"At the heart of society burns the fire of social movements":
What would a Marxist theory of social movements look like?

Alf Gunvald Nilsen, University of Bergen, Norway

Laurence Cox, National University of Ireland, Maynooth

- abstract -

Social movement activists have their own theories of social movements, whose goals and structure often diverge radically from those of academic social movement studies. This paper explores the example of Marxism, as a theory developed outside the academy, primarily on the basis of the experience of the nineteenth-century workers' movement in Europe. If society consists of socially organised human practice, then social movements contend to direct this "historicity", in Touraine's words: they are struggles over how society creates itself.

This paper attempts to do two things. Firstly, it offers a rough-and-ready typology of how grassroots activists experience their opponents in "social movements from above", the ways in which dominant social groups attempt to maintain or extend ways of organising human practice that sustain their power. We explore defensive and offensive movements from above, the political choices and alliances involved, and the ways in which movements from above impact on activists in movements from below.

Secondly, we attempt to theorise the collective agency of subaltern social groups, making the links between their situated experience of their lifeworld, the conflicts between "common sense" and "good sense", and the development out of these of militant particularisms, large-scale campaigns and social movement projects aiming to restructure human practice on a large scale. We are interested in particular in how this process is experienced and shaped by activists themselves. In conclusion, we use the categories of neo-liberalism and the "movement of movements" to discuss the current shape of the conflict between movements from above and from below.

(I) Introduction:
Marxism and social movement theory

Activists need theory, and actively search for appropriate ideas to guide their practice. But what kind of theory? As Barker and Cox (2002) argued, little of the theory which marks itself out as "social movement theory" can be said to have activists' problematics at heart. The thematics guiding Piven and Cloward's seminal *Poor People's Movements: why they succeed, how they fail* (1977) are only rarely those of academic (or journalistic) social movement theory, much of which is concerned instead with explaining the development of social movements, exploring their themes and issues, discussing their cultural background etc. – all potentially fascinating stuff, but most of it material which activists are fully familiar with (however unfamiliar other academics or the general public may be).

If we are interested in finding theory which places activists' viewpoints and problems centre-stage, a more obvious place to turn is theories generated by activists themselves. Given the intimate connection between the development of Marxism and the development of the worker's movement, it can be considered a serious paradox that a Marxist theory about social movements has yet to be formulated, there is within Marxism (and more generally for most other theories developed by social movement activists, such as feminism) 'no separate and coherent body of theory which could define the nature of social movements, explain their existence, analyse their development and theorise their effects' (Cox 1999: 69).

Marxism as a theory of social movements

What we want to propose is that Marxism does not have a specific theory *about* social movements because it is in itself a theory *of* social movements. To say this suggests a much

broader view of social movements than that dominant in much mainstream sociology, where social movements are thought of as field-specific institutional formations - i.e. unconventional or informal political organizations and campaigns, but excluding (with a few honourable exceptions) such issues as revolutions, political parties, popular culture and consciousness, states and capital. What we propose is that the conflictual historical process of developing needs and capacities through the social organization of human practice constitutes the kernel of Marxism as a theory of social movements. Rather than taking the status quo for granted and examining social movements as ripples on the smooth surface of society, this means seeing the *whole* of society as socially produced through collective agency – and hence open to contestation and transformation.

Our understanding of social movements, drawing in particular on Western Marxist theory, revolves around a view of history and the making and unmaking of social structures as the product of human practice - and, more importantly, the outcome of collective human practice, articulated in and through conflicts which encompass the totality constituted by a given social organization of human practice, and in turn define that totality. We consider these conflicts as not only being grounded in the material activity of human beings, but also as revolving around how that activity and its social organization are to develop: as Touraine (1981) puts it, these are conflicts over historicity, over the ways in which societies produce themselves.

Social movements from the margins to the centre

Social movements, in this perspective, are not considered as ruptures of an otherwise passive or institutionalized social/political landscape. They are the ways in which human practices are socially articulated. Thus, we propose the following definition:

A social movement is the organization of multiple forms of materially grounded and locally generated skilled activity around a rationality expressed and organized by (would-be) hegemonic actors, and against the hegemonic projects articulated by other such actors (Cox, 1999: 99).

For activists, this approach means two things. On the one hand, it means demystifying their own action – or more exactly pushing beyond a narrow, "technical" or field-specific understanding of their own activity to one which identifies both its roots in everyday practice and the nature of the opposition it encounters. On the other hand, it means demystifying that opposition: moving beyond seeing it simply as that of a poorly-informed, or consumerist, "mass", or (at a more refined level) of simply expressing a "system" or a "society", to a point where activists can see the active role of their opponents *within* society and as *constructing* a system.

This is then a view of social movements as being *in movement*. In place of the focus on static institutions that dominates much mainstream social movement theory, we propose a developmental theory of the direction of collective action, dealing specifically with how the scope of collective action is widened and deepened through reflexive self-activity, in other words the development of practices and ideas grounded in human needs and capacities.

Movements from above and below

This perspective in turn leads to a significant element of our theoretical framework, namely that we conceive of social movements refer not only as the collective agency of subaltern social groups, but also the collective agency of dominant social groups. Ahmad has argued about the tendency towards one-sided understandings of class struggle:

We tend to think of class struggle only in relation to the proletariat, as revolutionary struggle. Marx's point is that the possessing class itself wages a brutal and permanent struggle in defence of its own class interests, through violence and threats of violence, through exploitations both extensive and intensive, by maintaining a permanent army of the unemployed, and through thousand other means in the social, political, ideological and cultural arena. Class struggle has, in other words, not one side but two (1998: 34).

Hence we propose a logical analytical distinction between social movements from above and social movements from below. In what follows we will elaborate on the specific

character of these forms of collective agency, before we discuss their dialectical interrelationship in the making and unmaking of social organizations of human practice.

(II) Social Movements From Above: Understanding the Collective Agency of Dominant Social Groups

Sklair (1997: 514) has pointed out that most social movement research 'has always and quite properly been on anti-establishment, deviant and revolutionary movements of various types'. However, a fundamental point for Sklair is that a social organization of human practice - in the case of Sklair's argument, global capitalism - 'does not just happen' (ibid.: 514); on the contrary:

> It is a social system that has to struggle to create and reproduce its hegemonic order globally, and to do this large numbers of local, national, international and global organizations have been established, some of which engage in practices that clearly parallel the organizational forms and actions of what are conventionally called 'new social movements' (ibid.: 514-15)[1].

Exploring movements from above

We propose the concept of *social movements from above* for the theorization of the collective agency of dominant social groups to maintain or extend social organizations of human practice that sustain their dominance.

The specifics of such movements vary, most obviously as between capitalism and other historical epochs, but also within capitalism. Nevertheless, they tend to be able to mobilise characteristic resources, such as a directive role in economic organisation, control of the state, and a leading position vis-à-vis everyday routines and "common sense".

---

[1] As will become clear, while we accept this latter point of Sklair's, it weakens his claim that social movement research should properly focus on anti-establishment movements. If the hegemonic order of capitalism is created and reproduced through social movements from above, then these movements have logically to be more powerful and are presumably more continuous than those from below.

An investigation of the collective agency of dominant social groups can help activists in avoiding the reification of exploitative and oppressive social structures. Hegemony is not a given or the result of "conformity"; it is the (temporary) outcome of political projects to establish and maintain a certain way of socially organizing human practice through leading, organising and articulating other people's practice.

