GLOBAL MOVEMENTS IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD SYSTEM:

OCCUPY WALL STREET AND THE WORLD SOCIAL FORUM

By

Loren Collins

A Thesis Presented to

The Faculty of Humboldt State University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Sociology

Committee Membership

Dr. Sing Chew, Committee Chair

Dr. Anthony Silvaggio, Committee Member

Dr. Alison Holmes, Committee Member

Dr. Meredith Williams, Program Graduate Coordinator

May 2017

ABSTRACT

GLOBAL MOVEMENTS IN THE CAPITALIST WORLD SYSTEM: OCCUPY
WALL STREET AND THE WORLD SOCIAL FORUM

Loren Collins

Over the past forty years, the information revolution, a neoliberal agenda and
globalizing financial markets have led to a quantitative increase in accumulation,
widening inequalities throughout the globe. This widening inequality has cast doubt on
the legitimacy of a world system governed primarily by the invisible hand of the free
market. Economic power has taken priority over political power in determining the
nature of social relations and our institutions. This imbalance has opened the door for
resistance movements to challenge a system that fails to represent the interests of the vast
majority of the world's population while it benefits a smaller and smaller subset. While
capitalism has undergone shifts on a global scale, social movements and resistance to
capital have undergone a shift of their own. Movements have begun to come together to
confront global capitalism, identifying this contest as the central conflict of our age.
These global movements are reclaiming the public sphere and places held in "common,"
raising a clear ideological challenge to the neoliberalism, uniting across varied agendas,
and networking at the local, national and international levels. "The Occupy Wall Street"
Movement and the "World Social Forum" provide pertinent case studies in the potential

these global movements have to challenge the powers that be and to articulate an

alternative vision for globalization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For this thesis, I owe a level of gratitude to many that can barely be represented here. To Professor Sing Chew who nurtured an interest and passion for theory and world systems that carried through from my time as an undergrad to the submission of this thesis, and well beyond into my lifelong pursuit of learning. To Professor Anthony Silvaggio who provided insights on social movements and gave his time for a student who he had never seen before this project, your generous trust and commitment has been paramount. To Professor Meredith Williams-Teale, graduate studies coordinator and friend, who settled my concerns, arranged my timeline and always made yourself available for every question or concern. To Professor Alison Holmes, your insight into globalization and perspective from outside Sociology was certainly valuable but your insight into myself, this process, and your questions helped me come to peace with my own place in these theories and my studies; I am lucky to count you as a friend.

To Larry, Austin and Kathy who helped me as close friends and provided insight, support, and a nurturing of my passions, drive to learn and to articulate clearly. To my Dad and Patti, who first taught me to read, really read, and to question everything, you were the first intellectuals I met. My mother who always believed in me. Most importantly, to my family and household, including Geneva, who was always there to listen. Alexis, Klara and Emma, above all, I would have never done this without you, couldn't have done it without you, and certainly did this because of you; you are the heart of everything I do and you truly inspire and challenge me to grow in every way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

In an address at Yale University Immanuel Wallerstein (2014), the originator of

World Systems Theory, stated "there have always been historical systems in which some

relatively small group exploited the others." He went on to to say "that the modern world-

system, which came into existence in the long sixteenth century in the form of a capitalist

world-economy, has been extremely effective in extracting surplus-value from the large

majority of the populations within it." When Wallerstein first began his research on the

world system in the 1970s, the world market was just beginning to undergo a shift that

would drastically increase its effectiveness in extracting value from the world's

population at a more intense rate. As national markets across the globe became

integrated into a truly global economy, wealth and resources have been concentrated into

the hands of fewer and fewer individuals and the economic divide between those with

means and those without has increased to the point of crisis.

USA Today reported in 2014 that almost half the world's wealth is in the hands of

a mere one percent of the world's population with a total worth that amounts to $110

trillion dollars (the world's total wealth is estimated to be $241 trillion). Oxfam, a

charity based in the United Kingdom, published a study "Working for the Few" that

demonstrates the widening gap between the world's wealthy and its poor. According to

their report, over the last thirty years "seven out of ten people have been living in

countries where economic inequalities have increased" and that the "bottom half" of the

world's population has about the same amount of money as the richest 85 individuals on the globe. The report goes on to say that "the massive concentration of economic resources into the hands of fewer and fewer people presents a significant threat to inclusive political and economic systems." This global trend has gone nearly unchallenged by the political institutions in which the world's population has placed its trust (Hjelmgaard 2014).

By the time of Wallerstein's address at Yale in 2014, he was able, from the hindsight afforded to one late in their career, to speak to this increased exploitation and the reaction this process has provoked. He asserts that movements against and reactions to capitalism have always been present but that in our current time, the same advancements that contributed to the increased power of capital have also contributed to the ability of social movements to challenge that power. In the same approximate period of 40 years that capitalism has shifted and inequality has deepened, social movements have undergone significant changes in response. As capitalism has advanced through technology and increasingly globalized markets, social movements have learned to harness the power of that technology and increase their own global trajectory.

From the 1960s onward, a variety of theorists have explored the nature of resistance to the modern capitalist system and what they identified as new forms that resistance has taken. They found innovation in feminist, anti-racist, anti-globalization, anti-capitalist, and de-colonization movements. Theorists who focused on anti-globalization, decolonization, and anti-capitalist movements were especially drawn to the

1999 "Battle for Seattle" and the World Social Forum which began in 2001. For many of these theorists, the "Great Recession" of 2008 signaled a long awaited, undeniable crisis of legitimacy within the world system. The financial collapse provoked the permeating and underlying sense that economic and political stability are under genuine threat from the imbalance between the will of the people and the current vision of a global free market. This imbalance was made clearer by the response of many governments to the crisis with their simultaneous enactment of austerity measures toward public services and bailouts for large corporations. According to the same Oxfam report of 2014, as a result of how the 2008 financial crisis was handled, the wealthiest one percent of Americans "captured 95% of post-financial crisis growth since 2009, while the bottom 90% became poorer." The implicit social contract had been forgotten and inequality had finally reached an apex that demanded a response.

The Occupy Wall Street Movement and growing viability of the World Social Forum offer two relevant case studies on the form resistance to power has taken in recent decades. This thesis is an historical analysis of the quantitative and qualitative shift in global capitalism, the crisis of legitimacy it has created, and the response to this crisis offered by the Occupy Movement and the World Social Forum. The assertion here is that these global trends can best be understood by drawing from a number of key theorists. Michael Mann's (1986) framework of the sources of social power suggest that the ruling structures in our society are built upon four interacting sources of social power and that these sources ebb and flow over time. This thesis borrows heavily from Mann's theory

on the sources of social power and seeks to apply his model by asserting that these sources of power are currently, significantly out of balance. Capitalism is no stranger to this kind of ebb and flow and the struggle to balance the sources of social power, but global trends over the past forty years have affected government and market structures and their ability to re-balance these social powers. Intervention is proving to be increasingly more difficult even as it becomes more critical.

This historical analysis of the capitalist world-system and the resistance demonstrated through Occupy Wall Street and the World Social Forum will draw extensively on four theorists in pursuit of an explanation as to why this imbalance has occurred and the features of the crisis in terms of inequality and illegitimacy this imbalance has created: Manuel Castells (2011), Bill Robinson (2004; 2014), Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2001; 2005; 2009). Castells, Hardt and Negri will also offer foundational frameworks for understanding the nature of the resistance demonstrated in the two case studies to follow while the work of a fifth primary theorist, Jackie Smith (2007; 2008; 2013), will provide the foundation for understanding how these two case studies represent global movements as offering alternative visions of globalization.

CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Globalization has been a source of confusion and contention in public discourse for quite some time. In more recent decades, the establishment of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the increasing influence of long-standing global organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank (WB) have raised serious domestic concerns over the future of national industries and the role of nation-states in a global economy. The 1999 Battle for Seattle, in which activists from around the world protested at a meeting of the WTO, is just one example of the discord and discontent raised over competing views of the outcomes of globalization. While these protestors were labeled "anti-globalist," their understanding of globalization and resulting policy positions were often more complex. Many were seeking ways to alter the path to globalization rather than trying to avoid it altogether (Vidal 1999).

Globalization is not just a source of contention for industry and activists, it is also a source of contention among economists and social scientists throughout the academy. Many theorists have sought to define and analyze globalization in terms of the roles of economic integration, technological advancement, international relations, social movements and international governance. The debates in those areas of research have been both lively and persistent in recent decades. The role of capitalism as the basis of

the world system and acts of resistance toward the widespread inequalities engendered by the global capitalist system are central to these debates.

The Occupy Wall Street (OWS) and the World Social Forum (WSF) movements that began in 2011 and 2001, respectively, are responses to aspects of globalization that are driven by an increasingly globalized, capitalist system. "Another world is needed, together it is possible" (Anon n.d.) and "we are the 99%" (Castells 2015) became the monikers that identify these movements as key to an alternative view of globalization. These movements have a shared catalyst in the structural crisis and inequalities perpetuated by what some theorists see as a new epoch of capitalism in a global system that gives ultimate primacy to market forces in determining the nature of our institutions and social relations.

This chapter will provide the theoretical framework for understanding the global capitalist system and the movements it has provoked, beginning with an outline of the theoretical basis of power and drawing on Michael Mann's analysis of the four sources of social power. The chapter will provide a foundation for how capitalism as a system exercises power. The work of Immanuel Wallerstein will form the basis for an explanation of capitalism as a world system, and combined with Bill Robinson, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, the chapter will address the capitalist world system of this new era. These works will be used to demonstrate a quantitative and qualitative transformation in the world system with the rise of the Transnational Capitalist Class (TCC), the Transnational Capitalist State (TNS), and the embodiment of the global

capitalist system as "Empire." Such changes have led to the ultimate primacy of market forces in determining the nature of globalization and social organization. The work of William Connolly, Michael Mann, and David Harvey suggest that this structural transformation coupled with the rise of a neoliberal ideology has reinforced the power of the market throughout every aspect of our existence in the world system.

The global power that results from the globalization process provokes a response identified by Michel Foucault (1990) when he observed: "Where there is power there is resistance." The inequalities and inconsistencies pervasive throughout this latest period of transformation into new forms of global capitalism have given rise to all kinds of social resistance. A brief survey of the study of social movements by theorists such as Manuel Castells, Jurgen Habermas and Alaine Touraine outline how the emergence of these social movements provide the resistance to the capitalist world system. These three theorists provide a context for the more recent work of Jackie Smith on global movements and will also be explored. In this regard, Smith sees these social movements, such as the Occupy Wall Street Movement and the World Social Forum, as global movements capable of contending with the forces of global capital, and in the process, constructing alternative views of globalization that go beyond the neoliberal model.

Power and Social Organization

Understanding capitalism is not just about understanding the distribution of resources and wealth; it is about power. Sociologists often take the position that Capitalist

society is built upon laws and norms that protect the accumulation of capital and the pursuit of surplus wealth. Michael Mann (1986) sees society as structured by organized power networks. In his view, the question of ultimate primacy or determinacy directs us to the sources of social power and the organization of those powers. Although he acknowledges that societies are messy and ultimate primacy must be attributed to a combination of factors in the evolution of society, the sources of power itself must be among the most important elements of any consideration of that primacy.

Building on the work of Max Weber, Mann (1986) defines power "in its most general sense…as the ability to pursue and obtain goals through the mastery of one's environment." Social power adds "mastery over other people,"as in carrying out one's will despite resistance. Drawing from Talcott Parsons (1960), Mann notes that collective power speaks to the ability of "persons in cooperation" enhancing their "joint power over third parties or over nature." This collective power leads to "social organization and a division of labor." This speaks to the beginnings of social stratification and complex systems that handle distributive power (p. 6).

Mann (1986) offers a matrix, shown in Table I, to classify four kinds of societies based on organized power structures. On one axis he places extensive vs. intensive power while on the other lies authoritative vs. diffused. Extensive power speaks to "the ability to organize large numbers of people over far-flung territories in order to engage in minimally stable cooperation." Intensive power on the other hand speaks to tight organization and a "high level of commitment from participants." Authoritative power is

control "willed by groups and institutions" and comprised of "definite commands and conscious obedience." Diffused power is "spontaneous, unconscious, decentered," and spreads throughout a population "resulting in similar social practices that embody power relations" without "explicitly" commanding it (Mann 1986; 7-9).

Table 1: Societies as Organized Power Networks

	Authoritative	Diffused
Intensive	Army Command Structure	General Strike
Extensive	Militaristic Empire	Market Exchange

The rise of capitalism brought about a system of power and social organization centered around accumulation, resulting in new social relations pertaining to the distribution of power and allocation of resources. Capitalist power is both intensive and diffused, pervading the very foundations of institutions throughout our society. The resulting organization, division of labor, and structures become the basis whereby a "few at the top can keep the masses at the bottom compliant" by institutionalizing control through laws and norms. Evoking the words of Adam Smith, Mann states "the principal power in a market is an 'Invisible Hand' constraining all, yet not controlled by any single human agency." (Mann 1986:6-8).

To understand the extent to which capitalist social forces exercise power throughout the world system and to understand the assertions of our primary theorists in regards to global capitalism, it would help to understand Michael Mann's (2013) four "sources of social power": ideological, economic, military, and political. These four sources synthesize very nicely with the theoretical framework, outlined below, regarding the important changes wrought by neoliberalism and global capitalism. According to Mann, these four sources interact, both complementing and competing with each other, in a web that addresses the question of ultimate primacy in determining social organization.

Ideological power refers to the need to "find ultimate meaning in life, to share norms and values, and to participate in aesthetic and ritual practices with others." This source of power speaks to culture, belief systems, religion and identity as powerful sources of motivation and control. Economic power is the harnessing of resources from nature through collective industry. Capitalism, accordingly, is our era's means to "extract, transform, distribute, and consume the produce of nature." According to Mann, "capitalism has been the most consistently dynamic power organization in recent times, responsible for most technological innovation – and most environmental degradation." Military power is the "social organization of concentrated, lethal violence." This is "most lethally wielded by the armed forces of states in interstate wars," and as such has an "obvious overlap" with political power. Political power is the "centralized and territorial regulation of social life." Governments provide order, rule of law, sanctioned

use of violence, and other institutions to regulate social relations on a territorial basis.
(Mann 2013:1-2)

Mann (1986; 2013) views these sources of social power as in constant interaction,
with ebbs and flows or checks and balances, as the powers work together to shape
society. Borrowing from his theories and synthesizing them with those of world systems
theorists and theorists of the global capitalist system, it could be argued that global capital
has come to extend its influence and control by elevating economic power above all the
other sources of social power. As a result, it has subordinated ideological, military and
political power to the economy. In response, global movements seek to challenge
economic power through political and ideological means, to take back some semblance of
primacy and give it to the democratic process. Before considering global movements and
their efforts against the priority that is given to market forces, we must consider how the
modern world-system under capitalism has developed. Wallerstein's world-systems
analysis provides the basis for understanding the modern capitalist world-economy.

<p align="center">The Capitalist World System</p>

As is the case with many theorists, Immanuel Wallerstein (1979) places the
beginning of the capitalist world-system in Europe during the sixteenth century. With the
transition from feudalism to capitalism, the "endless accumulation of capital" became the
"underlying objective" of those in power (Wallerstein 2011). Prior to capitalism, power
was held in the capital center of empire. After the rise of capitalism, it was diffused

through the market economy. With the establishment of nation-states, capitalism quickly became the organizing force behind a system comprised of competing nations with varied powers, interconnected in the world system through market interactions and interdependency. Core nations collectively hold the most power, benefiting from unequal exchange with periphery nations. Traditionally, core nations acquire resources at low cost to produce commodities to be sold at higher cost. This leads to accumulation and surplus among capitalists in core nations and greater levels of need and poverty in peripheral nations. A semi-periphery of rising nations occupies a place in between. Whereas the feudal system had been dominated at times by empires, the modern world system has at times been dominated by a hegemonic core state that exercises power through market forces. In the 17th century, the United Provinces (the Dutch) held this status, followed by Britain in the 19th century, and the United States in the 20th century. The western nations of the world together have occupied the core since the rise of the capitalist world-system. (Wallerstein 1979; Wallerstein 2011)

Wallerstein (1979) explains the nature of capitalism through "three antinomies: economy/polity; supply/demand; capital/labor." The antimony of economy and polity addresses the negotiations that occur between a global economic system based on market principles and forces and a political system that centers on state boundaries and relations. Supply is based on "market-oriented, 'individual' production decisions" and demand speaks to "'socially' determined" distributions of income. Capital depends on labor producing surplus while the accumulation of that surplus supersedes the need for labor.

These dichotomies produce inconsistencies and structural issues that at times demand correction to avoid collapse of the market or crises of legitimacy among the working class. As a result, struggles and anti-systemic movements have been prevalent in this system for quite some time. From the 16th through 18th centuries these conflicts centered mostly around remaining feudal systems coming in conflict with newer capitalist structures. From the 19th and 20th centuries these conflicts took the form of labor and class struggles and ultimately battles involving the ideologies of Marxism, socialism, and communism as opponents challenged the inherent contradictions and inequalities of the capitalist system. These conflicts occurred within cycles of growth and retraction and often coincided with alternating periods of war and peace, globalization and isolation.

