti-Capitalist/Anti-globalization FAQ.” <http://www.fugazi.net/plf/anticapitalfaq.htm>
[03/11/04]

“Anti-Globalization Movement.” http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-globalization_movement#Anti-globalization_movement [04/13/01]

“Anti-Globalization Movement & OCAP.” http://www.ocap.ca/archive/anti-globalization_movement_ocap.html [04/04/04]

“Anti-Globalization, Pro-Peace.”
<http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/2001/10/peace.html>
[07/21/04]

“The Anarchist Ethic in the Age of the Anti-Globalization Movement.”
www.geocities.com/kk_abacus/kka/ethic.html [5/21/04]

“Because something is happening here.”
www.ohio.com/bj/features/2000/November/13/docs/0193437.htm [06/02/01]

“Brainy encyclopedia Anti-Globalization Movement.”
http://www.brainyencyclopedia.com/encyclopedia/a/an/anti_globalization_movement_1.html
[07/21/04]

“Burning and Looting All Illusions Tonight: The FTAA and the Future of the Anti-Globalization Movement.” <http://www.infoshop.org> [05/21/04]

“A Carnival Against Capitalism.”
<http://www.nadir.org/initiativ/agp/free/ftaa/carnival.htm> [07/21/04]

“CLAC Basis of Unity.” <http://clac.tactic.org/en/index.php?section=0&subsection=2>
[07/21/04]

“Class Struggle Beyond Anti-Globalization Protest.”
<http://makhno.nefac.net/html/drupal/?q=node/view/19> [07/22/04]

“CSIS Report.” www.csis-scrs.gc.ca/eng/miscdocs/200008_e.html [06/09/01]

“Fighting to Win: Thoughts on Reform and Revolution.”
<http://www.onwardnewspaper.org/archives/2-2--2/win.html> [04/04/04]

“First Declaration from the Lacandon Jungle.”
<http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/exlnwa.html> [13/06/04]

“First declaration of La Realidad for Humanity and against Neoliberalism.”
http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/ccri_1st_dec_real.html [13/06/04]

“From Seattle to Prague and Beyond! From: Anarchy.”
<http://www.cb3rob.net/~merijn89/ARCH/msg00417.html> [06/02/01]

The Geology of Protest.” <http://www.ainfos.ca/01/sep/ainfos00014.html> [7/21/04]

“Growing Pains.” <http://www.theactivist.org/archives/SU01/> [07/21/04]

“Have Anarchists Always Opposed State Socialism?”
<http://www.geocities.com?CapitolHill/1931/secH1.html> [04/03/03]

“History of the International Workingmen’s Association.”
http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/firstinternationalhist.html [04/03/03]

“Increased Unity is One of the Signs of the Change in Tide.”
http://www.infoshop.org/news5/a16_call2.html [04/03/04]

“International Workingmen’s Association.” <http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/International>
[04/03/03]

“Know Your Enemy: Capitalism.” www.plp.org/pamphlets/antiglobal.htm [5/24/01]

“Marcos to the Underground culture of Resistance.”
http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/ezln/1999/marcos_under_culture_oct.html [07/22/04]

“Letters From Inside the Black Bloc.” <http://www.alternet.org/stroy.html?StroyID=11230>
[09/29/01]

“Libertarian Socialism.” http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Libertarian_socialsim [04/08/03]

“The Life--or Death--of the Anti-Globalization Movement.” <http://www.anarchist-studies.org/publications/perspectives> [07/16/04]

“Mikhail Bakunin.” http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mikhail_Bakunin [04/03/03]

“Movement gears up for New York Tycoons to meet on Feb. 2 amid swirl of protest.” <http://uuhome.de/global/english/WTO060.html> [07/21/04]

“This is NEFAC! An Introduction to the Northeastern Federation of Anarcho-Communists.” <http://makhno.nefac.net/html/drupal/?q=node/view/83> [07/22/04]

“The Origins of the Polaris Institute.” http://www.polarisinstitute.org/about_us_index.html [07/13/04]

“Post modernism and Post-modernity.” from <http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-postmd.htm>

“The Protests of the "Anti-Globalization Movement.” www.home.uleth.ca/-crawsd/AntiGlobalization.htm [6/2/01]

“Resistance to Globalization.” <http://www.chiapaslink.ukgateway.net/ch1.html> [07/12/04]

“Revolutionary Anarchism and the Anti-Globalization Movement.” <http://www.ainfos.ca/O1/feb/ainfos00355.htm> [5/24/01]

“Thoughts on the Anti-Globalization Movement.” <http://www.indymedia.org> [07/13/04]

“Toronto Mobilization for Global Justice.” <http://www.mob4glob.ca/> [07/13/04]

“Us, Beyond ‘Anti-Globalization’: Towards a Deeper Understanding of Capital and the State.” <http://www.ainfos.ca/01/mar/ainfos00501.html> [06/11/04]

“Vision Statement.” <http://www.canadians.org> [07/13/04]

“Vision Statement Backgrounder.” <http://www.canadians.org> [07/13/04]

“We the Peoples Believe Another World is Possible.” <http://www.twinside.org/title/people.htm> [06/23/04]

“This is What Democracy Looks Like.” (2000) *Documentary Film*

“What is Anarchism?” <http://www.geocities.com/capitolhill/1931/secA1.htm> [06/14/01]

“What is it that is Different About the Zapatistas?” http://flag.blackened.net/revolt/mexico/comment/andrew_diff_feb01.html [06/12/04]

Why do racism, sexism and homophobia exist?"

<http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/1931/secB1.html> [06/23/04]

"The Zapatista Movement." <http://www.chiapaslink.ukgateway.net/ch1.html> [07/12/04]

VITA AUCTORIS

Ghada Chehade was born in 1978 in Egypt, and has lived in Canada since age two. She graduated from Walkerville Collegiate Institute in 1998. From there she went on to the University of Windsor where she obtained a B.A. Honours in Political Science in 2001. She is currently a candidate for the Master's degree in Communication and Social Justice at the University of Windsor and hopes to graduate in Fall 2004. She recently co-published "Networking for Social Justice: The Rise of Indymedia" in *Communication in the Public Interest, vol.2: Seeking Convergence in Policy and Practice*, Ed. L. Shade and M. Moll. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. 2004.