Similarly, activists are not as alone in their struggles against hegemony as they may feel. Hegemonic projects from above invariably meet with resistance from below (albeit often fragmented and isolated), from subaltern social groups struggling against exploitation and oppression – a resistance which is in turn countered with a mixture of attempts at consent and coercion. Thus hegemony must be viewed as a process, as opposed to an achieved state of affairs:

> … active or passive affiliation and the preservation of mentalities are placed within a dynamic range of actions, positions, and possibilities, a range that includes the formation of new organizations and institutions, the pressing of claims, the assertion of autonomy … [T]he relations between ruling and subaltern groups are characterized by contention, struggle and argument (Roseberry, 1996: 80).

Defensive movements from above

How can activists understand their opponents? It follows from our discussion of the duality of movements that they exist in relation to each other. Social movements from above, then, can be either *defensive* or *offensive*, depending on whether they are responding to movements from below, or the reverse.

In the first case - *a defensive movement from above* - we are dealing with political projects that seek to counter challenges from below to the status quo. Such responses can be either *accommodative* or *repressive*. An accommodative project typically seeks to grant certain concessions to the claims emanating from social movements from below so as to appease and thus also defuse a political force that threatens to destabilize the social totality. A typical example here would be the various reforms that were implemented throughout Western Europe in the early and mid-

twentieth century in response to the increasing strength of the workers' movement. This was of course a crucial dynamic in the establishment of the social compact between capital and labour which underpinned the political economy of organized capitalism.

A repressive project typically counters insurgent political projects through violent coercion and the curbing of civil rights so as to silence or erase resistance. A typical example here would be the state terrorism unleashed by Latin American dictatorships upon campaigns for democracy in the 1970s and the 1980s. More recently, state practices have come to centre increasingly around control and discipline through legislation that curbs civil liberties and the containment of dissent through various forms of policing and surveillance.

We want to note here that we are not suggesting that accommodative projects are purely oriented towards the gaining of consensus, nor that repressive projects rely on coercion alone. Rather, they differ above all in their response to large-scale, organised movements from below: the accommodative response to such movements does not exclude coercion vis-à-vis ethnic minorities, the lumpenproletariat or the radical wing of such movements (consider e.g. the Italian *compromesso storico* between Christian Democracy and official Communism, achieved at the expense of the autonomous Left). Nor does the repressive project abandon all attempts to gain consent; rather, it restricts these to narrower social groups than before.

Accommodative projects seek to separate movements from each other and to incorporate them in selective ways (since to incorporate a movement from below more fully would be to abdicate, both in terms of power granted and in terms of interests). Activists facing such projects need above all to stress solidarity and find ways of building links with one another. In facing repressive projects, which seek to exclude movements from below, activists need to treat civil and political rights as the gains of past movements (which they are), and understand that (whether legal or illegal) the exercise of such rights is the necessary precondition for movement action. This does not, of course, mean that movements from below should remain passive in this situation, which is after all one where movements from

above are on the defensive. Rather, they need both to tackle these responses from above to their own movements and to find ways of taking the initiative further.

Offensive movements from above

In the second case - *an offensive movement from above* - we are dealing with political projects that seek to attack the truce lines left by past movement struggles, particularly through undermining or reversing victories won by or concessions granted to movements from below. Through such attacks, offensive movements from below seek to extend ways of socially organizing human practice that consolidate social dominance. Privatization, for instance, can be understood as one such project, where the logic of commodification is extended into more and more spheres of people's lifeworlds, thus expanding and consolidating the power of capital over labour (see Harvey, 2004).

These offensive movements from above often emerge at conjunctures where an extant social organization of human practice, in whole or in part, starts to show signs of breaking down. Such tendencies towards crisis open up a space for a contestation of the existent, and in this space, movements from above will tend to clash with movements from below and their projects for social change. An example of this would be the space of contestation that emerged with the onset of the crisis of organized capitalism in the late 1960s and early 1970s, where the New Right emerged as an offensive social movement from above to propagate neoliberal restructuring as the way out of the crisis, and replaced earlier consensual conservatism or social democracy. Another historical example would be the emergence of Italian fascism and the German Freikorps in opposition to the "revolutionary wave" of 1916 – 1919.

In this context the difficulty for activists is often not to get locked into a purely defensive response, which often means defending institutions whose value is often very ambiguous. The crisis situation represents a moment of possibility, during which movements from below can not only attempt to hold onto what is valuable in existing institutions, but also to open up new spaces of conflict. At the core of their opponents'

strategy is a situation of uncertainty and doubt about previous approaches, and this is important to understand, whether or not it is possible for movements from below to take independent initiatives.

The social strategies of movements from above

Practical activist choices necessarily depend on seeing the different ways in which these movements from above affect different social groups. There is always a need for two faces of power: one turned towards those whose practices and ideas are effectively organised and incorporated, in whatever form, and one turned towards those whose consent is not needed or sought within a particular regime.

These two faces target different groups: within capitalism, the consent of large capital and those controlling the means of state coercion is needed almost by definition. At the other end of the spectrum, the "lumpenproletariat" and the least organised parts of the working class will almost always be targeted with coercive measures to some degree. Other groups, such as trade unionists or liberal professionals, may find themselves within the sphere of consent or within that of coercion.

In search of popular support

Within capitalism, ruling classes increasingly need a mass base for their politics, and so have tendentially shifted away from the use of small networks of notables (as in many nineteenth-century parliaments) towards adopting the political techniques pioneered by the left (which had to rely on its mass base, because it had no other significant resources). Hence between 1789 and 1848 the French legitimists (who wanted to rely on automatic routines of status and deference) gave way to the Orleanists and the Bonapartists, representing progressively greater degrees of popular mobilisation behind conservative agendas.

Similarly, between 1918 and 1945 the collapse of old empires and monarchies and the threat from the left led to the decline of conservative monarchist politics and the rise of fascism, firstly in central Europe (Germany, Italy) and subsequently in the Mediterranean fringe (Spain, Greece, Portugal) as structures for popular mobilisation against the Left. In postwar Europe the rise of Christian democracy, and at a later date of Thatcherism in Britain, represented new variants of popular mobilisation behind right-wing agendas. Sklair's comment on the nature of the movements constructing the hegemony of contemporary global capitalism, brings the process up to date, again highlighting the creative role of movements from below in pioneering organising strategies which are then selectively adopted from above.

One way of summarising this is to say that because within capitalism "all that is solid melts into air", consent is no longer as automatic as it tended to be in most periods of earlier history, when ruling classes could rely more on "traditionalised" routines and ideas. Capitalism's constant shaking-up and resettling of everyday routines and language implies the need for far more active and conscious measures to ensure continued consent.

Weaknesses of the "transnational state"

Within this general analysis, it's important to distinguish the "hard core" of a particular leadership project (as represented e.g. by the World Trade Organisation, the G8 etc.) from the "softer fringe" (as represented by national parliaments, local government, etc.) These two rely on each other, but tend to adopt a "division of labour" (eg at present, where a relatively small core of institutions pursues the goal of neo-liberal implementation and the pursual of the "war on terror", while a far broader fringe has the task of securing popular support, not so much for these tasks in themselves, as for the structures of power which make these activities possible.)

This is a complex balancing act: what William Robinson (2004: ch. 3) calls a transnational state (WTO, WB/IMF, G8, WEF etc.) represents an attempt to remove decisions that were previously taken in formally (national-) democratic forums from the sphere of public debate. The movement of movements is of course a kind of "democratisation offensive" from below seeking to counteract this.