Globalization and Capitalism

In his theory of global capitalism, Robinson (2004) conceptualizes four epochs of capitalism and attributes the first three to the description Wallerstein provided. The first epoch covers the birth of capitalism out of feudalism and "its initial outward expansion" around the time of Columbus. Mercantilism provided a sort of "primitive accumulation" that often found itself at odds with feudal systems. Robinson's second epoch includes the industrial revolution, the birth of the nation-state, and a rising capital class or the "bourgeoisie." The third epoch was the rise of corporate capitalism, monopolies, and a "world market" that integrated the nation state system. The rise of the finance industry, world wars, the end of classic empires, and the rise of socialist states also occurred within

this epoch. It can be argued that in the first three epochs of capitalism the strength of national governments was adequate, when pressed by labor movements and democratic efforts, to put economic power in check, as economic power had not yet taken priority over other sources of power in a global sense. The fourth and final epoch, however, brings us to the basis of Robinson's Global Capital theory, a new era of capitalism and globalization.

The term globalization was coined in the corporate world as early as the 1960's. According to Robinson (2004), it only began widespread use in the 1990's and has since caused divergence among various fields of study, and used in a variety of ways as a result. He classifies the term as an "essentially contested concept." Alison Holmes (2009), like Robinson, draws on the work of Sholte (2000) and provides a summary of Scholte's five conceptions of globalization: liberalization, internationalization, universalization, modernization, and deterritorialization. The three most relevant conceptualizations to the present study, and sociology as a whole, are liberalization, modernization, and deterritorialization. Liberalization speaks to the spread of democratic practices throughout the world. Modernization speaks, in sociological terms, to the rise of the industrial age through to the information age as manufacturing, finance, and exchange began to occur across the globe, instantaneously. Deterritorialization speaks to the decline of the role of the nation-state in view of global corporations, intergovernmental organizations, and the free flow of identity, culture, and ideology across the globe as more and more of the world embraces open trade and open borders.

Holmes (2009) demonstrates that globalization is not new; rather, it has occurred in phases throughout history with alternating periods of increased global interaction and periods of increased isolationism and nationalism. As we saw from world-systems theory, many of these periods coincide with periods of war and peace and capitalist expansion and recession. Robinson (2004) also acknowledges that globalization is the "continuation" of these "earlier historical processes but his stance on the debates about globalization focuses on what he sees to be a clear qualitative and quantitative difference in this epoch of the capitalist world system, what he now calls the "capitalist global system," distinguishing it from the three previous capitalist epochs.

The global information age

Castells (2010) tackles this new era of globalization by building on the work of Michael Piore and Charles Sabel (1984), in the assertion that about 40 years ago the world began moving from the industrial age into an interval, or a period of transformation that he calls the "information technology revolution." This led to a new pattern of organization of labor, production, and development. The new age has been coined the Information Age. Castells makes the point early in his work that he is not a technological determinist, but rather he sees the rise of technology and the loosening of the restraints on capitalism as two factors that converged to allow for the acceleration of the move into a new, information based economy in the 1980s. These two forces combined to lead to a drastic restructuring of our economy and our society on a rapidly globalizing scale.

These changes produced the conditions and opportunities for networks to become the predominant pattern of organization in terms of production.

Early in this interval, governments clearly saw the benefits and possibilities of new technology in terms of maintaining and securing an advantageous place in economic and power relationships on a global scale. This is where structure and inequality meet. "Digital Divide" is another turn of phrase, or adage, that circulates throughout the academy, the media, and common day language without much consideration of what it is really referring to. Castells is adept at revealing that a knowledge based economy depends on the technology that goes hand and hand with its production, operation, and distribution. Governments that had the means to see the direction the economy could go as a result of this transition and that could invest in the infrastructure to facilitate the production and distribution of information and knowledge quickly secured a dominant place in the new economy on a global scale.

Castells (2010) argues that our understanding of the global economy depends on two premises. First, dominance in the economy is no longer based on the accumulation of capital alone, but the capacity to work in real time across the globe and to access the ability to produce information. Technology, in Castells' view, did not drive this information revolution as the sole determining factor, but access to technology in the new economy did become necessary to gain any meaningful foothold in the new economic dynamics the revolution produced. The finance industry grew in tandem with the development of technology that made transactions global, and instantaneous. The digital

divide speaks of the regions and populations of the world that cannot even be considered players in the global economy because they have no point of access to these new systems. This often gave continuity to, and reinforced, the core-periphery relationship outlined in world systems theory.

Second, Castells (2010) challenges traditional economic and social theory by forging new ground in formulating the structure of the global economy and the networks involved in its formation. In the industrial age, the focus on the means of production led to the creation of a capitalist class that had acquired those means. This led to the rise of an elite that held its power in the form of capital for production and the replacement of the hereditary elite that held its power in the possession of land. In the agrarian age, land was the means of production, in the industrial age it was the factory, and in the information age it is information technology. In the information age, innovation and information itself, which had been the means to development in previous ages, was now the means of production, of development, and the product to be developed.

> My thesis is that the rise of the informational, global economy is characterized by the development of a new organizational logic which is related to the current process of technological change, but not dependent upon it. It is the convergence and interaction between a new technological paradigm and a new organizational logic that constitutes the historical foundation of the informational economy (Castells 2010:164)

The nature of information technology is evident in the structure of the internet; it is a network of interlinked and collaborative technology and hubs of information. The capital class in the new economy resembles these structures and as such is organized as a network system itself. Similar to Robinson's work on the rise of the transnational capital

class, as will be outlined below, Castells points to the rise of a networked class that works

across national and cultural divides. The days of the capitalist that seeks to own all the

means to their production are disappearing and the new paradigm is a collection of

innovators, entrepreneurs, and capitalists that are networked across borders and through

interlinking technology and pockets of information. The form this new system of

organization takes is flexible and adapts to each new context or market that it enters and

controls. No one company or organization could keep up with the level of development

necessary to operate unilaterally, they have to network and cooperate in order to compete.

> In such a context, cooperation is not only a way of sharing costs
> and resources, but also an insurance policy against a bad
> technological decision: the consequences of such a decision would
> also be suffered by the competitors since networks are ubiquitous
> and intertwined (Castells 2010:193).

Castells (2010) provides a history of the transition to this new paradigm by

tracing the de-regulation of capitalist markets and the development of new information

technology. In terms of this transition, the author points to all the openings this process

created for both new players who stepped into the global economy and some old players

who quickly sought to reinvent themselves as innovators in knowledge based economics

and within new global networks. "The network society cannot be understood without the

interaction between these two relatively autonomous trends: the development of new

information technologies and the old societies attempt to retool itself by using the power

of technology to serve the technology of power (Castells 2010:52)." It is not difficult to

see the ramifications and the tensions that this transition has had amongst the owners of

old capital, who have not adjusted and found a place in the new market, and those that are gaining a place within global networks. The conversations amongst conservative capitalists show division as nationalists fight for national businesses on the grounds of older models of protectionism while corporations and global capitalists continue to work towards what is best for those in the new, information based, global networks.

The digital divide based on access to information technology and a chance to compete in the knowledge based economy is not the only aspect of structural inequality that Castells addresses. Inequalities in the division of labor and the ability for different regions of the world to compete in the labor market are also deeply embedded in the structure of the new economy. High skilled labor has the capability of moving across borders even if their ability is not as great as the network of capitalists that employ them. Low skilled labor is at the bottom of the tier. It is no accident that high skilled workers are sought after in an information age while factory workers would have no dream of getting a visa to come work in an American factory. American factory workers are stuck in place and are fighting for local jobs while the low skilled labor forces in other nations are competing for industries to come to them. These foreign laborers also find themselves trapped in their own borders. Applying Mann's four sources of social power, this advantages economic power over political power, often regionally based, and leaves laborers without recourse as national policies cannot hold capital accountable on the global level.

Castells continues his examination of the phenomenon produced within the information based revolution by looking at the rise of global cities and the change in the make-up of the core, the periphery, and the relations between the two. Calling this concept "the space of flows," he asserts that new industrial spaces are organized around the flow of information. Smaller cities as the site for industrial production are on the decline as mass production is not involved in the production of the new commodity of information. The production of information involves a much more flexible process and can be produced through technology and network relationships from anywhere and between anywhere on the globe. These network components are everywhere and he has called them "electronic cottages," referring to the old cottage industry model that predated the industrial factory. Global cities however, such as Tokyo, Paris, London, and a special consideration for the Silicon Valley and places like Seattle, have become necessary metropolitan centers, or "technopoles," that are leading in innovation and are critical as hubs for network components throughout the globe.

By further updating traditional world-systems theory and bringing it into a fourth epoch, this explanation suggests that the core of the system is no longer bound by physical location, such as the core nation or the core city with the periphery surrounding it. Now everywhere, a periphery can exist next to or even within a core as the core occupies a space of flows rather than a physical location. Global cities, however, still emulate a somewhat spatial model as the key players in the global network occupy the center and the periphery of the cities serve from the surrounding areas; the reach of core

elite members extends beyond these physical spaces as their networks stretch across the globe. Even places that are outside these networks are affected by the decisions made within them. As Castells (2010) points out, time almost fades as global players can evoke instant responses in markets and societies all over the world. Thus, time itself is influenced by the flow. As we will see later, this begins to reveal the conception of an "Empire" that is not bound by space or national lines as in the case of the empires of old.

Castells (2010) offers a comprehensive and thoroughly researched examination of the rise of technology, the loosening of constraints on capitalism and the four-decade interval in which these autonomous forces converged. Although it is possible that some of his micro level conclusions could be challenged, it would be difficult to level a sweeping claim against the overall themes and theses he sets out. His work suggests that the capitalist world system has entered a new age of a global, knowledge based economy where networks of elite capitalists operate across borders and emulate the network technology that facilitates their existence and their dominance. These markets are unpredictable and the network players are not as secure in their place of prominence in the network as past players in other ages may have been. Inequality, however, is perhaps as structural as it has ever been. Regions and populations are left out due to lack of access to the networks and infrastructures that transmit information and allow for its production; these are the antecedents that allow one to play in the new economy. This networked pattern of organization, centered around technology and a global economy,

has produced questions regarding "deterritorialization" or the role of the nation state. For this area we turn to the work of Saskia Sassen.

<u>Role of the nation-state</u>

The role of global capital in this era has led to a precarious relationship between national governments and marketplace dynamics which are no longer bound to nationalities, government institutions and regional identifications. This phenomenon has not gone unnoticed by theorists even though it seems to be overlooked in the rhetoric of governments and the media. Sassen (2008) joins the list of sociologists who have tackled and explored the role of national governments, or nation-states, in relation to the subjects of globalization, the new phase of capitalism, the role of technology, the implications of environmental factors, the rise of a transnational elite, and global movements toward democracy.

Sassen's (2008) main thesis centers on the role of the nation-state. The future of the nation-state is a source of contention and divide in disciplines as varied as Sociology, Economics, and Political Science. Theorists often find themselves somewhere between two poles, or extremes. Placed on one end is total irrelevance and the end of the nation in our present day. The other end represents the belief that the nation-state is still the most dominant and powerful player in the world order and that it will remain so for some time. Proponents of this latter viewpoint often see the preoccupation with globalization and the idea that there is in fact anything innovative in this era of globalization as nothing more than hype. Sassen places herself at neither extreme and offers a nuanced viewpoint that

accounts for the continued value and importance of the nation-state while fully embracing a new reality of global capitalist systems that have transcended state boundaries and territories.

Sassen (2008) provides a fairly thorough structural history of these concepts as she follows the interactions between the localities and kingdoms of Europe and the imperial church. She traces the rise of territory and authority through the systems of taxation and legalities that developed in Europe and the interactions between local nobility and church power, the rise of cities, urban law, commerce, and eventually the establishment of nation-states as the West underwent industrialization and entered into the modern era. The imperial church's authority was challenged and ultimately placed in the hands of the aristocracy and eventually into the development of the modern-nation state. Laws to protect commerce, private property, and systems facilitating necessities such as taxation and governance cleared the way for the investment of supreme power into states and their bureaucracies; Sassen describes these as foundational concepts in the organization of our authoritative systems. Her analysis of this history and these developments maintains an empirical and matter-of-fact tone that gives the impression that she seeks to explain more than to challenge the emerging realities of our day.

By studying the structural history of territory, authority, and rights Sassen seeks to elucidate an empirically based argument that capitalism is very different than it once was. The competition between nation-states and the nationalist identities of key economic institutions and players has given way to market forces that feed off of global rather than

local potentialities. She identifies policies and structures that were put in place following the world wars that cleared the way for the marketplace to exceed boundaries. By the 1980's the way was cleared for a tipping point in the rise of a new global capitalist era. Deregulation, the information revolution, innovation in finance and investments, privatization of government authority, and the redistribution of power within the state all served to facilitate the foundational shift of capital out of nation centered constraints and into the hands of rising transnational elites and transnational apparatuses. This is reminiscent of what we have covered in the work of Castells, and foreshadows what we will see in the work of Robinson, Hardt and Negri. In this era corporations and capitalist elites began to shape state policies toward commerce in favor of global capital rather than state interests. As a result, the global marketplace gained the power to create norms and legitimize its aims transnationally.

Sassen demonstrates that capitalism has come to shape worldviews and expectations in its own favor all over the world. Another place of agreement between Castells (2010), Robinson (2004) and Sassen (2008) is that this modern era of capitalism represents a different kind of imperialism, a market driven system of creating norms and legitimizing institutions across the globe. Sassen spends more time exploring the apparatuses of the power of the transnational elite as she studies the rising use of privatized legal systems in international trade disputes and the use of global contracts in arbitration. She addresses the rise, power, and limitations of intergovernmental

organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the United Nations.

Sassen allows for the loss of prestige in state power and sees states as taking a subordinate role to the transnational elite and the demands of the global marketplace. She acknowledges the shifts from the legislative to the executive branch in the United States, a shift that eliminates an aspect of democratic representation in the name of serving global capital in a more rapid fashion. She also acknowledges the haze surrounding boundaries between nations, something she refers to as "analytic borderlands" for the purpose of studying the interactions of culture, commerce, citizenry and policy across borders. She highlights the realities of dual citizenship, almost digital and virtual citizenship, and the complete breakdown of spatial and temporal orders that previously served as the foundations upon which national bureaucracies were organized; this is the area where she integrates a strong sense of a postmodern approach and demonstrates a subordination of political power to the power of economic forces.

In advocating for her nuanced view, she does, however, point to the role of the United States and some other powerful state players in challenging market policy and demonstrates the continued need for nation-states to enforce policies across the globe. State sponsored protection is essential to maintaining a free market in many areas. At this point in time, international governing bodies have a very limited capacity to address conflict even as they grow in their ability to affect commercial aims. Nation-states control standing armies, notwithstanding mercenary armies, that can engage in large-

scale warfare across the globe. Nation-states have to allow for and sanction force or diplomacy in order to provide the protection of property rights on a global scale and to open new markets. This, among other examples of state power, led Sassen to believe that nation-states are in transition from one kind of power and role to another, but she points out, the new role is both important and powerful. The aims of global capitalists depend on the sanctioned force of nation-states to protect market interests, leading capitalist enterprises to try to maintain preeminence over the state to preserve their existing relationship. The economic power of capital depends upon encoding itself in policy, effectively enlisting political power to its ends.

Just as Sassen (2008) explored the history of territory and authority and followed the shift of these concepts from the realm of the nation-state to transnational forces, she follows the history of the protection of rights and hopes for their eventual entrenchment in a universal system of human rights and protection of all human lives as citizens of a more global world. If territorial authority can shift to an international plane, then maybe human rights can as well. In Sassen's view, the idea that the U.N. could embody an enforcement of human rights to a larger and more significant degree than they already have seems like a source of hope strong enough to offset the dangers and excesses presented by the hierarchies of global capital. In a more liberal approach and fashion, Sassen suggests that such a regulatory body could temper the forces of capitalism and advance the welfare of all citizens. In Mann's terms, this speaks to harnessing political power to curb the economic power of capitalism.

Neoliberalism

The historical formation and rise of capitalism are evidence of its ultimate

primacy in the ordering of our society. The move into this global capitalist epoch

demonstrates the dominance capitalism has gained over political power and military

power through the subordination of the nation-state. This relationship is dependent upon

the use of ideological power, discursive in nature, to maintain both legitimacy among the

populace and the conditions necessary for a global, free market. The argument for this

new epoch of global capital, for many theorists, hinges on capitalism moving concern for

the free market into control of all areas of social power. The ideological power driving

this process in the last forty years has been a political or economic philosophy known as

Neoliberalism. Speaking to this new era of global capitalism and its dependence on

neoliberalism, William Connolly (2012) said:

> Neoliberalism, let us say, is a socio-economic philosophy embedded to
> varying degrees in Euro-American life. In its media presentations, it
> expresses inordinate confidence in the unique, self-regulating power of
> markets as it links the freedom of the individual to markets. At a lower
> decibel level and high degree of intensity it solicits modes of state,
> corporate, church and media discipline to organize nature, state policy,
> workers, consumers, families, schools, investors, and international
> organizations to maintain conditions for unfettered markets and to obscure
> or clean up financial collapses, eco-messes and regional conflicts created
> by that collusion. (p. 20)

Harvey (2007), Mann (2013) and Connolly (2012) suggest that neoliberal

ideology gained ascendency in the late 1970's and early 1980's as Keynesian economic

policies began to result in a decline in economic growth. Keynesian policies, named for

the British economist, John Maynard Keynes, who developed them, focused on leveraging government debt to stimulate economic growth, investments in infrastructure, regulating markets, providing safety nets for outliers within the system, and creating a strong middle class of consumers. These policies earned the policies another moniker, "embedded liberalism," for their favoring of regulation and creation of government programs aimed at some degree of balancing distribution of income. At the height of Keynesian policies, "the ratio of median compensation of workers to the salary of CEOs was 30 to 1" and the share of national income held by the top 1% of U.S. earners was 8% (Harvey 2007:13-14).