The "transnational state" suffers from a series of weaknesses, which the movement of movements attempts to exploit. Firstly, unlike the Fordist model which neo-liberalism replaces, it has relatively little to offer most

social groups (see Cox 2001), and its leadership capacities (in Gramsci's sense) are therefore limited. Secondly, it still has to rely on the more accessible, and more formally democratic, structures of nation-states for the transmission of its policy prescriptions to achieve its ends, thus opening up spaces, however limited, for political contestation. Finally, it suffers from an ongoing "legitimation crisis", which the movement seeks to deepen.

Thus summit protests have been able to force a number of elements of the transnational state to withdraw from the public arena and hold their meetings in well-defended "fortress" locations. It is true that from one point of view – "power comes out of the barrel of a gun" – these fortresses are hard to touch. Yet from another point of view, this "retreat to Versailles" means abandoning a large part of the battle for legitimacy to the movement of movements, and a large-scale loss of this legitimacy. Albeit not a direct result, it is hard to imagine that the recent popular response to the war on Iraq could have developed to such an extent if the Bush administration and its allies had been more interested in securing popular consent. In turn, the same coalition (which is currently losing significant numbers of its allies from the Iraq coalition) will face serious difficulties in pursuing its declared goal of a longer-term "war on terror".

In spite of such variations, what remains constant in the political projects of social movements from above is that of maintaining the essential social relations that underpins power and dominance. For example, whereas the various movement projects from above that have been operative in animating the epochal shifts in capitalism have advanced different approaches to the actual configuration of 'the social structures of accumulation'[2] - i.e. the *form* of capitalist accumulation - but they have never put into question the basic social relation of capitalism - i.e. the *essence* of capitalist accumulation, namely the capital-labour relation[3].

---

[2] The concept "social structure of accumulation" is taken from Gordon, Edwards and Reich (1994: 14) and can be defined as "all the institutions that impinge upon the accumulation process".

[3] The distinction between the 'form' and 'essence' of capitalism is taken from Screpanti (1999). The epochal

Opposing movements from above

Activists in movements from below, for their part, find themselves struggling with movements from above at different levels. We can take the example of the current conflict between movements for capitalist globalisation and the movement of movements as an example. At its most general level, the political struggle between movements from above and movements from below is symbolised in confrontations such as summit protests, which make visible the two opposing *movement projects*. This struggle today involves intimations (but nothing more) of a "dual power" situation, not only in the institution of the "counter-summit", but also in that of the social forum, and in libertarian networks such as People's Global Alliance or Indymedia, all seeking to make visible the contrast between different ways of organising human practice. The slogan "another world is under construction" captures this level of conflict well.

At a second level, the slogan "another world is possible" highlights the social context of the way in which movements from below contest the *structures* generated by movements for capitalist globalisation. This is the level of most activist "issues", as well as the point at which activists develop various forms of utopian alternatives to existing social structures and state policies.

But movements from below also confront the everyday *routines* that encapsulate individuals within global capitalism, in a cultural conflict which runs within individuals, but also in micro-conflicts with institutional "ways of doing things". Following the analysis we develop below, this is where activism logically starts, with awareness of structural constraints coming second and awareness of movements from above coming third.

---

shifts in the social organization of capitalist accumulation will be discussed further in the next chapter.

(III) Social Movements from Below: The Movement Process – Starting from the Inside, Working Our Way Out

If movements from above attempt to create structures, which in turn generate routines, the activist experience in movements from below tends to reverse this order. Thus the point of departure for our approach to the understanding of the collective agency of subaltern social groups - social movements from below - is that of the existential situation of activists and the learning processes that are inherent to movement activity. We start from people's situated experiences of a social world that is problematic relative to their changing needs and capacities, and their attempts to combine with other people with similar experiences to do something about this. We refer to this as *the movement process* and propose the terms *local rationality* and *militant particularism*, *campaign*, and *social movement project* as conceptual prisms that might allow us to formulate a developmental theory of the direction of the collective agency of subaltern social groups.

Local Rationalities and Militant Particularisms

If we are to start with and from people's situated experience of a given lifeworld, we start from the context of everyday lives with all their manifold practical routines and received wisdoms. Gramsci's (1998: 333) concept of 'common sense' serves as an apt prism through which to view the experiential rationality that guides everyday activities and mentalities in the sense that it constitutes an amalgamation of two elements: Firstly, the established ways of doing things - that is, the routines that constitute the molecular workings of a hegemonic social organization of human practice, and its "received wisdoms" (the general outlook that this a natural way of doing things, "the way things have always been done", or "the only way of doing things").

Secondly, the practical but often tacit experience of the existent as somehow problematic in the form of "ticklish" knowledges or "grudges" that there is something wrong about the present state of affairs, that this is not due to individual maladjustment, and the subaltern skills and

responses that are developed so as to act on such grudges. These knowledges and their grudges can perhaps be likened to what Scott (1985) calls everyday forms of resistance - i.e. half-submerged forms of practice geared towards countering frustrations with the everyday status quo. These practices can be understood in terms of Gramsci's 'good sense', by which he referred to those 'embryonic' aspects of subaltern consciousness that signify 'that the social group in question may indeed have its own conception of the world' (1998: 327)[4].

However, good sense coexists with hegemonic conceptions of the world - 'a conception which is not its own but is borrowed from another group' - that conditions and constrains our practical activity in "normal times" (ibid.: 327). The crucial point here is to avoid conceiving of the lifeworlds and lived experience of subaltern social groups as hermetically sealed, autonomous spaces of radical otherness[5] but as hybrids of subaltern and dominant practices and worldviews (see McNally, 2001: 150). Subalterneity and the ways of being and doing that defines it should rather be 'seen to be forged relationally and historically' as opposed to 'an essential characteristic of social being' (Moore, 1998: 352). In other words, it is the shifting truce lines between movements from above (which tend to embed themselves as far as possible in hegemonic routines and "common sense") and movements from below (which attempt to articulate and develop the "good sense" of subaltern consciousness) which construct this particular context at any given point in time.

We follow Gramsci's insistence that good sense constitutes 'the healthy nucleus that exists in "common sense … which deserves to be made more unitary and coherent' (1998: 33). Thus, we want to consider the nature and origins of 'good sense' as a *local rationality.* A local rationality can be defined as 'a *formal characteristic about the way people make sense of and engage with the world which is capable of being generalised and taking on a life of its own*' (Cox, 1999: 113). In this context, *local* refers to the

---

[4] We owe this point to Ytterstad (2004); see also Cox (1998).

[5] This is a perspective most prominently present in the Subaltern Studies Project and in the work of post-development theorists such as Escobar. See Sarkar (1997), Moore (1998), Nilsen (2003, 2004) for critiques.

situatedness of people's 'responses to given situations', whereas *rationality* 'is not a single monolithic "thing" … but rather the way that actors practically engage with their world and make sense of their actions' (ibid.: 112).

Now, local rationalities can be more or less developed (in movements from below) as against the rationality deriving from a particular hegemonic arrangement (constructed by movements from above). In conditions of extreme domination, where subordinate groups are deprived of political and civil rights and consigned to an inferior social status by birth 'shared critiques of domination' may be developed by these subordinate groups 'as "hidden transcripts" that represents a critique of power spoken behind the back of the dominant' (Scott, 1990: xii).

At the other end of the scale, the "pillarised subcultures" of the 20th century European working class, in countries such as interwar Germany or postwar Italy, represent situations where local rationalities had achieved a very large space for institutional articulation. In such contexts it can reasonably be said that what is involved is not so much a "whole way of life" as a "whole way of struggle" (Hall, 1989: 61). Lichterman's (1996) discussion of different forms of environmental protest captures also this variability well. His middle-class, mostly white, US Greens, found themselves essentially isolated from the cultures they were born into and needing to construct new activist communities as a means of mutual support. By contrast, his black and Latina anti-toxics campaigners were thoroughly embedded in their own communities, for whom campaigning and political opposition were acceptable parts of everyday culture.

At the root of local rationalities, and across the spectrum of variations, we find those emergent radical needs that are frustrated or constrained by extant social relations – as well as existing needs under attack by offensive movements from above. Local rationalities are those oppositional ways of doing and being which people develop in their attempt to cope with such frustrations, constraints and threats – ways of doing and being that in more or less radical ways run counter to the routines and received wisdoms that characterize the hegemonic elements of common sense (or, in

defensive situations, attempt to reaffirm an older common sense against attempts to impose a new one from above – the situation captured in the original "moral economy" discussion (Thompson 1993)).

At times, local rationalities may erupt in the form of overt acts of defiance and opposition to the dominant social organizations of human practice. What we want to consider is the nature of the struggles that might emerge when local rationalities are made more unitary and coherent. We propose the concept *militant particularism* as a tool for grappling with the forms of struggle that may emerge if such a process of extraction and development takes place. That is, militant particularisms are what emerge when local rationalities move from existing as tacit potentialities (latent within common sense) to becoming embodied in explicit practices (and good sense), through conflictual encounters with hegemonic forces.

The concept 'militant particularism' was coined by Raymond Williams (1989: 249) and has later been developed by David Harvey (1996, 2000) to refer to the particularist origins of movement struggles. The concept refers to how 'politics is always embedded in 'ways of life' and 'structures of feeling' peculiar to places and communities' (Harvey, 2000: 55) and hence also bears the imprint of this specificity and situatedness, both in terms of the issues that are struggles over, and the practices, skills, idioms, and imaginaries that are deployed in the struggle. A militant particularism, then, can be defined as that those forms of struggle that emerge when a subaltern group deploys specific knowledges and skills in open confrontation with a dominant social group, in a particular place and at a particular time, over a particular conflict over a particular issue.

From Militant Particularisms to Campaigns

A fundamental aspect of militant particularisms is the fact that the practices, skills, idioms, and imaginaries of which they are made up can be generalized; these can then transcend the particular locale in which they have emerged and thus be applied across a spectrum of specific situations and singular struggles. This is one reason for speaking of local *rationalities*, as something which can firstly be derived from experience and hidden

transcripts and articulated in public ways. Raymond Williams pointed out this when he developed the concept of militant particularism to address the specific origins of workers' struggles:

> Of course almost all labour struggles begin as particularist. People recognize some condition and problem they have in common and make the effort to work together to change or solve it … The unique and extraordinary character of working-class self-organization has been that it has tried to connect particular struggles to a general struggle in one quite special way. It has set out, as a movement, to make real what is at first sight the extraordinary claim that the defence and advancement of certain particular interests, properly brought together, are in fact in the general interest. (Williams, 1989: 249)

This process of practices, skills, idioms, and imaginaries specific to a given site of conflict and struggle transcending the boundaries of this site is fundamental to the process of abstraction and translation through which activists *go beyond* the immediate parameters of the local of resistance in which they are situated. These are processes of learning, cooperation, and organization through which the scope of social movement activity is broadened and deepened, i.e. they are processes through which militant particularisms communicate and interconnect with each other, develop common strategies and identities across socio-spatial boundaries, and simultaneously deepen their self-understanding. We use the word *campaign* to conceptualize the organization of a range of local responses in ways that connect people across multiple such situations and challenge the construction of those situations

One obvious example would be the development of opposition to waste incinerators in Ireland. Rather than remain (as many politicians no doubt hoped they would) at the "NIMBY" level of opposition to a specific incinerator site proposal - "incinerators yes, but not just here!" - or at the level of opposition to incinerators and acceptance of large-scale landfill "superdumps", campaigners rapidly moved *both* to build national links with other anti-incinerator groups and to avoid being played off against anti-dump groups, developing networks arguing instead for alternative waste strategies.

In this and similar processes, documented by Allen and Jones (1990; Allen 2004), the local rationalities of poor rural communities proved thoroughly capable not only of generating their own militant particularisms but of creating large-scale campaigns connecting them with many other social actors. A similar process took place in Norway when, in 2003, a network emerged between groups throughout the country campaigning against the closing of local hospitals. With the formation of a national campaign, their activities are no longer merely directed against the closing down of this or that hospital, but towards current changes towards centralization and corporatization in Norwegian health policy. In both cases, we see first of all the articulation of a locally-grounded rationality rejecting the latest move "from above" (see Barker 2004 on this process in comparable health care campaigns in Britain), secondly its organisation as a militant particularism in a specific place, and finally its articulation as a general campaign.

Towards Social Movement Projects

While the development of campaigns entails the transcendence of the boundaries of militant particularism, the generalization of and abstraction from local struggles, and the development of collective identities that cut across socio-spatial divides, they are still limited forms of movement activity in that they do not address the issue of the social totality. Campaigns typically construct themselves as field specific in the sense that the organization of local struggles against waste incinerators or hospital closures, for example, limits itself to a questioning of a particular kind of environmental or health policy. They do not automatically, or for all their participants, bring into question the larger question of the social totality - the particular social organization of human practice - within which such field-specific policies are fostered and implemented[6].

---

[6] Obviously individual activists bring this perspective with them from previous campaigns (see Allen and Jones 1990), or from growing up within a movement culture transmitting the knowledge gains of previous movements.

However, they do contain – in the local rationality that spawns them – a germ of transcendence. As activists "join the dots", connecting different issues, linking up with different groups, and criticising the structures that cause their problems or frustrate their campaigns, they are starting to move beyond this field at the same time as they find their place within it. (Those who have already reached this point nevertheless have to argue their case with those who haven't: Barker and Cox 2002). Such movement processes emerge when activists take the process of abstraction one step further and relate the particular issues around which local struggles and field-specific campaigns emerged to the logic of a social totality and articulate a politics which seeks to rupture and go beyond this totality, towards the constitution of an alternative social organization of human practice.

We propose the term *social movement project* to conceptualize the development of a politics which connects campaigns with what from a local or situated perspective is seen as diverse origins around a challenge to the way situations are constructed in general. Social movement projects are defined by the following features: (a) they pose challenges to the social totality which (b) aim to control the self-production of society and (c) possess or are striving to develop the capacity for the kind of hegemony - i.e. giving direction to the skilled activity of different subaltern social groups - that would render (b) and thus (a) possible. Drawing on Touraine (1981, 1985) one might argue that a social movement project stands out from other forms of collective agency from below by virtue of its capacity to *identify* (i) its actors socially; name its central *opponent* (o), and recognizing that the social *totality* (t) is the product and object of such struggles. In other words, there is a return "up" the sequence from opposing routines to opposing the structures which generate them, and finally to directly confronting the movements from above which have constructed the whole.

Although Touraine does not say this, we should note that social movement projects can in turn develop towards the development of

dual-power and thus of revolutionary situations, although this last point is beyond the scope of this paper.