According to Harvey (2007) the 1960's were the beginning of the end for Keynesian policies as economic growth drastically slowed and created a vacuum for new policies to come in and fill the void. The 1970's and 1980's presented the opportunity for neoliberalism to rise in pockets throughout the world and it especially solidified its hold through politicians such as Margaret Thatcher in the United Kingdom and Ronald Reagan in the United States. Free market fundamentalism quickly joined forces with traditional conservative ideologies and neoliberalism and quickly became seen as the path to preserve the power of the elite. These ideologies served to redistribute wealth, toward the top, that had been lost in the depression before World War II and the following Keynesian era. Under neoliberal policies, the ratio of median compensation of workers to the salary of CEOs soared to 500 to 1 and the share of national income held by the top 1% of U.S. earners rose from 8% to 15% (Harvey 2007:13-14).

In *Commonwealth*, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2009) argue that there are many ways to institutionalize the status quo and entrench an imperial power, such as building laws at the local, national, and intergovernmental level that promote and protect capitalism. They suggest that to entrench capitalism into the human psyche, neoliberal philosophy has been at war for the minds of the middle class. Connolly (2012) argues that neoliberalism is in essence "free market" fundamentalism, an ideology that almost acts as a capitalist religion. Mann (2013) argues that neoliberalism has significantly advanced capitalism throughout the globe through the use of discursive power, one that gains ground through ideology and employs those it subordinates in its expanse and maintenance. He outlines the core tenets of neoliberalism as free market, open borders and trade, deregulated labor markets, and reducing state intervention into the market except in terms of advancing capital. The ideology has blended a belief in the free market with the ideas of individual freedom and democracy. As liberal democracy has spread throughout the globe, so has neoliberal ideology. Interestingly, neoliberalism sees value in ever-larger corporate entities to ensure efficiency and the greatest level of profit; the byproduct is greater concentration of economic power in the hands of fewer corporate leaders and shareholders. These factors combined to prepare the way for a global upper class of political and business elites who depend upon neoliberal ideology and open markets for their way of life.

Connolly (2012) shows that its theoretical proponents, such as Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek, argued that this ideology was needed to counterbalance the

conflicts and contradictions that came from the balance between state governance and the global free market. According to Connolly, Hayek asserted that the more unemployment, inflation, inequality, or financial collapse occurred, the more necessary it would be for the media, economists, law, policy and politicians to promote an ideology that connected freedom and the free market. Proponents of this ideology wanted to ensure that free market principles were not only institutionalized, but culturally supported. These efforts safeguard against reactionary democratic actions that during difficult economic times could allow lower classes to push to legislate policies that favor redistributive, anti-global or anti-free market policies. Within neoliberalism, the free market is the only fair way to ensure freedom and enterprise, and given time, the free market will self regulate to spread the benefits of wealth throughout the populace. This ideology is a direct counterpoint to democratic aims at regulations that would ensure equality, a safety net, and liberal agendas.

Connolly and Mann both assert that neoliberal policies have been on par with technological, financial, corporate, and global advances as a cause of the spread of global capitalism across the globe. In fact, according to Mann (2013), growth in the financial sector saw stock markets open in 50 new countries in the 1980's as they were incorporated into the global capitalist system, demonstrating the connection between modern financial markets, neoliberalism, and the global market. Over the last 40 years, the same period outlined by Castells, these trends have increased in tandem as capitalism outlasted alternative forms of governance and organization.

Connolly (2012), Mann (2013), Robinson (2014) and Hardt and Negri (2009) all

demonstrate that the neoliberal agenda was further advanced during the "Great

Recession" as austerity movements were enacted and nation-states sought to balance

budgets, lower debt, and lean further into neoliberal policies in hopes to promote further

growth. They also show the inherent contradiction in the idea that the free market

orientation of neoliberalism avoids government interference, when the actual truth is that

it interferes and redistributes wealth from the hands of the lower classed and places it into

the hands of the wealthy. This reality leads directly to the discontent that provokes the

resistance, as will be seen in our case studies of the Occupy Wall Street and World Social

Forum movements. These movements represent direct ideological challenges to the

beliefs and efforts of neoliberalism.

<p align="center">The Transnational Capital Class</p>

William Robinson's (2004) conceptualization of the transnational capital class

(TCC) demonstrates one of the qualitative differences between the current global

capitalist system and capitalism in its former epochs. In his view, the TCC now has

primary control over the direction of globalization and dictates both policy and

commercial interests across the globe. As evident in one of Robinson's critiques of

Wallerstein, and most of world systems thinking as a whole, Robinson (2004) sees that

most theorists are stuck in a nation-state vs. globalized world dichotomy as well as a

market economy vs. political systems dichotomy. These theorists are caught in seeing

the world as primarily built by nation state units in competition or alternatively as a globalized world that is doing away with nation-states altogether.

Along with Sassen, Robinson (2004) sees that nation-states can, and have been, transformed to serve the interest of transnational capitalism while remaining important units of analysis. He argues that theorists often tend to interpret world events as either political or market related, rather than allowing that they represent interacting, overlapping collisions of the two; politics and economics are in fact one. According to Robinson, this hinders other thinkers from seeing the true nature of this present epoch of global capitalism. According to Robinson (2004), the fall of the Soviet Bloc and the integration of the Middle East, Africa and Asia into the world market reveal that capitalism now exists and is predominant in every area of the globe.

Robinson (2004) reveals the gravity of the situation and argues that capitalism has not only spread quantitatively, but qualitatively as well. Capitalism is not just prevalent in the realm of commodity production and the factory setting, it has moved into the realms of information, healthcare, education, international aid/development, and the building of governing bodies. Capitalism has turned culture and aspects of daily life into a commodity. In the new epoch capitalism not only determines the nature of the world economy but also the policies of national and transnational governments and the minute details of individual and family life.

Robinson (2004) also asserts that the market is no longer contained by national boundaries; the unionization that led to the Ford compromise, holding capitalists to

account for fair practices by the solidarity of a national workforce, no longer holds sway over capitalists who can now horizontally disaggregate the process of production throughout the global market. Production can be overseen from one location as it simultaneously occurs in every region of the globe. Corporations are no longer national entities, but now have a transnational body that transcends boundaries and drives our deepening reliance on a transnational economy, transnational governing, and a transnational capitalist class (TCC) that is virtually without borders and boundaries. The TCC now represents the top tier of capitalist agency throughout the world and the structures of national and global entities have been shifted to maintain the status and accumulation of the TCC.

Inequality is deepening as a result of the transnationalization of the means of production and the further concentration of these means in the hands of a rising class of transnational politicians and capitalists who are no longer bound by national laws but instead have begun to use nation-states as tools to ensure their class status. As a result of 9-11 and of the recent worldwide financial crisis, we have seen a deeper and stronger marriage of the Transnational State (TNS) composed of international governing bodies, incorporated nation-states, and the apparatuses of the transnational state such as the World Bank (WB), World Economic Forum (WEF), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

In support of his arguments from 2004, Robinson (2014) is points out the bailouts following the "Great Recession" in regards to Greece and the austerity measures and

further integration into the capitalist bloc that were required in order for them to receive aid from the European Union. The leverage placed on the nation-state of Greece by aspects of what Robinson called a strengthening TNS reveal that neo-liberalism and the TNS are not down and out just yet, in fact they have experienced resurgence in many ways. The European Union, the WB and the IMF were key players in pushing Greece to meet the expectations of investors and the transnational entities with the means to help them in their default. Many nations in the periphery have experienced financial pressure from the core, which has used the TNS to create open markets and conditions favorable to global capitalist enterprise. This TNS become an apparatus of neoliberal policies.

Recalling the discourse in Western nations in the last decade as the economic downturn hit, it is easy to see that the dialogue took almost all the same directions that Robinson (2004) spoke of in his work: the transnational elite began pushing for protection and regulations to protect their investment while at the same time challenging the cost of Keynesian programs and social spending. Politicians began to court the middle class while entirely ignoring the growing divide of the lower classes in an effort to coopt votes and support for what Robinson (2004; 2014) would call a growing transnational agenda. This is exactly what Robinson (2004) spoke of as the three-tier system where the wealthy elite courted the middle class for support while working to contain the lower class, or the third tier.

Austerity was championed throughout the western world and struggling countries seeking aid had to show that they were willing to embrace the economic agenda of global

leaders. In an unprecedented manner, those same world leaders embraced international

discussions and cooperation to handle the economic downturn on a united front.

Disagreements abounded, but Robinson (2004) may be correct in his assertion that in our

present time these disagreements are more centered in nation-state centric regimes or the

issues of localized elite that have not yet embraced the realities of a global economy.

Robinson (2004) wrote before the arguments related to the one percent and the

occupy movements took hold of the media in the United States. As he watched the

events of September 2011 unfold, he may have been hopeful that these movements would

have signaled a new cohesion in efforts toward global democracy. For Robinson (2004;

2014), the agency of the TCC and the use of the TNS is a large part of what makes global

capitalism move forward. If neoliberalism harnessed ideological power in shaping society

and placing the market at its center, the TCC uses the political power of the TNS and

nation-state policies for the same purpose. William Connolly (2013), Hardt and Negri

(2001) however outline their conceptions of the ideology, the structures, and the system,

that have placed the market at the center, creating an almost living and perpetual system

that self-maintains, feeds, and reaches ever deeper into the very fabric of human

existence: "Empire."

<div align="center">Empire</div>

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's (2001) work, *Empire*, examines capitalism as

the preeminent problem that humankind faces in our time. According to their view,

capitalism should be understood so that it can be challenged and overturned, both as it existed early in western history and as it exists today. Like many of the theorists we have discussed, however, they spend some time pointing out that capitalism has undergone some very fundamental changes in recent history. They point out that the capitalist marketplace has become a powerful and all-encompassing global marketplace that has not only subjugated the nation-state, but has brought subjugation to a new level across the globe through capitalist commodification of government, media, information, and culture. The areas they identify nearly overlap with Mann's four sources of social power. As a system, capitalism, has moved beyond punitive power and control, it has come to encompass the full use of "biopower," the control over life and body, to maintain its status. Hardt and Negri employ Marxist viewpoints in elevating the Global Market, which they call Empire, to the place of an entity to be contended with in their own version of a postmodern dialectic. They break from traditional Marxism in that it is not necessarily a class war in this era any more than it is a contest between nation-states; at this point, it is a contest of humanity against the entire capitalist system that drives all aspects of global and individual life.

Hardt and Negri call this focus on social constructions such as our constitution that seem to exist to protect freedom but are in fact primarily protecting property rights. This places the priority on those that own property over those that do not. They refer to this codified preference as the "Republic of Property." The Empire they are concerned

with is the global capitalist system that creates this republic, envisioned in much the same way as Robinson's recognition of the TCC.

Hardt and Negri's *Empire* (2001) does not set out to only defend its theoretical framework, but to introduce it as the source of the conflict of our age. Their theory argues for seeing global capitalism as an empire that provokes challenge. They focus on the history of power and ideas, specifically on how power and control are carried through language, culture and ideas rather than through the substance of structures, although they do not neglect structure completely. As a result, the bulk of their work is not devoted to history and traditional analysis, notwithstanding the presence of some archeology of terminology and concepts. Rather, their work is dedicated to persuading the reader to see the issues for what they really are and to create an optimistic hope in the opportunity to unite for an alternative, which they term "counter-empire."

Consistent with this theme, their explanation of the fundamental change in capitalism is as much a call to resistance as it is an explanation as to what "empire" really is. They present an argument that market forces have expanded beyond the interest, the territorial boundaries, the legal systems, and the marketplace policies of individual nation-states. Technological advances, globalization, and networks at the dawn of the information age have created an opportunity for capitalism to move to a new, global and uninhibited phase. Capitalism has always been a force that has bred inequality in Hardt and Negri's view, but this new form embodies an unrestrained assault on self-determination and singularity. They speak of the rise of a transnational elite that benefits

from the system and perpetuates the inequalities of the system, but the face of this group is illusive; the authors do not address the agency of top players in the marketplace as much as the control and the power structures of a system that perpetuates itself. International governmental entities, networks, finance, infrastructure, and nation-states all serve the new Empire and it is only the force of the "Multitude" that can take power back.

Hardt and Negri's removal of the conflict from the space between classes is a significant theoretical point that many of their dissenters miss when they oversimplify their Marxist approach. They speak of the overthrow of power structures and concepts imbedded in our worldviews that breed inequality and domination; hierarchy and capitalism are the targets while people are seen as caught up in the systems, ideologies and capitalist patterns of organization. This nuance is a critical one in understanding the complexity of their approach (Robinson 2004; Castells 2010).

Where Hardt and Negri spend less time on analyzing the current role of the nation-state and rather dismiss it as much of a current factor, they spend more time on the area of the implications of this transition in global capitalism and what they believe to be the necessary response; this is an area where Sassen (2008), Robinson (2004) and Castells (2010) had at the time only given a collective nod. Hardt and Negri concentrate on the possibilities presented by what they call the "Multitude," a term they have resurrected from the time of Karl Marx that has at times been used to describe the masses of the lower classes. They set out to offer us almost a manifesto, the beginning of a trilogy that invites the "Multitude" (a cross-section of individuals, groups, social

movements, identity politics, classes, etc…) of singularities to unite across differences, and to challenge the systemic Empire that seems to be growing radically out of control. One angle they explore in depth is an idea mentioned in the work of Castells: that the same innovations, networks, and global realities that allow for the rise of Empire are the same tools and circumstances that clear the way for the resistance to Empire, or counter-empire.

Hardt and Negri believe, in Marxist fashion (with a postmodern twist) that the combined force of the Multitude, if it ever became as unhindered as the force of Empire, would be enough to establish a new world order. They suggest this counter-empire is not an attempt to stop globalization, but rather an attempt to enact an alternative to a global order that relies on hierarchy and dominance. Alternative media, network systems, global flows of capital and information are not only beneficial to the market forces behind the power of Empire, but they can be harnessed and leveraged by the Multitude to envision, disseminate, and empower an alternative vision of globalization that turns power on its head and gives force and celebration to the true immanence present in every singularity.

Global Social Movements

The stage for resistance has been set

Wallerstein's (2011) theory of the world system combined with Robinson's (2004) theory of global capital and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's (2001) concept of

Empire was necessary to set the stage for understanding global movements as a response

to global capitalism. In the same way that these theorists have shown a qualitative shift

in the capitalist economic system strengthened by a neoliberal ideology and technological

advances, theories in relation to social movements and resistance to these macro systems

have undergone a shift of their own. The Occupy Movement and the World Social

Forum are a part of what some theorize to be a challenge on par with a contender as large

as global capital. Stephen Beuchler (1999) summarizes Alaine Touraine's assertion that

there is one central conflict in every society that all other conflicts flow to and from.

Although this assertion may be too reductionist, it does fit well with the scope of the

struggle or crisis in question. In the industrial age, Marx identified this central conflict as

existing between workers and the industrial capitalists for the way society is ordered and

how relations of power dictate every aspect of life (Castells 2009). In the period

following Marx, this epic view of antisystemic movements was lost to a more structural

functionalist set of approaches. In our day, many theorists have returned to frameworks

that identify a central conflict and place it between the global, networked capital interests

as outlined in the preceding sections, and a new kind of rising resistance that will be

outlined here.

The following case studies of the Occupy Movement and of the World Social

Forum are considered within the context of two forces contending for an alternative

vision of globalization, as it is put in Jackie Smith's (2008) terms. On one side stands the

"Multitude" contending for global democracy and on the other is "Empire," the self-

organizing system of the market in connection with the Transnational Capital Class (TCC) of Robinson.

Historical perceptions of resistance

The wide use of, "where there is power there is resistance" (Foucault 1990), and at times misuse of this quote from Foucault, sets an excellent foundation for the discussion on the analysis of the antisystemic social movements we find in the age of advanced capitalism. This quote, from early in his exploration on the nature of power, ends with the notion that this resistance is never external to the power it opposes. Often, social movements have been analyzed with frameworks that are predicated on the assumption that resistance, and the movements that foster it, occurs within systems of power merely as symptoms or byproducts of the system itself. Certainly this assumption guided early conceptions of social movement theory and for the purposes of examining antisystemic movements such as the Occupy Movement and the World Social Forum, this assumption must be altered, if not discarded altogether.