In India, the Narmada Bachao Andolan has, on its own and through national movement networks, embedded their campaign against dam building in an overarching critique of the dominant practices and discourses of development in postcolonial India. Concurrently, they have also articulated a vision of alternative development. The critique of dominant notions of development centres on the argument that the promises of national development articulated with the coming of Independence have been betrayed in the sense that it has been hijacked by elite interests, leaving social majorities the socially and economically marginalized and politically voiceless by the wayside. The vision of alternative development then centres on reclaiming these promises – elements of past movement processes from below, harnessed by a now-dominant project from above - and devising strategies that will secure, say, social equality and participatory decision-making processes (Nilsen, 2004). Here we have something akin to a social movement project, and the most striking feature of it is that it is a project that has emerged through a long and drawn out process of learning. This process seems fundamentally to have revolved around the articulation of ever more encompassing, and indeed radical, perspectives for understanding a very specific conflict.

The Movement Process: Logical, Not Teleological

The movement process that we have sketched out – the abstraction of skills, practices, knowledge and consciousness from the level of local rationalities towards social movement projects – can seem suspiciously linear, and of course as all activists know it is easier to have a map of how movements *can* develop than to win the battles – both internal and external – which can make such a development possible[7]. We would contend, though, that this analysis

---

More generally, the movement process as we present it here is logical, but not always chronological, for these and similar reasons.

[7] As Lukacs (1971) argues, this is an ideal-typical approach; see also Löwy (2003: 8-9) and Cox (1999: 114). This recipe knowledge, however, enables activists to come closer to an ideal type of which they are themselves often aware, by avoiding potential pitfalls and sidetracks.

amounts to a kind of "recipe knowledge" which experienced activists routinely draw on when engaging with local struggles. It is also, and importantly, a means by which newer activists can avoid having to constantly "reinvent the wheel": not everyone starts in the "year zero" situation of total domination by a movement from above. Thus the history of past movements can be drawn on for ideas, languages and repertoires of action (e.g. the constant referral to the past in Parisian revolutionary movements); contemporary movements in other countries or other sectors of society can form a valuable source of inspiration and support (e.g. the international links drawn on in the late 1960s by activists across Northern countries); and "traditionalised" social movements, which have become sedimented as everyday cultures, can be reactivated in response to new circumstances (e.g. the role of black Christianity in the Civil Rights Movement).

The sequence we suggest is thus a logical one, but not necessarily a chronological one in all cases (although as the NBA example suggests individual movements can follow it more or less from one end to the other). The abstraction from militant particularism to social movement project is not a foregone conclusion or a necessary trajectory, but an inherent potentiality of movement processes, whose realisation is contingent upon how actual struggles work themselves out. Hence, when we suggest that movements can develop from local rationalities and militant particularisms, to campaigns, and ultimately to social movement projects, we are initially suggesting these as logical - as opposed to teleological - categories. For activists, however, these represent *practical possibilities,* whose feasibility is grounded in particular local rationalities and the shape of conflicts with movements from above; they can become teleological in the literal sense that activists take them as goals (as we have suggested, for many activists they are a form of "recipe knowledge").

The Movement Process as Praxis: Considering the Subjective and the Objective

At the heart of the development of a social movement project lies praxis. Social movement projects emanate from 'the dialectic of human practice' in which the subjective and objective are fused as opposites in unity in a dialectical process – as people engage creatively with their world and in the process remake themselves as much as the world. Here we want to consider some characteristics of these opposites.

The Subjective Moment: Learning as an Achievement

Firstly, the "subjective moment" – how this appears to the individual concerned - can be thought of as a learning process that engenders knowledge through the dynamics of conflictual encounters with opponents:

> The starting point is often the practical critique of 'common sense' … For many activists … it is a turning point to be at the receiving end of police aggression and to discover that an institution they have been brought up to see as underwriting their safety and the moral order is in fact prone to violence against 'ordinary people' … pursuing what they perceive to be eminently moral … pursuits … When budding activists start to think their way out of 'common sense' … there is often an interest in forms of generalized understanding that might offer clarity, justification and a broader vision to underpin their activity … Activist theorizing can thus present itself as a process of throwing off the contemplative 'muck of ages' gathered by traditional intellectuals within universities, or perhaps more exactly its creative reworking, its cultivating for other purposes (Barker and Cox, 2002: 7)

From this point of view, movement processes consist precisely in (a) people who were not previously active becoming mobilised, and (b) people becoming more radicalised through their participation. The perspective suggested here, then, is one where mobilisation, radicalisation and knowledge production in social movement activity are understood as '*achievements*', and these achievements are 'subject to constant revision as movements develop and change in interaction with opponents and allies' (ibid.: 39). The praxis of movements from below consists of this process: experiencing or repressing needs, developing or losing capacities, exploring or ignoring ideas, creating or abandoning practices in conflict with movements from above.

The Objective Moment: Confronting Actually Existing Global Capitalism

Considering the "objective moment" – what activists experience as being outside themselves - means considering global capitalism; capitalism constitutes a global parameter for the social organization of human practice. The crucial social relations of private ownership and control of the means of production and free wage labour, commodity exchange and capital accumulation have become or are in the process of becoming the essential pillars of social organization in every nook and cranny of the world:

> … by the early twenty-first century the vast majority of peoples around the world had been integrated into the capitalist market and brought into capitalist production relations. No countries or regions remained outside of world capitalism, and there were no longer any pre-or non-capitalist modes of production on a significant scale … Under globalization, the system of world capitalism is undergoing a dramatic intensive expansion … The era of the primitive accumulation of capital is coming to an end (Robinson, 2004: 6, 7)

In this sense, then, one can argue that the present is an era of 'universal history' (Bensaïd, 2002: 19). This does not entail a teleology where history is universalized 'because it aims at the fulfilment of its Idea, or because it aspires to a goal from which it retrospectively derives its meaningful unity, but quite simply a function of a process of real universalization' (ibid.: 19). The universal, abstract presence of capitalism globally is always particular and concrete in its manifestations on the ground. It is these particular and concrete manifestations of global capitalism that people are responding to and learning about in the process of developing movements from below, as they start from their own situated engagement with this capitalist otherness. When activists grapple with local problems, learn and generate knowledge about the character of these processes, and, as suggested above, subject this knowledge to change and revision in their interaction with opponents and allies, they may also come to realize the objectively extra-local dimensions of these problems.

(IV) Social Movements and Social Worlds: Organic Crises and World Historical Movements

What follows from our approach to social movements as coming both from above and from below is a notion of *social structure as the sediment of social movement struggles*. An extant social organization of human practice – a society - can be conceived of as a "truce line" between collective actors from above and below, with inherent antagonisms and contradictions that may give rise to new rounds of contestation and struggle that may engender new processes of change in this social organization. In this section we outline some concepts that allow us to grapple with these processes of change.

Organic Crises as Catalytic Moments

Such rounds of contestation and struggle will tend to take place between movement from above and below in the context of what Gramsci called 'organic crisis'. What we suggest is that organic crises be thought of as catalytic moments where an extant social organization of human practice - itself an outcome of past struggles over historicity - moves from relative stability to thoroughgoing volatility where new struggles for control over historicity unfold. The truce lines of the past give way to open articulation of the antagonisms and contradictions that they once held in check; spaces of contention and terrains of struggle emerge where social movements from above and below clash over the direction of the imminent changes in the social organization of human practice. These are ultimately struggles between hegemonic projects for the future development of the social organization of human practice.

World Historical Movements – From Above and Below

The social movement projects from below that emerge in times of organic crisis can be thought of as the terrain of what Katsiaficas (1987) calls 'world-historical movements'. With this term he refers to '[p]eriods of crises and turmoil *on a global scale*' that are 'relatively rare in history'. He identifies 'a handful of such periods of global eruptions', namely the

movements of 1776-1789, 1848, 1905, 1917, and 1968 (ibid.: 6, 18). Now, what is it that qualifies these movements as being 'world-historical'?

> In each of these periods, global upheavals were spontaneously generated. In a chain reaction of insurrections and revolts, new forms of power emerged in opposition to the established order, and new visions of the meaning of freedom were formulated in the actions of millions of people. Even when these movements were unsuccessful in seizing power, immense adjustments were necessitated both within and between nation states, and the defeated movements offered revealing glimpses of the newly developed nature of society and the new kinds of class struggles which were to follow (ibid.: 6).

Katsiaficas' perspective engages with those movements that erupt and ascend from below to challenge the extant social system. However, our perspective entails that both social movements from above and social movements from below move in the spaces of contention that open up through organic crises, and, furthermore, that their roles may be both offensive and defensive. Social movements from above may be defensive in that they seek to defend social structures and power relations that underpin a social order that serves the interests of hegemonic social groups. However, they may also be understood as being offensive when they set out to change social structures that bear the imprint of the victories of social movements from below, i.e. social structures that constrain the power of hegemonic groups. Similarly, social movements from below can be understood as being defensive when they seek to defend the outcomes of their own past victories, while they are on the offensive when they set out to challenge the hegemony of dominant social groups.

The Contingency of Crises and Contention

One last point need to be made. Organic crises are *contingent conjunctures*; the outcome of the struggles that emerge cannot be foretold. Rather, what emerges from the space of contention that has emerged depends on the dynamic of the struggles as such. As a particular movement project gradually attains hegemony - i.e. wins partial and/or total victories - this space is constrained and narrowed down. The attainment of a greater or lesser extent of hegemony creates a greater or lesser extent of 'path dependency', in that a certain kind of direction is given to the changes in the social organization of human practice which in turn excludes alternative possibilities.

(V) Conclusion:

Social Movements From Above and Below – The Current Conjuncture

The current conjuncture, we argue, is one of organic crisis and contention between emergent world historical movements from above and below. From above, there is the project of neoliberal restructuring. From below a 'movement of movements' for global social justice is in the process of crystallizing. In what follows, we offer a brief and broad-brushed sketch of this scenario.

The Crisis of Organized Capitalism and the Emergence of Neoliberal Restructuring

The late 1960s and early 1970s marked the onset of a profound crisis in the social structure of accumulation commonly referred to as 'organized capitalism' (see, e.g., Lash and Urry 1987). The golden age of capitalism that had lasted since the end of WWII crumbled:

> 'By the end of the 1960s [organized capitalism] experienced cracks in its foundations and began to fall apart under conditions of stagnant production, declining productivity, and intensified class conflict over higher wages, greater social benefits and better working conditions. These conditions created a profit-crunch on invested capital' (Petras and Veltmeyer 2001: 14; see also Armstrong, Glyn and Harrison 1984 and Harvey 1990).

Simultaneously, the advanced capitalist state and the social compact that underpinned it faced a loss of legitimacy. From below, this was evident in the global uprisings of 1968 (Katsiaficas 1987; Arrighi, Hopkins and Wallerstein 1989; Wainwright 1994). From above, a "New Right" crystallized around a political project that sought to vindicate the liberal economic doctrines of Hayek, Von Mises and Friedman that had been marginalized by the hegemony of Keynesianism (see Harvey 2003: 157; see also

Holloway 1995, Bonefeld 1995, and De Angelis 2000a).

In the face of economic stagnation and loss of legitimacy, social democracy generally resorted to its conventional strategy of stimulating demand through such measures as increased public spending and credit expansion. This strategy staved off the crisis temporarily, but by the mid- and late 1970s, it was clear that the crisis was of a structural rather than conjunctural character and that the tried-and-tested crisis management of social democracy were insufficient to address this structural crisis (Bonefeld 1995, Cappelen et. al. 1990). By this time, the uprisings of 1968 had waned and assumed the character of a 'war of position' as opposed to a 'war of manoeuvre' (Cox 2002). From the space of contention that opened up in the 1960s, the New Right emerged as a social movement from above capable of implementing and giving direction to a process of change in the social organization of human practice that centred on a project of global neoliberal restructuring.

The politics of monetarism revolved around curbing public expenditure, tax-cuts, wage-freezes and so on – it was a call for 'a return of the market' and its rationale can be explained as follows:

> … capitalist reproduction depended on a deflationary integration of labour into the capital relation so as to reduce the ratio of debt to surplus value through an effective exploitation of labour. In other words, money has to command labour for the purpose of exploitation rather than keeping unproductive producers afloat through an inflationary expansion of credit … The regaining of control over the money supply involves a deflationary attack on social relations through the intensification of work and a reduction in public spending that put money into the hands of workers (Bonefeld, 1995: 45).

Monetarism represented a direct effort to restructure the organization of accumulation that defined organized capitalism – the rise of monetarism, then, was the emergence of a social movement from above to dismantle organized capitalism yet 'contain social reproduction within the limits of its capitalist form' (ibid.: 49). In the United States, Australia, New Zealand and Western Europe,

this process was spearheaded in the 1980s by conservative parties, the epitomes of which are of course Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher (see, e.g., Piven and Cloward 1982 and Jessop et. al. 1988). During the nineties, reformed social democratic parties – "New Labour" – appeared at the helm of the project of restructuring (see, e.g., Jessop n.d., Hay 1999, and Watkins 2004). Neoliberalism assumed a global character through the imposition of structural adjustment programmes by the World Bank and the IMF in the post-colonial world; firstly on African and Latin American countries in the 1980s, and then on crucial Asian economies such as India (early 1990s) and South Korea and Thailand (late 1990s) (see, e.g., Cheru 1989, Green 1995, Petras and Veltmeyer 1997, Ghosh and Chandrasekhar 2000, Corbridge and Harriss 2000). The collapse of Stalinism opened up the economies of Eastern Europe to restructuring by "shock therapy" (Gowan 1995).

At the dawn of the twentieth century, the process of neoliberal restructuring had given rise to an epochal shift in towards 'global capitalism' characterized by 'the rise of transnational capital and the supersession of the nation-state as the axis of world development' (Robinson 2003: 12; see also Robinson 2001 and 2004). The epoch of global capitalism emerged through a process of 'intensive expansion' in which 'those cultural and political institutions that fettered capitalism are swept aside, paving the way for the total commodification … of social life worldwide' (Robinson 2001: 159). This process has been designated by David Harvey (2003: ch. 4) as 'accumulation by dispossession' – a contemporary form of 'primitive accumulation' where social, ecological, cultural, and intellectual "commons" are commodified 'and brought within the capitalist logic of accumulation' (ibid.: 146). This unfettering has altered the power relations between capital and labour:

The liberation of transnational capital from the constraints and commitments placed on it by the social forces in the nation-state phase of capitalism has dramatically altered the balance of forces among classes and social groups in each nation of the world and at a global level towards a transnational capitalist class and its agents (Robinson 2003: 37).