Review of social movement theory

John Hannigan (1985) categorizes the study of social movements into three historical categories under the classifications of "traditional," "resource mobilization," and "the French school." The traditional approach constitutes the study of collective behavior and dominated the field in the 1950's. The earliest example of a theory related to social movements demonstrates the most extreme version of the assumption that social movements represent a minimal concern within the large framework of understanding

social systems. The collective behavior approach reduces resistance to a kind of social deviance and as a result the study of social movements was a side project rather than a field in its own right at the time (Beuchler 1999). Resource Mobilization theory gave movements credence as fully legitimate parts of the political process and brought the study of movements into its own right as a field in Sociology (Hannigan 1985). The French School ultimately assumes that social movements represent a power that has the ability to help shape society as they contend in the central conflict within our society. Jackie Smith, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri will bring social movements to the global level and provide meaningful reflection on the nature of the Occupy Movement and the World Social Forum.

Collective behavior theory operated on two frameworks, those of Symbolic Interactionism and Structural Functionalism, assuming that resistance was a symptom that simply needed to be addressed as the current system balances between adaptation and maintenance. Steven Beuchler's (1999) summary of classical collective behavior theory captures the "core assumptions" shared across its various iterations. The first of these is that all collective behavior shares the same explanation whether one is addressing "panics, crazes, crowds," or "movements." Next, collective behavior occurs outside the normal workings of society. This basically places social movements in the realm of social deviance. The third assumption is that collective behavior arises from "stress, strain, or breakdown" in the system. Fourth, individuals experiencing "anxiety" or "discontent" are the sparks of incidents of collective behavior. The last assumption

Beuchler summarizes is the idea that collective behavior is generally "dangerous, threatening, extreme, or irrational" within society. It is interesting to note that those wanting to delegitimize social movements today attempt to describe social movements in these same terms, casting a shadow on them as deviants.

These assumptions, as outdated as they are in terms of the legitimacy now given to social movements, make collective behavior theory largely inapplicable to a study of the two movements addressed later in this paper. However, three lines of thought from collective behavior may still be valuable for explaining isolated aspects of global movements. First, Beuchler (1999) highlights Herbert Blumer's (1969) assertion that collective behavior often operates outside social rules and expectations, begins spontaneously, and operates in an unregulated and unstructured way. Second, Turner and Killian (1972), identify the translation of feelings and perceptions into collective action as a distinctive feature of social movements. Finally, the line of collective behavior theory emphasizing the concept of relative deprivation can address the motivation among social actors that recognize the extreme contrasts and inequalities present in the capitalist world system. Beuchler summarizes this approach as, "When people judge themselves as lacking resources enjoyed by their reference group, relative deprivation may be said to be present."

The second historical category in social movement studies arose as a response to the impact of movements in the 1960's and 1970's. The collective behavioral approach assumed the legitimacy of the organizing structures in society and, as a result, could not

theoreatically withstand the kind of upheaval in the 1960's and legitimate challenges to the status quo. As Hannigan (1985) asserts, the Parsonian roots in collective behavior ignored the reality of power struggles. Resource Mobilization theory and Political Process theory, in response, made huge strides in accepting the legitimacy of social movements as part of the political process and their proponents as rational actors with identified goals to challenge or improve that process. Resource Mobilization theory saw social movements as an "extension of politics by other means" (Beuchler 1999). According to Hannigan (1985), theorists using this framework see social movements as "extensions of institutional actions" with the purpose to "reform the predominant social structure" and/or "gaining entry into the polity."

Informal organizations and spontaneity found little place within the resource mobilization framework which heavily favored formal structures and existing networks (Beuchler 1993). Hardt and Negri (2009), however, mentioned future movements would struggle to maintain momentum and create lasting change as they cast aside hierarchy and organization. Beuchler (1993) shows that the women's liberation movement gained a lot of ground through Social Movement Communities that were much less hierarchical and formally organized than traditional Social Movement Organizations, showing that loose organization and non-hierarchical structures can still be effective. According to Beuchler, the history of women's movements in the United States suggests that communities with loose organizational structures have been critical in every major period

of feminist mobilization, and more organized structures among activists have sometimes been non-existent or marginal in these events."

Perhaps even more importantly for the two cases studies here, is that the Resource Mobilization theory put forward by John McCarthy and Mayer Zald never provided much context or explanation for movements at the macro level. The work of Charles Tilly at least addressed the way macro events opened the system to challenge, providing opportunities for action. Neither attempt articulated a theoretical framework for looking at social movements as a contender in macro level events. Tied to this "meso level" approach is the "cost-benefit" method of explaining motivation for collective action. Although there is some truth to their concern for the "free-rider" phenomenon and the idea that actors weigh the cost against benefits before joining movements, this approach leaves out other motivational factors. Perhaps it is the failure to put these movements into a macro context that leads resource mobilization theories to pay less attention to factors such as identity, culture, and ideology as driving factors in post-industrial social movements. According to Beuchler, it was the work of European theorists that sought to address this lack of a macro level theory. Alain Touraine made context the central aspect of social movement studies when he theorized that every society has one central conflict over power and that understanding that conflict was key to understanding the social movements within it (Beuchler 1995).

Resistance as forces of social construction

Returning now to Hannigan (1985), the third category of social movement theory and the most important for this analysis. What Hannigan calls "The French School," is also known as New Social Movement Theory, or theories. This set of theories, rooted in the work of Jürgen Habermas, Manuel Castells and Alain Touraine, arose in response to the revolutionary events of 1968 in France. The title "French School" arises from the connection of these theories and activities in Paris. The title of "New Social Movement Theory" was coined when these theories were in fact new, but it must be noted they were first articulated in the 1970's. If Resource Mobilization theory moved the study of social movements from the sideline to a full area of study in Sociology and a fully recognized, legitimate aspect of the political process, New Social Movement theorists recognized movements as a force with the power to create and recreate society. Beuchler (1999) shows New Social Movement theories arose to address the inability of previous theories to address the motivations of politics, ideology and culture in social movements.

Castells, Touraine, and Habermas address resistance to global capital in terms that will be valuable for our analysis. The New Social Movement theorists' efforts centered around explaining the movements of the late 1960's and 1970's in the macro context of advanced capitalism and a neoliberal agenda. Beuchler (2011) describes their intent as one that sought to update the Marxist class struggle from the industrial age of workers' movements to the post-industrial age of advanced capitalism and the new kinds of movements that arose to challenge it. He argues that central to these theories is the

necessity of placing movements into context within the central, macro level conflicts of the age.

It has been discussed that Castells (2010) was concerned with the transitions of capitalism to a new age with new forms of conflict over the last 40 years. New Social Movement theorists were concerned with the same central conflicts. Habermas (1989) had identified the "colonization of the life world" by "system imperatives" as the market system came to determine "identity formation, normative regulation, and other forms of symbolic reproduction." As a result of this colonization, social movements, newly aware of the socially constructed nature of identity, took to the realm of subjectivity, culture, spirituality and identity. As society moved into post-industrialism and the information age, resistance moved into postmodernity and post-materialism. Social movements were no longer reactions or mere attempts to balance aspects of society that had gone off kilter; they became attempts to reconstruct society as a whole and redefine social relations.

The erosion of the public sphere

Habermas focused on the crisis of legitimacy inherent in capitalist systems and the ability of social actors to step into the space created by crisis and to challenge the structures of capitalism. He believed the space for discourse and contention within democratic society or, the "Public Sphere," had eroded to the point that real social action was needed to reclaim or recreate it. For Robinson (2004), two primary causes of this erosion directly relate to the rise of the TNS, the rise of Empire and the thwarting of the Multitude for Hardt and Negri (2001). The power of private interest groups had begun to

focus on influencing state development and power at the same time that the state became more involved in the daily lives of citizens and the reproduction of society. The marketplace economy was beginning to drive the government at the same time the government was beginning to have more space in the lives of its citizenry. As discussed earlier, Robinson (2004) saw the qualitative expansion of capitalism into areas of media, education, healthcare and culture as a dangerous precedent deepening the reach and the control of the TCC.

Habermas (1989) focused extensively on the role of the media in these considerations. He asserts that during the rise of the Bourgeois Public Sphere, the printing press and the production of journals were key to the rise of the institutions of coffee houses and salons. The intellectual and bourgeois debates and conversations in these spaces over the information presented in these journals were a direct check on the influence and the power of the government and the elite. As these printed materials moved from their status as journals to a commercialized style of production, they began to direct more than inform, to spoon-feed information more than stimulate critique. The very same interests that were moving to influence the politics of the land were also buying space, influence, and as evidenced in our day, an all out control of the media. This effectively served to give neoliberal ideology a pipeline for reaching the minds of the populace, exercising the discursive power of capitalism at its best.

What Habermas had seen as a vanguard against the power and influence of the government and economic forces over control of social reproduction was disappearing.

Hardt and Negri point to these conditions as they deepened in later decades as a

component of empire (Hardt and Negri 2009). Robinson (2004) cites the involvement of

the media as a component of the transnational apparatus and points directly to their

involvement at the World Economic Forum as proof of their orientation toward capital

and accumulation.

At its best, the public sphere was a place where people come together to challenge

the actions of the commanding elite and to hold back the unfettered control the ruling

classes seek to exercise. This space allowed for a truly informed engagement with the

political actions of the day and a way to stand together in holding those forces to account.

At its worst, the public sphere became an exclusive group, a second tier of landowning,

privileged citizenry that had little incentive to act on behalf of the excluded. It had the

potential to lay a foundation for a wider system of challenging the ruling elite, but nearly

disappeared as the state apparatus and private, capitalist industry eroded the conditions

that once allowed it to incubate. Habermas feared that the public had lost their identity

and power as the public sphere, the private sphere, and the institutions of government

blended into a more commercialized, competitive discourse.

> Competition between organized private interests were neutralized in the
> common denominator of class interest once permitted public discussion to
> attain a certain rationality and even effectiveness, it remains that today the
> display of competing interests has taken the place of such discussion. The
> consensus developed in rational-critical public debate has yielded to
> compromise fought out or simply imposed nonpublicly. (Habermas 1989:
> 179)

Although Habermas held some hope, it is clear at the time he penned his work on the public sphere, he was not convinced that the people of the world would become the public it once was in order to challenge the institutions of his day. The possible presence of pessimism and the issues of representation in the public sphere aside, Habermas' passions and concerns seem to have been accurate, and his insights into the necessity of an educated, engaged, and enlightened public to challenge the powers that be and the status quo still resonate. This is comparable to Hardt and Negri's (2004) hope for the Multitude and embrace of the common, as well as the very thing Robinson calls for: a group that can be as organized as the transnational capital class they are to challenge. Habermas calls for social movements, incited by crises of legitimacy, to take back the public sphere. Habermas, Touraine, and Castells articulated a view of social movements and their potential that opened the door for them to be seen as contenders for the construction of a new view of Society.

Resistance as a global force for global democracy

Although Jackie Smith is more often identified as concerned with global or transnational social movements and not classified as a New Social Movement theorist, it is clear that her framework has been heavily influenced and even builds upon the central themes of those theories by applying them to the globalization of social movements. These themes can be identified in her work and solidifies the possibility of using this framework to explain the phenomenon we have seen in the movements of the last two decades. Additionally, Smith deliberately draws on the newer, networked society

theories of Manuel Castells. Translating Smith's (2008) work into Mann's framework of the four sources of social power, it centers around the ideas that the global capitalist system has taken control with economic power and has coordinated ideological power through neoliberal propaganda, subordinated military power to the policing and protecting of global capital, and harnessed political power through law and policy at the local, national and global levels. Global movements have to be equally strategic and networked to challenge and dismantle this current distribution of power.

Smith's (2008) work in *Social Movements for Global Democracy* will allow us to examine this connection between her global oriented theory and the work of new social movement theorists. Setting the foundation, she builds on the idea that an analysis of "processes and interactions" are more important than structures and organizations because movements are more and more seen as networks of 'informal connections' among various individual and groups engaged in this macro conflict.

Smith's entire theoretical framework positions her perfectly to address "societal totality" and the link it shares with modern social movements. She asserts that "the struggle can be seen in terms of a global society vs. a world economic system." Every strategy she analyzes or proposes, as both a scholar and an activist, centers around how to position networked local, national and transnational actors and movements to change international policy and global culture to one that embraces shared humanity and calls for global democracy. She sees state level and international governments not as the opponents of social movements within this framework, but rather as a tool, or even

collective actors, that can be harnessed by either neoliberal networks or social movement

actors. Whether these apparatuses serve to protect economic rule and interest or ensure

global democracy and equality is what is at stake in the contest. In this context, she

asserts that these rival networks are in competition and must recruit actors into their

networks and seek to harness local, national and international structures, including

governing organizations, media and non-governmental organizations into places of

support. The stakes are high.

> This fluid and diverse global justice network contrasts with the rival
> neoliberal network, where the transnational capitalist class has substantial
> economic, organizational, and cultural resources at its disposal, and where
> a unifying logic of capitalism helps orient actors in complementary
> directions. (Smith 2008:25)

Smith's (2008) view of two competing networks over the direction of the global

order leads to her analysis of existing resistance efforts and her call for increased

transnational collaboration among all groups fighting for democracy and overturning

systems of oppression and economic dominance. She embraces the idea that modern

movements must have a "diffused social base" that is not just based on one aspect of

identity, such as the old class struggle of classical Marxism. This is a prerequisite to

successfully challenge the level of organization represented by its rival, neoliberal

network. In terms of a "collective identity," Smith suggests that movements, as

proponents of global society are "a community of citizens and states organized around a

shared human identity and common norms that promote cooperation and social

cohesion." She states:

Transnational alliances based on religious, professional, or ethnic
identities foster ties that cut across nationalities, thereby deemphasizing
national differences. Increasingly, transnational identities have assumed a
more universal character, emphasizing a shared humanity over national or
religious differences. The proliferation of ideas such as those expressed in
the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as expanded
discussions of democratic values, contribute to this broadening basis for
transnational alliance formation. And as we will see in greater detail later
in this book, global institutions like the UN provide a common focal point
where citizens can turn when their governments refuse to uphold
international laws and norms. (p 10)

She places herself solidly in line with new social movement theorists when she

places the battle for the organization of society not just in the old conflict theory terms of

production and capital, but in the living of everyday life. The "postmodern" battle for

quality of life over quantity, and the political in everyday life themes come to play here.

Herein lies the challenge for social movements and their pro-democracy
alliance networks. Efforts to bring political education, discussion, and
action into the places where people engage in their everyday routines of
reproducing social life will expand the possibilities for people with fewer
resources and less leisure time to be active participants in politics. Without
such connections, only those individuals with the most resources, free
time, and skills can enjoy full rights of participation in political life. By
default, then, it is those already privileged by the existing order that will
be best served by policy decisions. If we want a more democratic political
order that responds to the needs of less privileged groups, it is important to
strengthen the various mobilizing structures that encourage civic
engagement at local, national, and global levels. (p.117).

Smith brings the power of ideology and its connection to identity and culture into

the mix when she points out that the "the neoliberal globalization network is populated

primarily by transnational corporations and their officials, think tanks, and other business

nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) formed to promote neoliberalism, individuals in

business and government, mass media actors." Their efforts are directly aimed at shaping

the way society sees itself as part of a market system and attempts to build trust that an

unregulated market can self-regulate in the way that is most beneficial to the rest of the

world. She points out that players who do not actively support these assertions about the

preeminent place of the invisible hand but do not oppose them implicitly perpetuate them

within the global order. This is a central aim of neoliberalism in the advanced capitalist

world system: it depends upon self-promotion of the market and implicit buy-in from a

consumer class.

The conflict has to take place in the realms of ideology, policy, culture, and

everyday life. This, however, leads to the optimism inherent in Smith's theory and

analysis. She places the global democratic movement and all the social movements that

fall under that banner not as a mere resister to its rival, but rather on par with it.

Neoliberal ideology may have resources behind it, but movements for social democracy

are well on their way to compete.

> The democratic globalization network can be understood as operating with
> a network division of labor that resembles that of the transnational
> neoliberal network. As will become clearer in later discussions of how
> these networks have operated, the corporate or organizational fraction of
> the democratic globalization network consists of organizations and
> coalitions that are most consciously devoted to advancing alternative
> visions of globalization, including social movement organizations and
> some (certainly not all) NGOs. The state fraction consists of politicians
> working in national and sub-national governments as well as in
> international organizations that support policies that advance democratic
> over market forms of global integration. Like its neoliberal counterpart,
> the state fraction also includes numerous politicians working in local-level
> governments, many of whom have interests that diverge from those of
> national-level politicians. The technical fraction is comprised of think
> tanks, academics, and other professionals (such as lawyers, physicians,
> etc.) who work on behalf of network aims. These individuals may or may

not be formally affiliated with a formal social movement organization or NGO. The cultural fraction of the democratic globalization network includes the collection of civil society groups and individuals who may or may not be organized specifically around movement aims— such as school groups, recreational and professional groups, and the like— which help advance the cultural norms of the network by spreading the network's ideas to a variety of settings where people work and live. Non-movement actors help expand the connections between the democratic globalization network and a wider public, thereby enhancing the interest and participation in the network. (p. 24)

This elevation of the resistance to a full competitive player in the global structure is among the largest contributions Smith has made to current studies of social movements and antisystemic challenges to the Capitalist World-System. Her work sees activists on the local, national and global levels all beginning to connect in overlapping global networks that are beginning to rival the networks of global capital. These players from NGO's, governments, activist groups, forward thinking corporations, and many other organizations are beginning to see conflicts as interconnected. Their efforts are connecting and they are attempting to create an "alternative view of globalization," and present an ideology that is a full counter-point to the neoliberal ideology dominating the current World-System. If these actors can promote an ideology and a universal belief in the priority of human rights across the globe, it can challenge the power of capitalism on an equal scale. In this way she sees these networks of actors and organizations articulating a vision that is the beginning of the same promise that Hardt and Negri (2009), say can only be fulfilled by a cross-sectional movement of the "Multitude" in a move to embrace the "common" and undermine the monolithic idea of "empire" we covered in the first chapter.