The restoration of the power of capital over labour is evident in sense that the mechanisms through which the process of accumulation by dispossession is effected have been redistributive rather than generative: while economic growth during the 1980s and 1990s fell far behind the average rates of the 1960s and 1970s, such mechanisms as privatization, financialization, crisis management and manipulations, and state redistributions have increased the incomes and decreased the expenditures of capital and, vice versa, decreased the incomes and increased the expenditures of labour (Harvey 2004: 27-34). The outcome? A world where Bill Gates, the Walton Family of Wal-Mart fame and the Sultan of Brunei were worth the combined national income of the 36 least developed countries of the world (Callinicos 2000: 1).

Making Another World Possible: The Emergence of the Movement of Movements

The recent cycle of protests against the summit meetings of the transnational capitalist class and the transnational state – Seattle, Quebec, Prague, Gothenburg, Genoa – and the creation of spaces and networks of communication between the many movements that animate these protests – the WSF and its regional progenies, People's Global Action, Via Campesina – has signalled to the world that neoliberalism will not proceed uncontested. A slogan such as "Our World is Not for Sale" testifies to a refusal to submit to the intensive expansion of capitalism, while "Another World is Possible" constitutes an insistence that alternative ways of socially organizing human practice are within reach. Klein has labelled the former refusal as resistance to 'the privatization of every aspect of life, and the transformation of every activity and value into a commodity' which amounts to 'a radical reclaiming of the commons' (2001: 82). Sousa Santos (2003) conceives of the latter insistence as a 'critical utopia'. The utopian dimension consists, basically, in rejecting the 'conservative utopia' of neoliberalism and 'its radical denial of alternatives to present-day reality' and 'in claiming the existence of alternatives to neoliberal globalization' (ibid.: 6, 7).

In order to understand why resistance to global neoliberal capitalism can rightly be referred to as a 'movement of movements', we need to understand how 'the spontaneity of Seattle was a long time coming' (Wilkin 2000: 42; see also Broad and Heckscher 2003). Whereas the transnational capitalist class was able to implement and consolidate neoliberal restructuring as a hegemonic project of global reach from the late 1970s to the 1990s, this does not mean that subaltern social groups merely acquiesced to this process. Throughout much of the postcolonial world, structural adjustment programmes were met by protests since their very inception in the mid-1970s:

> During the decade or so from the mid-1970s to the late 1980s, a veritable wave of more-or-less spontaneous popular protests engulfed those countries, mainly in the Second and Third Worlds, in which austerity measures had been adopted as part of structural adjustment and economic reform programmes – often under pressure from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank – which forced rapid economic liberalisation and the dismantling of many forms of state control, state intervention and state subsidy. The characteristic form of protest was the 'bread riot', although this combined in many instances with other forms of protest and struggle (Seddon and Dwyer 2002: 1).

Similarly, deindustrialization and the direct attack on labour through the casualization of work was met by militant strike action in Europe and the USA in the 1980s and 1990s. This being said, we need to recognize how these were essentially defensive struggles. The IMF riots sought to defend and retain the moral economy of the developmental state, i.e. a social compact between state elites and (primarily) urban groups where the state elites garnered support through various welfare policies (Walton and Seddon 1994: ch.2). Similarly, Massimo De Angelis argues about labour struggles in the 1980s:

> In the countries of the North … at first, neoliberal strategies were met with the resistance of social subjects whose main socio-economic characteristics and political/organizational imaginary were typical of the class composition of the Keynesian era. These struggles were mostly reactive in nature and mainly defensive of rights and entitlements threatened by the new neoliberal policies (2000b: 14).

What has changed? As essentially defensive movements, the IMF riots and strike waves of the 1980s and 1990s had found it hard to move beyond militant particularisms. Even sectoral campaigns were hard to sustain, let alone social movement projects. The actual social movement projects of those years, growing out of the "new social movements" (see e.g. Antunes et al. 1990), came from very different places, and ones which were still marginal to the traditional structures, organisations and languages of the largest movements.

This is not simply to say that the IMF riots and strike waves were mistaken in their ideologies. As defensive movements from below, they found themselves defending a moral economy whose practical basis was being cut from under their feet by capitalist restructuring. That in itself did not mean that the victory of capital was a foregone conclusion. However, the truce line implied by that moral economy had already proved intolerable for many movements from below during the 1960s and 1970s. Thus, within the context of organic crisis, once capital had won the essential battle about the direction of social change, subsequent attempts to reconstruct a political alliance in defence of Keynesianism were highly unlikely to succeed. The process of "disorganisation" (Lash and Urry 1987) was too far gone at this point.

The new movements of the 1960s and 1970s had highlighted popular discontent with Fordist society, a discontent which they were not initially successful in channelling and which was drawn on by the ideologues of the New Right (Wainwright 1994) in the construction of a popular base for monetarist policies. It is only with the emergence of the movement of movements that it has become possible to construct a new social movement project from below, not in defence of Fordism but in an attempt to take that popular discontent – whether it be a rejection of organised capitalism or of the developmental state – on board.

This has involved a number of processes. Firstly, the development of new militant particularisms and their coming together around new campaigns (e.g. over landlessness, in opposition to dam projects, in opposition to the MAI or NAFTA, etc.) Secondly, the construction of a new political subject in bringing movements that previously opposed each other together. This has been achieved, more than anything, by the omnipresent forces of neo-liberalism, which have forced together movements that twenty years ago still had the luxury of not seeing one another as allies. Since a return to Fordism is no longer a serious option, movements are freer to think in broad terms – and to raise the stakes in terms of their own movement processes.

Another way of putting this is that in the process of articulating new demands (moving from militant particularisms to campaigns) movements from below have created a space where isolated defensive struggles have been able to come together into one offensive struggle: one which no longer takes the terms of reference of Fordism for granted, but which (because of neo-liberalism's success in erasing those terms of reference) has been forced into defining new, and more radical, goals than were possible for most movements of the 1980s. As Gill writes:

> Thus, the battles in Seattle may link to new patterns of political agency and a movement that goes well beyond the politics of identity and difference: it has gender, race and class aspects. It is connected to issues of ecological and social reproduction, and of course, to the question of democracy. This is why more than 700 organisations and between 40,000-60,000 people – principally human rights activists, labour activists, indigenous people, representatives of churches, industrial workers, small farmers, forest activists, environmentalists, social justice workers, students, and teachers – all took part collectively in the protests against the Third Ministerial on 30 November 1999 … **In this regard, the effectiveness of the protest movements may well lie in a new confidence gained as particular struggles come to be understood in terms of a more general set of interconnections between problems and movements worldwide** (2000: 138; emphasis added).

That movement now represents a social movement project grounded in a self-identification around diversity and human need; in naming neo-liberalism or global capitalism as the common enemy, and in a clear identification that the struggle is about the whole of global society. The outcomes of those struggles will have a determining effect on what it means to live on planet Earth in the 21st century.

Bibliography

Ahmad, A. (1998): "The Communist Manifesto in its Own Time, and in Ours", pp. 14-47 in Karat, P. (ed.): *A World to Win,* Delhi, Leftword Books

Allen, R. (2004): *No global*, London, Pluto

Allen, R. and Jones, T. (1990): *Guests of the nation*, London, Earthscan

Antunes, C. et al (1990): *Für eine grüne Alternative in Europa*, Hamburg, Argument

Armstrong, P., Glyn, A. and Harrison, J. (1984): *Capitalism since 1945,* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Arrighi, G., Hopkins, T. and Wallerstein, I. (1989): *Anti-Systemic Movements*, London, Verso.