Smith (2008) has taken the concept of the centrality of these movements as a counterpoint and brings them to the global level. This overall framework will play heavily into the case studies in chapters III and IV. Specifically drawing from the work of Smith which sought to take social movement theory to the level of networked, global activism, we must ask of each movement how it connects the local, the national and the global in a way that rivals the organized, resource heavy, power networks of the TCC.

In addition to the local-global connection, it must also be considered how the conflict is playing out in the realms of ideology, culture, and the construction of subjectivity, or in other terms, Mann's social power of ideology. For this we turn to Hardt and Negri who heavily focus on the realms of culture and ideology as significant aspects of the struggle for global democracy. Hardt and Negri (2009) suggest that counter-power is not merely from within the power it opposes but is more like the notion of a "counterpower." This counter, however, was not homologous to the power it opposes; rather, it exists in its own right. They define this kind of power as "an alternative production of subjectivity which not only resists power but also seeks autonomy from it." Many current theorists that look to simultaneously address the areas of globalization, advanced capitalism, and social movements include this conceptualization of a "counter" or "alternative" power in their theories. Touraine, Castells and Smith are counted among these theorists.

Hardt and Negri (2005; 2009) concentrate on the possibilities presented by what they call the "Multitude," a term they have resurrected from the past that has at times

been used to describe the masses of the lower classes. Their conception of the Multitude imagines, or calls for, a unity among the masses that works across their differences, their diversities, and calls upon them to embrace their common vision for humanity. This is their conception of a diffused social base or networked movements and actors united for one common aim. They clearly state the Multitude is not a singular entity, like a union, or how we often envision a movement centered around a singular cause. The Multitude is legion and draws from every stream of discontent in resistance to power and an attempt to restructure that power. According to their framework, the power of empire can never exclude the Multitude entirely from its ranks because it depends upon harnessing the labor of the Multitude for every aspect of its existence. Hardt and Negri's conception of the Multitude is in essence Marx's conception of the proletariat updated for a new epoch of capital with its global conditions and its far more diversified units of labor, capital, citizens and consumers. The idea that the Multitude can stand in resistance to their conception of empire draws on ideas of horizontalism, anarchism, and its ability to create an alternative sovereignty in the democratic reign of the people. These ideas flow into many of the organizing patterns seen in more recent movements, including the two case studies to follow.

Hardt and Negri (2005; 2009) hope to slice right through the false dichotomies of public or private, capitalism or socialism and show that the ownership of property and the protection of that ownership is what creates and maintains systems of inequality. The only way to begin to dismantle these systems is to see that all our laws and our

marketplace economies are built around the acquiring and protection of private wealth and property, this is part of the concept of Empire we saw in chapter one. Even social constructions such as our constitution, which seem to exist to protect freedom, are in fact protecting property rights. This places the priority on those that own property and moves the Multitude – those with less means – off to the side. Hardt and Negri call this focus on property the Republic of Property. The Empire they are concerned with is the global capitalist system that creates this republic, envisioned in much the same way as Bill Robinson's recognition of the Transnational Capital Class (TCC).

Hardt and Negri's (2009) *Commonwealth*, begins to depict an alternative where private ownership is not the priori but rather it is what we hold and share in common. Even today there are many things that are not owned in the same way as land: much of the sea, the air, and a large amount of information and language are not subject to private property and are held in common. It is clear, however, that private industry and public entities can definitely affect them as if they were not held in common. This contention for the "commons," or the recapturing of the public sphere, is a central theme of both of the movements under consideration in this study, as we will see in chapters III and IV.

Commonwealth represents as much a call to reexamine what political resistance means, and how it should look, as it is a call to action in general. Hardt and Negri (2009) are no strangers to the strength and reach of power, and they evoke such an image as they speak of "Empire," a concept containing the TCC within a larger set of motivations and structures that exists beyond its membership, directing their actions even as TCC key

players imagine they control it. The republic of property may serve this rising class, but they are no less the subjects of empire than it is at the service of them. Hardt and Negri advocate for revolution and a large scale reorganization of society along the lines of creating a new image of humanity, a new future of cooperation founded on the principles of love in action.

For these reasons, Hardt and Negri look to propose the usefulness of forces such as antimodernity, asserting that antimodernity is a force made of many different factors and players. In an almost Eastern philosophical view, they suggest that it is neither separate from nor a reaction to modernity, but rather is within modernity and is prior to modernity. Resistance is not merely a response to the power of empire; it is the power within the subjugated that existed prior to the force of subjugation. It is the force that encounters the forces of dominance and that works to undermine those forces of dominance throughout. After speaking to the merits of antimodernity forces and viewpoints and convincing the reader that these are most definitely thoughts worthy of support, the authors pull their common move of challenging them, revealing that the concepts of antimodernity are great but only as they serve as a stepping stone to alter-modernity. Antimodernity is stuck in a dichotomous relationship with modernity that creates an oppositional or resistance-based critique of modernity, when what we really need is to re-envision our future and the meaning of modernity. Alter-modernity takes antimodernity perspectives beyond resistance and into the realm of offering reimagined alternatives to every "reified" system we know. This is central to their view of contention

against empire in the ordering of our world. This view of a force of power competing for

the place of constructing the systems that guide us directly connects with the move to put

social movements and resistance on the same level of the structures they contend with,

this time with an ideological and culturally driven bent.

Realizing the power inherent in those who experience economic, racial, or any

other form of oppression requires seeing resistance not as a reaction but rather the

assertion of a power equal, timeless/prior, and fully in an encounter with the force of

domination. In Hardt and Negri's (2009) propose as new perspective of resistance, the

poor and oppressed are not helpless, but comprise a sleeping giant with unimaginable

power, and once this is realized, there is no structure in place that can withstand their

rebuttal. This is definitely a reality that the Occupy Movement hoped to unveil as people

across the nation chanted, "we are the 99%." Hardt and Negri suggest this reimagining of

possibilities arises from an increasingly organic, or biopolitical, power of the Multitude

who will embrace their place in and through the "common" to not just oppose and resist

the domination inherent in current structures or the "governmentalities" of modernity, but

to reimagine the world anew and offer alternatives. They point to a united resistance and

the reconstruction of social relationships that can occur as labor movements, cultural

movements, and minority movements combine in the "common," including good

institutions, and rise in the power of the Multitude.

As the summary above and the observations contained within it demonstrates,

Hardt and Negri seem to be somewhat of an anomaly among theorists in this area. They

seem to draw from a variety of theorists as well as a variety of disciplines including those

of the arts. They integrate a breadth of work into their analysis. It seems that any

critique of their works would be tempted to attack their call to action that goes beyond

empiricism. One would definitely be tempted to critique their optimism and its incredible

effect on their assertions. As they criticize many authors of being theological, or relying

on teleological arguments, they seem to turn existentialist potential, optimism, and the

idea of what humanity can become into inevitability in the same way that Marx saw

epochs rolling out in an inevitable sequence. The activists within the movements covered

in chapters III and IV would have resonated with such inevitability and passionately

embraced the potential and optimism of their assertions. Hardt and Negri offer a view of

the ideological and cultural realms where these two forces for a global vision collide and

provide the following case studies the concepts of anti and "alter-modernity", the

"commons" and challenge to the "republic of property."

Conclusion

This chapter has drawn on and synthesized the work of these theorists and their

conceptualizations of this new era of the capitalist world system when capitalism itself

has become the new Empire of the global system. Ultimate primacy in the structuring

and ordering of society has been given over and secured to favor market forces. This

faith in the free market has usurped the power of the political process and left many

feeling the inconsistencies created by the hopes provided in an ever more global system

of liberal democracy and the ever deepening grip of global capital. This crisis of

legitimacy provokes response from those who expect democratic and political power to

deliver on its promise. Global movements check the powerful forces of the market and

place political power, democratically ensured, in the place of ultimate primacy.

The Occupy Wall Street Movement and the World Social Forum provide case

studies of the very reactions that this new era of capitalism has provoked. The OWS

represents a passionate critique of the power of finance capital in the U.S. and globally as

it was sparked by protest throughout the world and subsequently provoked Occupations

throughout the United States and abroad. The movement represents an attempt to create

an alternate narrative, to compete with the ideological power of neoliberalism and call

into question the primacy given to market forces. They sought to change our conception

of political power as a force to check economic power. The World Social Forum began in

2001 in efforts to take back the "commons" and create public space to reimagine the

process of globalization. To create opportunities for political power to reshape society

and to drive back the market driven ideologies and commodification that has spread

throughout nations engaged in the global market. Although the World Social Forum is

still active today but it's fifteen-year history will allow it to serve as a historical case

study and allow for projections of its future.

CHAPTER III: CASE STUDY - OCCUPY WALL STREET MOVEMENT

Introduction

The theories outlined in the previous chapter provides a way of understanding the conditions within the capitalist world system that are generating significant legitimacy crises. The quantitative differences within capitalism and the rise of neoliberal ideology has combined to strengthen the system's discursive power and reach into qualitatively deeper areas of social organization and the management of individual life. These processes have opened a rift and provided opportunity for social resistance, the mobilization of the 99%, or the Multitude. This resistance is attempting to create and enact an alternative vision of globalization, one where democratically organized political power will not only provide a counterbalance to economic power and the inequality it promotes but will take priority over it. The promise of global movements is to ensure that a common, global vision for human rights is raised to a status beyond the reach of free market fundamentalism.

Occupy Wall Street and the greater Occupy Movement it spawned provides a recent and pertinent case study of the response that the global, systemic crisis has provoked. Many from the outside, and not without some element of reasonable cause, discussed the Occupy Movement and as a sort of public tantrum among those struggling or refusing to integrate into the market system. Contributing to this impression was the influx the homeless population into the occupations, structural disorganization and a

seeming inability to effectively engage the system. These aspects represented the lowest denominator of the movement. The movement, under this surface, was much deeper, more targeted and built on models that many theorists believe can provide the most effective challenge to the system. This case study explores the nature of a new kind of globally networked, horizontally organized movement that is broad in its goals and diverse in the causes and its critiques. The movement may have been a brief promise of the possibilities of the Multitude as imagined by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2004; 2009) and the kind of global, networked movement captured in the analysis of Manuel Castells (2010; 2015) and Jackie Smith (2008).

The following case study of the Occupy Wall Street Movement will look first to the rise and history of the movement to provide the context and the foundation for our analysis. The argument is founded on the idea that the movement, above all, is a critique of the global capitalist system and an ideological challenge to the power of neoliberalism as seen in its primary action, an occupation at the heart of the global financial system. The movement's singular demand that our financial systems be held to account for the crisis of the world system is emblematic of the dynamics laid out in the theoretical framework in chapter I. Second, this case study will analyze this movement's ability to represent: the gathering and organization of the Multitude, an attempt to recreate the Public Sphere and reclaim the Commons, and a challenge to the preeminence of economic power in the process of globalization that an alternative network of globally, nationally and locally organized resistance offers.

The Rise of the Occupy Movement

Surprisingly for such a recent movement, there is a great deal of literature already available about the origins of the Occupy Wall Street Movement. General consensus exists among researchers and analysts that the movement owes its birth to three primary factors: a crisis of legitimacy in the global economic system, the spark of a series of related movements across the world, including the Arab Spring and the Indignadas movement in Spain, and the rapid mobilization of a tech savvy, college educated, younger generation encouraged by leadership within alternative media networks (Calhoun 2013, Castells 2013, Langman 2013; Milkman et al. 2012).

Craig Calhoun (2013) highlights the 2008 financial meltdown as the crisis that provoked many of the waves of protests that moved across the globe in 2011. He demonstrates how the occupiers targeted the role financial institutions played in creating the crisis and the role of governments in empowering those institutions. He cites an indignation that does not just find roots in the collapse of 2008, but also in the financial policies that paved the way for the crisis, the bonuses financial elites received despite the crisis, the bailouts the government enacted to stem the crisis, and the burden of lost jobs and homes, and heavy indebtedness endured by the lower classes amidst the crisis. These stark realities drew the eyes of the Occupy Movement to the nature of inequality and the government sponsorship it enjoyed under a neoliberal regime, even in the dire times of a recession. This led to the mantra of "we are the 99%." Tejerina et al (2013) demonstrates that the collapse of 2008 merely highlighted and drew into focus the reality of the

inequalities created by global financial structures and that the Occupy Movement was born out of an indignation toward inequality in general. These authors place Occupy among networks of indignation toward global conditions that arose across the globe in 2010 and 2011.

The year 2011, specifically, will be remembered for the passion that swept through the the Middle East in the series of protests that have been coined the Arab Spring. Calhoun (2013) encapsulates the broad consensus that these protests in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Syria and Bahrain were significant in inspiring Occupy Wall Street. The course of these uprisings were followed throughout the world and a real sense that some kind of change could happen in the Middle East inspired the discontent in the west. Although the movements themselves articulated their rage and demands toward changing regimes and affecting political control, many in the western world connected the uprisings with their own sense of frustration at the financial collapse as a result of the preeminence of capitalist interest over democratic concerns and the well being of the populace. The Arab uprisings offered inspiration and suggested the possibility that rage, frustration, and disillusionment could be rapidly fueled into demonstration and change. The Arab Spring demonstrated the powerful way that the use of technology, social media, and the occupation of public spaces could give voice to a struggling educated class. The movements in the East showed how focused power could become through collective, simple demands and expressions of outrage rather than the typical list of demands that fully organized, long term political movements have exercised in the past. This why

many of the theorists and analysts looking at the movements have suggested that the

events throughout 2011 represented a new kind of social movement. The Arab Spring

sent a message that citizens should demand governments be held accountable to their

people, a message that an educated class of disenfranchised and disillusioned college

graduates in the United States quickly identified with. (Castells 2013; Calhoun 2013;

Langman 2013; Macpherson and Smith 2013; Tejerina et al. 2013).

Castells (2013) points to a Twitter post under #occupywallstreet that was sent out

in July of 2011, the first kindling of the Occupy Movement, "Are you ready for a Tahrir

moment? On September 17th, flood into lower Manhattan, set up tents, kitchens, peaceful

barricades and occupy Wall Street" (p. 159). The use of social media, the tactic of

occupying public space and the reference to Tahrir suggests an attempt at solidarity and

connects the Occupy Movement to the energy that was present around the world, hoping

to make 2011 a symbolic time, perhaps like 1968 which is known for its upheaval and

revolutionary spirit. The tweet was directed toward those who were incensed by the

economic inequality unveiled in the economic recession (argued by some as caused by

the carelessness of investment bankers) and the control the financial markets had over

what was supposed to be a democratically elected government. As a result, Wall Street

was selected as the site to make a stand.

Milkman et al. (2012) demonstrates the key demographics of the movement.

According to Milkman, one key difference between the Occupy Wall Street Movement

and prior protests in the United States is that the agents driving the movement were

primarily college educated young adults in their twenties and thirties, millennials. Many

of these educated youth had gone through college and attempted to enter the job market,

but found it difficult to do so in a devastated economy. Many of them had also been the

same youth that had been called out in large numbers to help Barack Obama win his first

term and they felt betrayed by the systems they had invested in. Castells (2013) echoes

the same sentiment, saying those that poured into voting booths in record numbers to vote

for Obama, believing it would bring unprecedented change, were disillusioned by 2011

after government policies, bailouts and corporate bonuses seemed to give priority to the

wealthy over the hurting middle and lower classes.

The initial call to Occupy Wall Street was initiated through social media by the

magazine Adbusters which Costanza-Chock (2012) describes as a publication involved in

the Global Justice Movement and centered on ad-hacking and brand contamination.

Quickly after this initial call, Anonymous, the global hacktivists group leant their

endorsement through a web based video that went viral. On September 17, 2011, as a

result of these social media efforts, hundreds of people moved into New York City's

Zuccotti Park. Organizers had been blogging and tweeting about starting a protest

campaign on Wall Street, but had been shifting possible locations down to the last

moment so as to avoid police barricades. Within hours after selecting Zuccotti Park,

hundreds of people arrived to join the protest. Within two months, thousands of followers

and supporters joined what had become a full encampment, seeing to the construction of

a temporary kitchen, library, and medical center. The movement garnered early support

as the contrast between the high rises of Wall Street and the business elite they contained were offset by a montage of tents and a collection of protesters. What really took the movement to a new level was the publicity created as the New York Police Department attempted to contain the protest. Following the press and viral video coverage of what was broadcasted as a crackdown, increased support for the protestors began to come from larger organizations.

According to Milkman (2012), "It was not long before key labor unions and other progressive organizations stepped up to support OWS with both financial and logistical resources." Within months the occupy movement spread into more than 1400 localized occupations of cities, town halls, and university campuses, both domestic and abroad. These locations used social media networks to channel and articulate their frustrations into general demands for accountability and localized demands pertaining to their separate locales. This widespread, horizontally organized, and loosely networked structure spread quickly leading Langman (2013) to call it a new social movement and Castells (2011; 2013) to call it a networked movement. Hardt and Negri (2009) would classify the movement as a demonstration of the Multitude and the movement can be argued to fall under Smith's (2008) criteria for global movements. (Appel 2014; Chafkin 2012; Castells 2011; Castells 2013; Costanza-Chock 2102; Hardt and Negri 2009; Gitlin 2012; Jaffe 2013; Langman 2013; Milkman 2012; Smith 2008).

A Critique of the Global Capitalist System and Neoliberal Ideology

A great deal of the research and theories on social movements since the sixties have acknowledged the notion that systemic crises create opportunities for movements to organize around a common cause (Beuchler 1999). Although there are wide variations in the approaches of the theorists covered in the previous chapter, they all accept the notion that the economic collapse of 2008 represents a crisis in the global capitalist system. Robinson (2004; 2014) and Wallerstein (2011; 2014) argue that crises occur on a cyclical basis within the capitalist world system, but suggest that the quantitative increase in capitalism over the last four decades (attributed to the conjunction between neoliberal ascendency, technology, and changes in the finance industry) have led to a more extensive crisis than is typical in the regular cycles of the world system. Hardt and Negri (2001; 2005; 2009) argue that the commodification of every aspect of life contributes to a qualitative difference in this particular crisis and opens the door to both a quantitatively and qualitatively different mobilization of resistance. From their Neo-Marxian perspective, Robinson, Hardt and Negri argue this level of crisis is opening the way to challenge the structures of the system as a whole and perhaps begin to usher in a new epoch of sorts within the global system, one where economic power is the priority.

The collapse of 2008 led to a culmination of disillusionment and frustration among the population that had been percolating for some time. In rapid fashion it unveiled a crisis of legitimacy that provoked the underlying sense that neoliberal promises, pervasive throughout the media and government, were false and the hope they

---

offered had been torn out from beneath the middle and working classes. The Occupy

Wall Street movement set out from the very beginning to offer a critique of the financial

system's reign over all aspects of life and governance. The choice to occupy Wall Street,

the ultimate symbol of financial power in the West, rather than simply occupying

government spaces or symbols was perhaps the most significant statement of the entire

Occupy Movement. Whereas many movements of the past have been directed at political

institutions, specific labor relations with capitalists, or one area of politics, the Occupy

Movement directed its "outrage" at the priority given to the financial system in dictating

life across the board (Appel 2014; Calhoun 2013; Chafkin 2012; Castells 2013; Costanza-

Chock 2102; Jaffe 2013; Langman 2013; Milkman 2012; Macpherson & Smith 2013).

Castells (2013) summarizes the reason the financial sector became the primary

site for contention among the occupiers.

> There was outrage in the air. At first, suddenly, the real estate market plunged. Hundreds of thousands lost their homes, and millions lost much of the value they had traded their lives for. Then, the financial system came to the brink of collapse, as a result of the speculation and greed of its managers. Who were bailed out. With taxpayers' money. They did not forget to collect their millionaire bonuses, rewarding their clumsy performance. Surviving financial companies cut off lending, thus closing down thousands of firms, shredding millions of jobs and sharply reducing pay. No one was held accountable. Both political parties prioritized the rescue of the financial system. Obama was overwhelmed by the depth of the crisis and quickly set aside most of his campaign promises – a campaign that had brought unprecedented hope for a young generation that had re-entered politics to revitalize American democracy. The hardest was the fall. People became discouraged and enraged. Some began to quantify their rage. The share of US income of the top 1 percent of Americans jumped from 9 percent in 1976 to 23.5 percent in 2007. Cumulative productivity growth between 1998 and 2008 reached about 30 percent, but real wages increased only by 2 percent during the decade. The

financial industry captured most of the productivity gains, as its share of profits increased from 10 percent in the 1980s to 40 percent in 2007, and the value of its shares increased from 6 percent to 23 percent in spite of employing only 5 percent of the labor force. Indeed, the top 1 percent appropriated 58 percent of the economic growth in this period. In the decade preceding the crisis, hourly real wages increased by 2 percent while the income of the richest 5 percent increased by 42 percent. The pay of a CEO was 50 times higher than that of the average worker in 1980, and 350 times more in 2010 (pp. 156-157).

The OWS movement pulled together a citizenry determined to regain a stake in public discourse, recreating the public sphere in the middle of the financial institutions of our day. They demanded the financial industry be held to account and advocated for a type of change that has barely been conceived in the public mind. They challenged the elite bodies of transnational capitalists described by Robinson (2004, 2014) and all the capitalist contradictions that coalesced into a legitimacy crisis, bringing to the forefront widespread inequality and attributed that inequality to the rise of neoliberal agendas and the domestic and the transnational state apparatuses that safeguard the interests of the financial elite.

Rather than articulating a long, clear list of demands the Occupy Movement adopted the mantra of "we are the 99%" and targeted a few broad goals that Rizwana Bashir (2011) identified as "a demand for a fairer system that provides education, healthcare, and opportunities for all without corporate influences on the government" (p.69-71). Calhoun (2013) argues the premise that taking back the public space and doing so in the heart of the finance industry and uniting all the loosely organized

demands around that industry's abuse and control of the democratic process made the

Occupy Movement the first movement to fully address the economic collapse of 2008.

Calhoun (2013) demonstrates that the Occupy Movement lost nothing in being

"more moment than movement" because it clearly sent a statement throughout the world

that challenged the stranglehold of finance over politics. The Occupy Movement targeted

ideology more than policy. Mann (2013) demonstrates that the capitalist system of

organization and its prioritization of market forces and economic power over political,

ideological, and military power is a discursive and intensive form of power that depends

upon the unquestioning support of its subjects. This is where the ideological power that

neoliberalism has delivered in support of the free market has been so critical to the

advancement of the global capitalist system. Neoliberalism as an ideology made

promises to the world that the free market was the only system that could ensure personal

freedom, democracy, peace throughout the world, and fairness. At the same time, this

ideology was able to ward off challenges by blaming crises, inequity, war, poverty, strife,

and the rising burden of debt on opponents such as government intervention, unions,

leftist oriented social movements, culture, individual failures and any other entities or

ideologies that interfered with the "invisible hand."

So much of the crisis of legitimacy surrounding the global economic system

centers around a sense that this ideology has sold a lie to the populace and placed the

middle, working, and lower classes into a position that has seen their voices, power, and

opportunities decrease decade after decade. This ideology lost a great deal of its hold

when college graduates burdened with debt found nothing but the promise of unemployment, the working class watched their livelihoods disappear behind the doors of closing factories, and the safety nets that protected the lower classes from the cyclical nature of the economy was assaulted.

This opened the door for a real ideological challenge. Most recent research into social movements according to Beuchler (1999) have sought to incorporate the importance of ideology in the rise of social movements, especially in the capitalist context. Ideological power is as critical to challenging power in the free market system as it is in maintaining power within it. Remove the ideological challenge inherent in and close to the heart of the Occupy Movement and it is unclear what would be left. OWS was nothing if not a direct assault on the ideological power of neoliberalism and an attempt to articulate an ideology that demands basic rights and political power to take preeminence over economic power (Appel 2014; Castells 2011; Castells 2013; Macpherson & Smith 2013; Langman 2013).

In *Commonwealth*, Hardt and Negri speak to the connection between neoliberal philosophy and the same symptomatic socioeconomic conditions that others have argued brought about the movements embodied in OWS (Hardt and Negri 2009). The Transnational Capital Class is empowered by the resurgence of neoliberal policies that have nurtured and protected its rise to preeminence on the global scene (Robinson 2004). Calhoun (2013) and Castells (2015) see the OWS movement as one of the few outspoken challenges to this domination that has reached any serious degree of prevalence in the

public mind. The occupation of Wall Street sent a message to the world that politics and economics are one in this system and capitalism is driving a vision of globalization that entrenches and deepens inequality throughout the world. The concepts of government, capital, finance and the issues of equality have been irrevocably connected in the minds of our populace and the ideological alternative the movement voiced has moved into common discourse, political debates and elections for some time to come.

Smith (2008) believed that any successful alternative view of globalization would need to unite many constituencies around a common vision for human rights and the protection of democratic processes. This common vision for the rights of the public over those of corporations and finance, in the case of the Occupy Movement, was capable of drawing a large selection of people from across many diverse movements. This cross section of occupiers and resistance represents the promise of the Multitude as outlined by Hardt and Negri (2001; 2004; 2009).

The Multitude in the Occupy Movement

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2001; 2004; 2009), in their trilogy on Empire and the Multitude, focus on the power of global capital in this new epoch, driven by neoliberalism and empowered by finance and technology. In the Marxist tradition, however, they also focus on the inherent power of the populace to challenge the power of Empire and contend for an alternatively constructed society where democratic power that represents all peoples takes precedent over economic power. In their view, the united

front of all people, incited by the inequalities that Empire presents, is the Multitude. The Occupy Movement in many ways echoed their promise of the possibilities presented by the Multitude and showed the world that it might just be possible for such a Multitude to move into action. In the same way that they called for and predicted the possibilities of the Multitude, they also predicted the difficulties the vision and structure of it would present by its own design. The struggle of the Multitude to maintain momentum and cohesion is the greatest challenge to its success. The Multitude is evident in Occupy in its composition of various players and movements with diverse aims but united toward a central conflict, and in its structure as a non-hierarchical, horizontalist movement.

The Occupy Movement may have been launched and started by alternative media outlets, college educated millennial youth, and some of the unemployed constituencies reeling from the 2008 crisis, but it soon became a clarion call that brought diverse actors, representing a variety of movements and causes that flowed into Occupy to create a collective resistance to power. Castells (2015) and Langman (2013) demonstrate that Occupy's call to challenge the status quo of power and inequality in general quickly drew representatives from movements centered around labor, feminism, race and ethnicity, anarchism, socialism, communism, anti-globalization, and actors representing even more narrow focuses such as student debt reform and challenging austerity measures. Surprisingly, the movement included Democrats as well as Republicans, global human rights activists, revolutionaries and reformists, communists and libertarians, even Tea Party representatives who felt abandoned by the political establishment.

The movement's simple platform of "we are the 99%" and its targeting of global finance as the determinant of social power and organization created space for these diverse activists and movements to place their own interest in the context of the same macro level social conflict. To attack the power of capital, government support of its aims, and neoliberal ideology is to attack the overall structure of social relationships, and as such, it offers a chance for all movements to renegotiate their own relationships and contexts within the sources of power. A quick survey of some of the research and scholarship on some of the varied movements and identities that intersected in the occupation demonstrates the diversity of the movement. Hammond (2015) highlights the anarchists, Tea Party members, revolutionaries, communists and liberals that came together in the movement, generally seeking to change or check the control of global capitalism over government, and in many cases, over their lives in general. Talcott and Collins (2012) show the connection of feminism and its injection into the Occupy movement as advocates joined with the Occupy platform to bring issues of gender relations and equality into the movement. Juris et al. (2012) highlights activists from the LGBTQ community, Latino and African American race relations, the working class and labor organizers, and struggling individuals and families from impoverished neighborhoods established networked caucuses that worked in tandem with a united general assembly.

Hardt and Negri (2009) had predicted that a mobilization of the Multitude was on the cusp of occurring in light of ubiquitous inequality, but they also predicted two central

challenges it would face. One of those challenges deals with this diverse cross section of movements and aims, while the other deals with the difficulties inherent in the philosophy and structure of leadership that the movement chose. Hardt and Negri believe that for the Multitude to succeed and maintain momentum, actors with diverse goals would have to subordinate their goals to one central goal: human rights. They went even further to suggest that a new concept of love toward one another was perhaps the only force that could bring this kind of unity. Early on in the Occupy Movement, according to Juris et al. (2012), it was clear these various movements that came to occupy did not easily integrate into the general assembly format adopted by most of the occupations across the U.S. and abroad. Many of the locations sought to amend this as the occupations continued through the creation of caucuses at many of the sites, including Boston where Juris et. al. focused their research. This allowed each constituent group to approach issues specific to their identities simultaneously while maintaining their involvement with the larger movement.

Juris et. al. (2012) and Talcott and Collins (2012) are interested in investigating how the Occupy Movement attempted to handle the issues of differences and inequality among the various actors within the movement itself. Their work, collectively, identifies the strategy to give voice to various constituencies and highlight a model of education that occurred within many of the separate occupations. Talcott and Collins (2012) show feminists within the Occupation began to teach workshops and provide trainings on how patriarchy and forms of masculinity have not only affected the language and organization

of the capitalist system, but also that of the Occupy protests and movement itself.

Similarly, activists in Los Angeles and Oakland in California taught anout inequality and

race relations to encourage collective challenges to race issues. Juris et al. (2012) gives

credit to one Latina activist in Boston for the creation of the caucus system as she

attempted to address the reality that the general assembly format was channlegning to

many and excluded some cultures within occupation. Similar strategies occurred

throughout occupations in attempting to mitigate issues of difference and give voice to

varied constituencies. However, these researchers articulate that the Occupy Movement

had not fully solved the problem and marginalized groups continued to feel their

marginalization throughout the occupation, feeling that issues central to their own causes

came second to the white, educated and disenfranchised core of the attack on the global

financial system (Castells 2015; Juris et al. 2012; Langman 2013; Talcott and Collins

2012).

The organization of the Occupy Movement fits Hardt and Negri's model for the

actions of the Multitude and the challenges this model inherently presents. The Occupy

Movement, from the beginning sought to enact a horizontalist and almost anarchist

format, driven by a general assembly (Hammond 2015). This tied directly into one of

their mottos, "occupy everything, demand nothing." By embracing a very broad agenda

of challenging the power of the system, they sought to avoid the narrow organization and

identity that preclude invitation to a broad cross section of the populace. The movement

purposely embraced consensus decision making and avoided any form of hierarchy that

put one person in charge (Castells 2015). The adoption of the masks employed by

Anonymous by some occupiers in their protests and social media efforts was

demonstrative of this effort to remain faceless, expressing the discontent of the masses

rather than the agenda of an elite as they hoped to avoid credit toward and identification

of a central leader (Schneider 2011).

Many argue that the decentralized, loosely networked and nonhierarchical

structure is what made Occupy so powerful and effective in the minds of the occupiers

and of those watching the movement. This approach demonstrated participatory

democracy in action (Alcoff 2012; Baber 2015; Castells 2015; Hammond 2015). Others,

however, attribute the end of the occupations to the fracturing and disunity evident in

their lack of a common goal and their leadership's inability to cast a common vision.

When the Occupy Movement experienced mass policing of their protests and was finally

evicted from Wall Street, and eventually everywhere else, the lack of leadership,

structure, and a clear list of demands led to its loss of commitment and momentum

(Milkman et al. 2012; Roberts 2012).

Hardt and Negri (2009) recognize these challenges to large scale movements in

the age of Empire, but they still see the orientation toward multilateral efforts across

movements and horizontalist organization as essential to any opportunity to challenge a

power that is inherently unilateral and hierarchical. Their call in 2009 for the Multitude

to abandon their individualized goals and identity in order to embrace a common unity

and a common resistance still resounds, and the Occupy Movement's early attempt

toward this end does more to show it is possible than its end does to show it is not. Hardt and Negri's (2009) common goal is as broad and expansive as is their vision for a new humanity and the Occupy Movement embraced this broad vision for America, and its place in a global world. Equality, freedom, love, fairness, justice, peace, and a new humanity are just a few of the infinite themes they hold as possibilities for the future of the Multitude.

The Common and the Public Sphere

Many analyses of the rise and fall of OWS have considered the importance of space. Many of the agents of the movement cite the occupation of Zuccotti park in the first few months as integral to the confidence and the passion of the movement. One protestor said that they all felt they had a "voice because they had that space." The opponents of the movement looked at its eviction from the park in 2012 as a clear indicator of its defeat while those within the movement attempted to see it as a time to regroup and develop new strategies as they attempted for some time to start a campaign to eliminate the extensive personal debt that is prevalent across the nation from behind the scenes (Chafkin 2012). However, it is clear that increased police intervention, eviction from the park, and subsequent evictions from its various posts throughout the world ultimately weakened the power and symbolism of the movement and allowed its fractured consensus to erode (Castells 2015; Langman 2013; Milkman et al. 2012; Roberts 2012).