Barker, C. (2004): "Talk and power: oppositional discourse in two meetings", manuscript

Barker, C. and Cox, L. (2002): "What Have the Romans Ever Done for Us?", online at www.iol.ie/~mazzoldi/toolsforchange/afpp/afpp8.html

Bensaid, D. (2002): *Marx for our Times,* London, Verso

Bonefeld, W. (1995): "Monetarism and Crisis", pp. 35-68 in Bonefeld, W. and Holloway, J. (eds.): *Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money*, Basingstoke, Macmillan

Broad, R. and Heckscher, Z. (2003): "Before Seattle", pp. 713-728 in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 4

Callinicos, A. (2000): *Equality*, Cambridge, Polity

Cheru, F. (1989): *The Silent Revolution in Africa*, London, Zed Books

 Corbridge, S, and Harris, J. (2000): *Reinventing India*, Cambridge, Polity

Cox, L. (1998): 'Gramsci, Movements and Method', online at www.iol.mazzoldi/toolsforchange/afpp/afpp4.html

Cox, L. (1999): *Building Counter Culture*, unpublished PhD dissertation, Trinity College, Dublin

Cox, L. (2001): "Barbarian Resistance and Rebel Alliances", online at www.iol.ie/~mazzoldi/toolsforchange/rev/empire.html

De Angelis, M. (2000): "Globalization, New Internationalism and the Zapatistas, pp. 9-35 in *Capital and Class* # 70.

De Angelis, M. (2000b): *Keynesianism, Social Conflict, and Political Economy*, Basingstoke, Macmillan

Fagerberg, J., Cappelen, Å, Mjøset, L. and Skarstein, R. (1990): "The Decline of Social Democratic State Capitalism in Norway", *New Left Review* 181, May/June 1990

Ghosh, J. and Chandrasekhar, C. P. (2000): *Crisis as Conquest*, London, Sangam Books

Gill, S. (2000): "Towards a Postmodern Prince?", pp. 131-140 in *Millennium*, Vol. 29, No 1

Gordon, D., Edwards, R. and Reich, M. (1994): "Long Swings and Stages of Capitalism", pp. 11-28 in Kotz, D., McDonough, T. and Reich, M. (eds.): *Social Structures of Accumulation*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP

Gowan, P. (1995): 'Neo-Liberal Theory and Practice for Eastern Europe', *New Left Review* 213, Sept/Oct 1995, 3-60

Gramsci, A. (1998): *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, London, Lawrence and Wishart

Green, D. (1995): *Silent Revolution,* London, Latin America Bureau

Hall, S. (1989): "Politics and Letters", in Eagleton, T. (ed.): *Raymond Williams*, Cambridge, Polity

Harvey, D. (1990): *The Condition of Postmodernity,* Oxford, Blackwell

Harvey, D. (1996): *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference,* Oxford, Blackwell

Harvey, D. (2000): *Spaces of Hope,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh UP

Harvey, D. (2003): *The New Imperialism,* Oxford, Oxford UP

Harvey, D. (2004): "Neo-Liberalism and the Restoration of Class Power", online at www.sum.uio.no/research/changing_attitudes/humanism/harvey080604.pdf

Hay, C. (1999): *The Political Economy of New Labour*, Manchester, Manchester UP

Holloway, J. (1995): "The Abyss Opens", pp. 69-91 in Bonefeld, W. and Holloway, J. (eds.):

Global Capital, National State and the Politics of Money, Basingstoke, Macmillan

Jessop, B. (n.d.): "From Thatcherism to New Labour: Neo-Liberalism, Workfarism, and Labour Market Regulation", unpublished manuscript.

Jessop, B., Bonnett, K., Bromley, S., and Ling, T. (1988): *Thatcherism,* Cambridge, Polity

Katsiaficas, G. (1987): *The Imagination of the New Left*, Boston, South End Press

Klein, N. (2001): "Reclaiming the Commons", pp. 81-89 in *New Left Review* 9

Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1989): *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Cambridge, Polity

Lichterman, P. (1996): *The Search for Political Community*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP

Löwy, Michael (2003): *The theory of revolution in the young Marx,* Leiden, Brill

Lukács, Georg (1971): *History and class consciousness*, London, Merlin

McNally, D. (2001): *Bodies of Meaning*, New York, SUNY Press

Moore, D. S. (1998): "Subaltern Struggles and the Politics of Place", pp. 1-38 in *Cultural Anthropology*, 13 (3)

Nilsen, A. G. (2003): "Authors and Actors of their Own Drama", unpublished manuscript

Nilsen, A.G. (2004): "Collective Remembering and Struggles over Meaning", paper for "Imagining Social Movements" conference, Edge Hill

Petras, J. and Veltmeyer, H. (2001): *Globalization Unmasked*, Delhi, Madhyam Books

Piven, F.F. and Cloward, R. A. (1977): *Poor people's movements,* New York, Vintage

Piven, F. F. and Cloward, R. A. (1982): *The New Class War*, New York, Pantheon Books.

Robinson, W. I. (2001): "Social Theory and Globalization", pp 157-200 in *Theory and Society* 30

Robinson, W. I. (2003): *Transnational Conflicts,* London, Verso

Robinson, W. I. (2004): *A Theory of Global Capitalism*, Baltimore, John Hopkins UP

Roseberry, W. (1996): "Hegemony, Power, and Languages of Contention", pp. 71-84 in

Wilmsen, E. N. and McAllister, P. (eds.): *The Politics of Difference,* Chicago, U. Chicago Press

Sarkar, S. (1997): *Writing Social History,* Delhi, Oxford UP

Scott, J. C. (1985): *Weapons of the Weak:,* New Haven, Yale UP

Scott, J. C. (1990): *Domination and the Arts of Resistance,* New Haven, Yale UP

Screpanti, E. (1999): "Capitalist Forms and the Essence of Capitalism", pp. 1-26 in *Review of International Political Economy*, Volume 6, No. 1

Seddon, D. and Dwyer, P. (2002): "Food Riots, Past and Present", paper for "Making Social Movements" conference, Edge Hill

Sklair, L. (1997): "Social Movements for Global Capitalism ", pp. 514-538 in *Review of International Political Economy*, 4:3

Sousa Santos, B. (2003): "The World Social Forum", online at www.ces.fe.uc.pt/bss/documentos/wsf.pdf

Thompson, E. P. (1993): *Customs in common,* Harmondsworth, Penguin

Touraine, A. (1981): *The Voice and the Eye,* Cambridge, Cambridge UP

Touraine, A. (1985): "An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements", pp. 749-787 in *Social Research* 52

Veltmeyer, H. and Petras, J. (1997): *Neoliberalism and Class Conflict in Latin Americ*, Basingstoke, Macmillan

Wainwright, H. (1994): *Arguments for a New Left,* Oxford, Blackwell

Walton, J. and Seddon, D. (1994): *Free Markets and Food Riots*, Oxford, Blackwell

Watkins, S. (2004): "A Weightless Hegemony", pp. 5-33 in *New Left Review* 25

Wilkin, P. (2000): "Solidarity in the Global Age", pp. 20-65*, Journal of World Systems Research*, Vol. VI, 1

Williams, R. (1989): *Resources of Hope,* London, Verso

Ytterstad, A. (2004): *SVTs Uppdrag Granskning og Gøteborgsprotestene 2001*, unpublished Master's Thesis, Institute of Media Studies, University of Oslo.