The Common and the Public Sphere were central to the Occupy Movement. The use of alternative media and social media outlets was not only an attempt to leverage the networking power of technology and speak in the millennial generation's language, it was also a response to the need to create alternative media outlets and articulate a message that was both opposed to the neoliberal agenda and outside the power of the capitalist system. In older movements and revolutions, leaflets, pamphlets, pubs, union halls, factory occupations, rallies and salons were the spaces available for discourse, challenges and actions against the existing powers. Occupy was no different in its attempt to create space for discourse. The difference, however, was that it was challenging a qualitatively and quantitatively different opponent and was forced to leverage an assault that countered power in new ways.

Habermas (1989) was concerned about the erosion of the public sphere and that intelligent, critical discourse has been removed from the public that at one time held the elite to task. Another powerful demonstration of the OWS was its ability to create an open space for such a forum, to meet in the "common" places, rather than bourgeois salons and coffeehouses or labor union halls. Instead, they met on the web, arguably elitist in its own way, and in loosely united occupations of public spaces across the world. The Occupy Movement did not only represent actors with means but drew together a representative cross section of the Multitude. This made the occupation and attempt to take back public spaces that much more poignant. Prior to the mass media and official

channels painting an image of their own, the movement leveraged alternative forms of media that seriously heightened the level of discourse across the nation (Chafkin 2012).

The movement, like the Arab Spring, depended heavily on the use of technology and channels such as Twitter, YouTube, Facebook and the blogosphere. This allowed the movement to take control of their own narrative and present an alternative set of facts to the public, inciting assistance and solidarity from the Multitude rather than division and dismissal. Early in the movement, a large amount of support across the nation and the world came from a YouTube video capturing an instance of police brutality. Seeing an American officer violently react to an American protester rallied protestors as the media broadcast the scene repeatedly. Major news network could dismiss this scene and hold any viability in the sight of a public to whom they wish to appear impartial. In this case, the OWS movement had taken control of the media for one day and extended the life of the movement beyond what anyone had predicted. In effect, the movement had created and taken back a piece of the public sphere (Chafkin 2012).

If Habermas (1989) were to write further on the public sphere today, Occupy Wall Street would offer him opportunity to discuss alternative media channels and their role in creating a new, educated, and engaged class of citizenry across socio-economic lines of division. This is something his critics arfue he ignored at the time of his writing on the public sphere (Thompson 1993). The elevation of the issues of the 99% vs. the 1% in the election cycles since 2012 show the potential that these channels have for reinvigorating the discourse of our political process, which is something Habermas felt we had lost. The

widely known clip of the Republican presidential candidate, Mitt Romney, in the 2012 election debasing 47% of Americans – in essence, the poor – was as common a topic of discussion along with the topics of the 1% and the 99% that reverberated throughout election booths across the country in both the 2012 and the 2016 presidential races. The power of the media is held much more in "common" today than when Habermas was led to write his critique of the public sphere almost 50 years ago, even in light of the capitalist control of those systems (Castells 2015).

The public sphere and public spaces are deeply connected for movements like Occupy. The attempts to occupy space in Wall Street and public spaces throughout the country, including government and financial buildings and symbols, were key to the messages and strategies of the movement. Hardt and Negri's (2009) work in *Commonwealth* begins to depict an alternative where private ownership is not the ultimate priority but rather it is what we hold and share in common. The Occupy Movement was deeply interested in dismantling the increasingly private system of ownership that had begun to creep into public and government realms and spaces. The commodification of every aspect of life and the turning of common places into private opportunities to redistribute income from the bottom up was one source of their indignation (Castells 2015; Crane and Ashutosh 2013; Milkman et al. 2012; Langman 2013).

This dichotomy of private and common space became a central feature in the occupation of Zuccotti Park. As the park was not owned by the city and was awkwardly

held somewhere between private and public ownership, the OWS movement was able to remain on the land for a longer than expected. The treatment of the space as either public or private became a central battleground. Eventually the health and sanitation issues within the camps, blamed by many on the presence of a large contingency of homeless, allowed the city to evict the camps and effectively end the occupation (Chafkin, 2012).

Executives from Adbusters who had been integral in the organization of OWS have sought to take their efforts to the living room and through an alternative media, a place in "common" that would not be subject to debates of private and public ownership (Crane and Ashutosh 2013). These efforts have not come to much fruition since the time of Crane and Ashutosh (2013) had hoped for this alternative kind of occupation, but it cannot be denied the Occupy Movement showed the possibilities that a new kind of public sphere, incited passion to regain common places, presents within the democratic system. The movement certainly changed the discourse of our politics in the United States, and throughout the western world for some time.

Networked Engagement of the Local, the National and the Global Levels

Manuel Castells (2011) and Robinson (2004; 2014) demonstrate the strength, resources and and effective organization of the global networks of neoliberalism and global capital in their work on networks and the Transnational Capitalist Class and Transnational State Apparatuses, respectively. Castells suggests that the same technical and social resources that allow this network to move so quickly and to be so effective are

also available to the movements that seek to oppose it. Network organizations and the

instantaneous communication and processing power of technology have paved the way

for movements like the Arab Spring, the Indignadas Movement in Spain, and Occupy

Wall Street to claim a public sphere and rapidly mobilize resistance at a global level.

Smith (2008) argued that to compete with the organized networks of capitalists, social

movements have to become global movements that can combine the networks and aims

of local, national and global actors in a comparable level of organization.

Often, the Occupy Wall Street movement is not seen as a global movement, since

it occurred mostly in U.S. cities, and the few claims it made were directed at local or

national policies such as student debt, regulation of the finance markets, employment

issues, and general inequality throughout the U.S. economy. It has already been

suggested that the Occupy Movement cannot be understood without looking at it in the

context of a critique of the capitalist system as a global, world system. However, there

are elements of the movement that make it more global than one would expect. The

Occupy Movement presents an illustration of connection between global, national, and

local networks and movements in three central ways. First, the occupiers placed their

own demands in the context of global capital, acknowledging the role of Wall Street and

American finance institutions in imperialism as Empire carries out a global agenda.

Second, the Occupy Movement was one part of a global wave of reactions to the financial

crisis of 2008 and general trends in capitalism that were entrenching and/or increasing

inequality throughout the globe. Third, the Occupy Movement's loose organization and

structure of networked and spontaneous camps throughout the United States allowed it to target national and local issues at the same time, and its spread to foreign occupations took these localized efforts outside the United States.

Manuel Castells (2015) follows the spark of protest in the Middle East in what he calls "Networks of Outrage and Hope" from Egypt and Tunisia to: Algeria, Lebanon, Jordan, Mauritania, Sudan, Oman, Yemen, Bahrain, Libya, Kuwait, Morocco, the Western Sahara, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. These uprisings occurred between January and the end of March in 2011. Macpherson and Smith (2013) show that every one of them owed their rapid success to the use of technology and social media, an educated class of younger citizens, and a sense of the illegitimacy of their current political institutions and financial circumstances. In virtually every case, they sought to occupy public spaces as a noticeable challenge to their political institutions and the legitimacy of those institutions to govern. These waves of protest also moved throughout European nations in 2010 and 2011, including Greece, Germany, Iceland, Portugal and Italy. Robinson's (2004) analysis would explain the protests of these governments across Europe as an indictment of the global economy rather than protests over merely isolated, national concerns (Calhoun 2013; Castells 2015; Gitlin 2013; Langman 2013; Schneider 2011; Tejerina et al. 2013).

While it is widely accepted by analysts that OWS was influenced by the Arab Spring and inspired by the role of technology and social media in facilitating the uprisings, many theorists separate these two movements into separate streams of

resistance. They classify Occupy as targeting the financial sector and the movements in the Middle East as targeting their particular political institutions. Tejerina et al. (2013) continue in the vein that Occupy was inspired by the Arab Spring, but go further in asserting that although the uprisings in the Middle East appear to be directed primarily at political institutions, they are provoked by the effects that neoliberal policies have had on their regions, including widening income inequality, exclusion of educated youth from the labor market, austerity efforts toward government services, and the rising costs of basic commodities.

The Occupy Movement targeted these same issues overall and adopted many of the same tactics deployed in Spain and the Middle East. Many Occupiers actually travelled to the Spain during the Indignadas movement and collaborated and trained with the activists there. For this reason, Tejerina et al. (2013) and Castells (2015) do not just see the Arab Spring as inspiring the Occupy movement but rather as being part of the same system of global protests against economic inequalities wrought by neoliberal policies and most evident through the financial collapse of 2008. Their argument is that the Occupy Movement and the movements abroad were loosely networked reactions to the same global pressures and inequalities. In this way, they were like eruptions along the same ring of fire and were networks within a global set of movements.

The Occupy Movement was not only part of a global wave of movements, but as a movement itself, it spread across the United States and the globe. According to Macpherson and Smith (2013), the localized occupations spread to somewhere between

1400 and 1500 cities. These occupations not only took place throughout every state in

the United States, but many also took place in other nations. These included some of the

previous sites of protest throughout Europe, creating a synergy and fusion as movements

abroad and the Occupy Movements in the U.S. networked. According to Tejerina et al.

(2013):

> Activists around the world have also coordinated efforts, particularly
> during the organization of Global Action Days. On 15 October 2011, 951
> cities in 82 countries witnessed simultaneous demonstrations and
> assemblies aimed at 'initiating global change' against capitalism and
> austerity measures. The second Global Day of Action, 12 May 2012, was
> organized by occupy social movements around the world to rally against
> corporate greed, corruption, human rights violations, police brutality, and
> censorship. From 12–15 May 2012 protesters took the streets to hold
> assemblies, performances, workshops, and debates addressing the status of
> public education, migration, the housing crisis, the environment,
> unemployment, civil disobedience, feminism, youth, pensioners, and
> more. Finally, on 14 November 2012, European workers held their biggest
> ever coordinated strike action. Called by the European Trade Union
> Confederation, the European Action and Solidarity Day coordinated a
> considerable amount of protests against the austerity programs that have
> been gripping the region since the mid-2000s. General strikes took place
> in Spain and Portugal; Greece saw a three-hour stoppage starting at noon
> and rallies ending in Syntagma Square; and workers held a four-hour
> stoppage in Italy. Many occupy social movements endorsed and
> participated in the mobilization.

This global networking is only one piece of Smith's (2008) assertion that global

movements have to engage at the local, national and global levels. The Occupy Wall

Street portion of the movement and those of its networked support throughout U.S. cities

had collected a number of national agenda items, even if they were never fully articulated

as a list of actual demands. Castells (2015) summarizes these national efforts that filtered

up from all the various movements:

The movement demanded everything and nothing at the same time. In fact, given the widespread character of the movement, each occupation had its local and regional specificity: everybody brought in her own grievances and defined her own targets. There were multiple proposals of various natures, voted on in the General Assemblies, but little effort to translate them into a policy campaign going beyond combating the effects of mortgage foreclosures or financial abuses on borrowers and consumers. The list of most frequently mentioned demands debated in various occupations hints at the extraordinary diversity of the movement's targets: controlling financial speculation, particularly high frequency trading; auditing the Federal Reserve; addressing the housing crisis; regulating overdraft fees; controlling currency manipulation; opposing the outsourcing of jobs; defending collective bargaining and union rights; reducing income inequality; reforming tax law; reforming political campaign finance; reversing the Supreme Court's decision allowing unlimited campaign contributions from corporations; banning bailouts of companies; controlling the military-industrial complex; improving the care of veterans; limiting terms for elected politicians; defending freedom on the Internet; assuring privacy on the Internet and in the media; combating economic exploitation; reforming the prison system; reforming health care; combating racism, sexism and xenophobia; improving student loans; opposing the Keystone pipeline and other environmentally predatory projects; enacting policies against global warming; fining and controlling BP and similar oil spillers; enforcing animal rights; supporting alternative energy sources; critiquing personal leadership and vertical authority, beginning with a new democratic culture in the camps; and watching out for cooptation in the political system (p. 184-186).

Every localized movement articulated specific demands along the lines above that connected to national policies as well as their own local context. Almost every occupation created web pages, Facebook pages, blogs, and Twitter accounts, linking themselves to each other through Social Media across the country and the globe. They connected to share stories, strategies, and articulate their frustrations in some form of the loose demands from above. In addition, each movement chose a symbolic site for occupation to send a local message, created an organizational structure of its own that

met the needs and expectations of their own occupations, and articulated demands to their

towns, cities, counties and states that were specific to their needs on a regional basis.

These demands, however individualized, centered around the same general focus of the

heart of the movement centered in Wall Street: to place economic power in check and to

challenge the status that the government has given to market forces in determining social

organization. The Occupy Movement provides a valuable and relevant example of

Smith's (2008) articulation that it is possible for movements in our day to leverage

network capabilities and effectively link local, national and global agendas. This unity

creates the synergy needed to create an alternative vision of globalization where

democracy takes priority over economy (Appel 2014; Bashir 2011; Calhoun 2013;

Castells 2013; Gitlin 2012; Langman 2013; Macpherson and Smith 2013).

Conclusion

In the absence of clear and accessible ways to shape and affect the national and

global processes involved in the shaping and direction of capitalism and the global

system, people sought alternative and fringe outlets for their reactions in order to make

their voices heard in the mainstream. The Occupy Movement is an outraged reaction to

systems and processes that felt out of reach to the very populace they affect the most. In

the globalizing world, the occupiers felt their democratic options were limited to check a

system that often operated beyond the reach of national laws. At its best, the Occupiers

were simply demanding that democracy be everything it promises to be and that

democratic power be taken from a position of subordination in determining social relations and become the powerful determinant it was intended to be.

The Occupy Movement has already come and gone, and in a few short years it went from a promise of the present day to an example of the past. Many have made judgments about the reasons the movement ended, including: evictions from the occupied sites, lack of leadership and organization, and the influx of homeless populations into the occupy camps throughout the country, which gave the appearance of illegitimacy and provided the reasoning for authorities to force evictions. Regardless, the fate of this particular movement and the future of the agents and architects of the September 2011 occupation are far less important than what the movement demonstrates about this generation of protest and resistance. The movement reveals a shift in discourse and action; it brought the conversations of inequality and inequity to the forefront of the national consciousness and represents a trial run at a large-scale, democratic mobilization of parallel movements. The example of the OWS movement points to the loss of the public sphere, the promise in recreating that sphere by embracing the common, and the real possibility of a cross sectional unity across the Multitude to offer resistance and demand a change of course (Calhoun 2013; Castells 2013; Gitlin 2012; Langman 2013; Macpherson and Smith 2013; Milkman et al. 2012; Roberts 2012).

According to Langman (2013) and Castells (2014), following the demonstrations of the movement, 2/3 of Americans, according to Pew Research, voiced their concern that growing inequality is a problem and that they would support a call for increased

government support, economic investment and higher taxes on the rich to address the issues. In contentious elections between Mitt Romney and Barack Obama in 2012, Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders over the democratic nomination for 2016, and Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016, the issues of equality and fairness took center stage in much of the rhetoric, debates, and coverage of the campaigns. The 99% and the 1% will forever be a part of political discourse in the United States.

Speaking to the value of the OWS's ability to operate as long as it did, or as its proponents argue it still does, Lagnman (2013) stated:

> These movements of the marginalized, the excluded and the indignant as contestations over cultural meanings, and the creation and recognition of new forms of collective identities impelled by visions of alternative possibilities of subjectivity within a transformed society that is egalitarian, caring, participatory, and democratic are the means of sociocultural transformations.

It is the modernity within us that looks for the one common goal, the one calculable return on our investment or the percentile that can demonstrate the effectiveness of our sacrifice for a common outcome. Alter-Modernity, not modernity, offers us the chance to make our individual and identity based agendas subordinate to the parallel mission of creating an equal world, a just world, not for just 1%, or 99%, but for 100%. Envisioning a new humanity requires 100%, not the kind of cutting goals that benefits one group, another group, or even the most groups. The OWS movement may be just the beginning of the possibilities available to the Multitude, the possibilities that embody the challenge to the organization of the TCC, the embrace of the common and

the resurrection of the public sphere, and a chance for a new humanity. The OWS may be

an early promise of the kind of engagement we are capable of in the years ahead.

CHAPTER IV: CASE STUDY – THE WORLD SOCIAL FORUM MOVEMENT

Introduction

Chapter II's case study of the Occupy Movement analyzed a movement that arose rapidly in 2011 and declined almost as rapidly in 2012. The whirlwind protest and occupation targeted the financial institutions of the United States after the financial collapse of 2008, ultimately offering a critique and challenge to the neoliberal agenda and the global capitalist system. The protest in the United States began in Wall Street but was connected to a string of global protest movements centered around the occupation of public spaces. In turn, the Occupy Movement itself contributed to the spread and furtherance of those global movements. Many classify the Occupy Movement as part of the greater, Global Justice Movement of which the World Social Forum (WSF) is also a part. This case study will now turn to the WSF as an example of a different kind of response also provoked by global social inequalities.

The WSF is self-defined as "the largest gathering of civil society to find solutions to the problems of our time. Starting in 2001 in Brazil, the WSF brings together in each of its meetings tens of thousands of participants to more than a thousand activities (workshops, conferences, artistic performances …) on various themes (social justice, solidarity, economy, environment, human rights, democratization…)." Additionally, the WSF describes itself as "an open space for democratic debate of ideas" and "formulation of proposals" for "groups and movements" to unite for "effective action" in order to

counter "neoliberalism," "domination of the world by capital," and "any form of imperialism." In its charter, it lays out that it is "localized" in time and place but is a "process" with "international dimensions." The WSF has had twelve official "gatherings" between its inaugural meeting in Brazil in 2001 and the most recent iteration in Quebec in August of 2016. These gatherings have taken place in South America, Asia, Africa and North America (Anon 2016). By the time of the third iteration of the WSF in Porto Alegre, Brazil, the World Social Forum had become a global representation of the Multitude, drawing more than 100,000 participants from more than 150 countries (Baiocchi 2015).

Whereas the Occupy Movement was a flash fire response that represented the frustration of the people, there was little organization, longevity, and direction given to their agency. The World Social Forum (WSF), a movement that has been more long term, has still been subject to some of the same critiques leveled against the Occupy Movement. The WSF has been active since 2001 and continues to facilitate and engage more of a democratic process on multiple levels while attempting to find a workable balance between grassroots and consensus oriented, loose designs and structures that allow the movement to survive. Although the WSF differs from the Occupy Movement in many ways, the following case study demonstrates that the WSF shares many of the same features as the Occupy Movement, including: its ideological critique of capitalism and neoliberalism; the coordination of the Multitude as a movement of movements with a nonhierarchical, horizontalist organization; attempts to create and take back the public

sphere and the commons; and a focus on networking to challenge capitalist excess at the local, national and global levels. Where the Occupy Movement showed the promise of the Multitude being able to step into the public sphere in response to the legitimacy crisis brought by global capital, the World Social Forum shows the promise that the Multitude can engage more systematically, and with a long-term view in mind, even while trying to hold close to its horizontalist values. The World Social Forum is perhaps the best example of what Jackie Smith identifies as a global social movement.

Rise of the World Social Forum

The first World Social Forum meeting in Brazil in 2001 may have been the first meeting of the actual forum, but its roots were connected to movements, protests, and acts of resistance that had preceded it. According to Smith et al. (2007), there are four primary factors that led to the creation of the forums: first, a series of Third World protests against transnational organizations jeopardizing their local interests; second, gathering transnational networks working to politicize the populace that neoliberalization had attempted to depoliticize (these networks include those that developed in 1999 to protest the WTO in Seattle Washington, among others); third, unrest and dissatisfaction with the role and efficacy of the United Nations (U.N); and finally, the growth of a transnational feminist movement, which contributed significantly to the development of the forums.

The theoretical framework of Robinson (2004) in chapter I followed the development of the Transnational Capital Class over the last 40 years, as well as Harvey's (2007) history of the rise of neoliberalism. These two transitions in the capitalist world system facilitated the development of the World Bank (WB) and the International Money Fund (IMF) as transnational institutions capable of clearing the way for free market integration and advancement of neoliberal aims throughout the world. The protests discussed in chapters I and II throughout Europe as a result of the 2008 financial collapse, and the pressures these two entities put upon governments to maintain credit and trade status were not in fact new phenomena. According to Smith et al. (2007), significant pressure was placed upon Third World governments as prerequisites for entrance into or maintaining status in the global market throughout the 1970s and 1980s. This pressure included embracing high levels of expensive debt, austerity measures in government, and imbalanced trade relations that forced nations into industrial and agricultural transitions that held financial promise in the short term but seriously undercut their economic future. As time passed and the citizens of these nations began to feel the pressure of these relations, protests against the IMF began to erupt and spread throughout the Third World. These protests planted seeds among the populations of these nations and prepared the way for the more collective, sustained, and globally networked activities.

If these protests throughout the developing world prepared a foundation among their populations, it was concern for transnational trade agreements, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the role of industry and finance in a new

form of imperialism, and threats to the environment that began to mobilize networks of

resistance in the North. Smith et al. (2007) highlight the 1999 Battle of Seattle protest of

the World Trade Organization (WTO) as a significant foundation for preparing 'first

world' activists for their upcoming roles in the World Social Forum. The activities in

Seattle inspired actors to build stronger local and international networks, learn tactics and

to experiment with new kinds of coordinated resistance. These actors and these efforts

were directly involved in the establishment of the first WSF in Brazil only two years later

(Smith et al 2007; Wallerstein 2004; Wallerstein 2014).

Smith et al. (2007) demonstrate that at the same time many of these international

financial and trade organizations have been gaining influence, many looked to the

International Governing Organizations (IGO) of the United Nations to temper the power

of global capitalism and govern internationally in places where national governments did

not have jurisdiction to challenge policies and practices in any meaningful way. Both

Smith (2008) and Sassen (2008) suggest that the growing nature of transnational

capitalist interest and their work above and beyond traditional areas of national

sovereignty leaves the United Nations as the only sanctioned force with any real

possibility of enforcing regulation, equality, and a common vision for human rights.

They also reinforce the notion that the United Nations has not been truly endowed with

that kind of power and the United States' tentative relationship with the United Nations

significantly undercuts its effectiveness. In contrast, the WTO, WB, and IMF enjoy a

higher degree of support among leading nations that have shifted to a global, free market

economy, and the United States is very active in its pursuit and support of these organizations' policies and practices. This imbalance has brought many actors and movements at the national and transnational level to respond, making the frustration with the role of the UN one more factor in preparing the way for the WSF to draw so many participants, from so many political backgrounds and activist interests, and so many places from around the world.

Smith et al.'s (2007) final of the four key factors that led to the first WSF meeting in 2001 were the women's movements that had already been active and networked throughout the globe. Smith et al. state that feminist responses to gendered violence and injustice have been some of the best examples of globally networked responses and actions to date. While women's rights activists have been deeply involved in conferences led by the United Nations, the same frustrations with the UN's relative ineffectiveness has led them to engage in other outlets, such as the World Social Forum. The inability of the world's governments to address a universal concern for women's rights across the globe cast another doubt on the efficacy of the system. Feminist activists have not only brought their issues to become a part of the WSF's core mission but have been actively involved in promoting, shaping and carrying out the WSF year after year.

These various factors all coalesced in loosely connected networks across the globe and their actors all came to similar conclusions: Empire was the primary source of power in the world; the economy driving it is not centered around local or national needs or social relations any longer; and human rights are failing to compete with profit

margins and the returns on investment that boards of directors expect. Movements that are primarily concerned with renegotiating power structures are likely embedded in this struggle for the ultimate primacy of our time. Democratic, political power does not hold the same level of power as capital in our day, and movements are attempting to challenge that status. The Battle of Seattle in 1999 brought thousands to Seattle from around the world to challenge the primacy of capital as represented in the WTO. This singular meeting place is cited as the most critical in the rise of the WSF. Following the protest in Seattle, many of the same agents began to plan and design for something they had barely thought possible: a transnationally networked series of forums where actors from all movements and all ends of the globe could bring their critique of capitalism, and in those open spaces, begin to imagine an alternative form of globalization and social relations. Two short years later, French activists joined with seven different organizations in Brazil to launch this same vision in the 2001 World Social Forum in Porto Alegre, Brazil.

<div align="center">A Critique of Global Capital and Neoliberal Ideology</div>

Although lines of reasoning and causes pursued vary, the activists that have come together in the World Social Forum process are all responding to a crisis of legitimacy in the world system. This current phase in the capitalist world system has opened the door for challenges to both the market and the governments that ensure its status in the global order, on the grounds that they fail to place human rights at the forefront of their concerns. The motto, "Another world is needed, together it is possible," centers the

movement within Jackie Smith's (2008) claim that two alternative visions of globalization are competing for preeminence in the world order. The World Social Forum seeks to leverage the crisis of legitimacy in the current system in order to advance and facilitate the alternative vision of global democracy centered on a bill of human rights, calling upon political power driven by an alternative ideology in order to subvert the balance against economic power.

Although neoliberalism does not represent a homogenous group, as an ideology, it carries a singular, unified message with clear-cut ambitions and a clearly identified group of opponents. From the outset, the WSF has sought to match this level of clarity by articulating one aim: to challenge its one opponent and that opponent's role in social organization. Hardt and Negri (2001) and Verónica Perera (2003) point out that many consensus-based movements that brought a multiplicity of movements together have lacked a common language and a common enemy, and as such, had lost any sense of cohesion and context. Perera suggests that the WSF set out to alleviate this issue in the beginning by creating a common language of resistance and by setting out a clear, unified target for this resistance. This target was not globalization or capitalism themselves, although some activists coming to the forum may be entirely against one or both. Their opponent was global capital under the influence of neoliberalism and the vision of globalization it represents.

In keeping with this critique, the movement has embraced symbols and forms that offers an ideological challenge to neoliberalism. Actors involved in the design of the

forums chose both their name and the time of year for their annual gathering to be in clear relation and direct contrast to their neoliberal counterparts, and to send the message of critique throughout the globe. Every year, the WSF takes place during the same week as the World Economic Forum (WEF), which brings together financial, corporate, political and media elite from around the world to meet in Davos, Switzerland. The WSF's choice to meet in an urban space of a developing nation to advance global human rights is a critique of the fact that the world's financial elites meet at a Swiss resort to coordinate global economic policy (Anon 2016; Alawalah and Keil 2005; Perera 2003).

As Beuchler (1999) had identified, social movements in our age pay particular attention to the need to challenge and address political motivation and ideology. The World Social Forum leaves no room for doubt as it self-identifies as a democratic challenge to neoliberal ideologies, non-reflexive market forces, and the role leading governments play in ensuring that economic power reigns over global democratic possibilities. The choice to embrace a nonhierarchical structure in itself was a critique of the way power is organized in the capitalist system, and this sends an ideological message of its own to the powers that be. Cândido Grzybowski (2006) identifies the ideological message as: a radical break with neoliberal globalization, a critical understanding of corporations and finance capital, undoing privatization of common goods and public space, challenging the commercialization of social life, demystifying the power of global financial organizations, challenging militarism, and envisioning a world without imperialism.

Like many modern social movements, the philosophies behind the movement determine its structure, and its choice of space is designed to send a message. Wallerstein (2014) identifies the resistance inherent toward the primacy given to the north in the capitalist world system in the WSF's choice to meet in the South. Additionally, many of its architects represent southern, developing nations. To this day, only one of the main World Social Forum gatherings have taken place in an advanced capitalist nation.

Hardt and Negri (2009), Beuchler (1999), and Smith (2008) all argue that this structure – or lack thereof – sends a powerful statement to the world and provides opportunities to experiment with new forms of participatory democracy and action. They also recognize that it creates a particular challenge to making a lasting difference and producing effective changes. The WSF not only sets out to actually produce or change policy, but also to challenge the way society thinks and operates, to induce hope, to explore possibilities, and to dismantle harmful ideologies. As is the case with many of the newer movements aimed at the current era of financial globalization, the WSF also did not set out to articulate a list of demands or a systematic strategy for carrying out those demands. To do so would be to require a top down structure or a democratic process that potentially could sacrifice minority interests for the sake of possible majority interests among their ranks (Anon 2016; Byrd and Jasny 2010; Conway 2005; Hardt and Negri 2004; Hardt and Negri 2009; Perera 2003; Sceri 2013; Smith et al. 2007; Smith 2012; Wallerstein 2014).

The various issues represented at the forum include: women's rights, national and indigenous sovereignty, poverty, debt burdens, crippling pressure for the IMF, WB, and WTO, water sovereignty, racial equality, LGBTQ rights. These are all brought into a general argument for human rights through the forum process. This unified articulation among the various causes brings what Smith (2008) called an alternative ideology for universal rights to the forefront as a contender with the power of the invisible hand. The participatory democracy practiced at the forum gatherings is meant to facilitate political action at home that is coordinated globally against a common target. If economic power has drastically displaced the other three forms of social power, then the world social forum process is attempting to use ideological and political power to regain the balance and put human rights at the forefront of democratic aims. This movement of movements, to be effective, needs the support and momentum of the Multitude.

<center>The Multitude in the World Social Forum</center>

Baiocchi (2015) asserts that the World Social Forum evokes "well the notion of the Multitude, the new plural political subject brought forth by globalization to resist Empire," and classifies it as a "movement of movements." The World Social Forum may in fact be the best representation of the kind of possibilities that Hardt and Negri speak of when outlining the possibilities of the Multitude. The WSF represents the awakening and embodiment of the Multitude in two key ways: first, the flow of various impassioned

activists from varied streams of resistance and diverse identities; and second, the horizontalist organization and structure of the WSF.

At its inception in 2001, the WSF meeting in Porto Alegre was in large part made up of Brazilians, activists from the U.S., additional actors from the America's, the French and then a scattered number of participants from abroad. Building momentum out of the Battle of Seattle, the movement drew many educated individuals – with over half identifying as white – to engage one another, based on their knowledge and resistance to trade relations and trade agreements. Although the gathering had hoped for 5,000 participants, over 10,000 came to the forums that year. One of the forum's claims to legitimacy was diverse representation and participation from countries all over the globe. By the third year, this claim would hold true as the forum drew 150,000 participants from over 150 different countries (Smith et al. 2007; Baiocchi 2015).

Literature on the forum covers a variety of participants involved. Smith et al. (2007) demonstrate that they come from many walks of life: students, professionals, artists, activists, NGO personnel or administrators, skilled, blue collar workers, farmers, entrepreneurs, researchers, professors, and the unemployed. In a working paper of the UC Riverside Institute for Research on World Systems, Chase-Dunn et al. (2006) demonstrate that the social forum draws activists concerned with movements related to: alternative media, anarchism, global justice, human rights, communism, environmentalism, feminism, fair trade, queer rights, health, indigenous rights, labor rights, national liberation, peace, food sovereignty, socialism and movements against

capitalism and against globalization. Their surveys of the 2005 WSF revealed that some participants identified as being concerned with multiple causes and/or participating in multiple movements. The central movements held in common by many were human rights and the environment with the peace, alternative media, anti-globalization and global justice movements following closely behind.

For 11 years now, the World Social Forum has sought to stay true to its form and increase its representation of the world's population, precluding governing bodies from participating and attempting to keep from being coopted by a singular political effort or agenda. The philosophy and structure of the forums have allowed for various actors to continue to share space and collaborate and may help meet the goal the forums have to be a "permanent" process (anon 2016).

Wallerstein (2014) describes the World Social Forum's choice to embrace horizontalism as absolutely necessary to maintain its identity as a counterforce to the capitalist world system. Recognizing that movements often embrace a hierarchical order and through their verticalist organization effectively exclude many from their ranks, the WSF chose to embrace an all-inclusive movement of movements. To oppose the power structures of the day, they embraced an organizing philosophy that stood in direct opposition to the structures of power throughout the ages. In an earlier article, Wallerstein (2004) states that the movement has no spokesperson, no officers, passes no resolutions and organizes no political activities.

In the place of specific demands and a top-down agenda from leadership, the social forums provide spaces for activists and movements to come, share, train, strategize, and articulate their various causes and coordinate actions of their own design. The forums at times operate like a large university forum or conference, allowing for workshops, participatory action, learning, and networking. Smith (2008) identifies a number of ways that the WSF "nurtures" an alternative vision for globalization. First, it serves as a laboratory for experimentation with different forms of participation and representation in a large and diverse global system. This experimentation builds upon lessons of past transnational mobilization, and it contributes to the development and further testing of models for participatory and democratic global governance. Second, it creates opportunities for people to learn skills, share analyses and ideas, and cultivate transnational identities that are all central to the formation of a global political order. Third, the WSF process creates spaces and focal points where diverse movements can come together to organize and expand their own initiatives to democratize the global economy and to hold transnational corporations accountable to broader social norms.

The forums, by design, merely empower collectivity and provide space for envisioning a response to the power of neoliberal globalization. As a result, they allow diverse actors to bring various goals and agendas to the table to debate, discuss, and design. At the forums, they can turn these varied agendas, at their own pace and under their own direction, into strategies for local, regional and global actions against neoliberal

policies. These agendas are not imposed on any of the participants or actors; rather, they

are self-identified and facilitated in the open space. Perera (2003) describes these as a

> Multiplicity of autonomous struggles, embodied in actors as diverse as
> Tobin Tax activists, environmentalists, feminists, gay, lesbian and
> transgender activists, unionists, indigenous peoples, pacifists, human right
> militants, solidarity and cooperative economy proponents, ethnic groups,
> intellectual-activists and activists-intellectuals, churches, NGOs and
> activists struggling for Esperanto as lingua franca, all organized in
> regional or global networks, that draw the map of the WSF… (p.77).

Smith et al. (2007) describe the work of the World Social Forum as "a

culmination of political actions for social justice, peace, human rights, labor rights, and

ecological preservation that resist neoliberal globalization and its attempts to depoliticize

the world's citizens" (p 14). This work to counteract the attempts to depoliticize the

world's citizens is done through the creating of space to experiment with alternative

forms of participatory democracy, to articulate new narratives, and to reclaim the public

sphere.

The Common and the Public Sphere

The World Social Forum defines itself as an "Open Space" according to

Wallerstein (2004) and Grzybowski (2006) and identifies the reversal of the

commercialization of social life and the privatization of public spaces as its central focus.

Efforts to create a place where transnational communication networks can come together

to challenge the dominant narrative essentially centers the entire movement as an effort to

take back both the public sphere and the commons. Hardt and Negri (2001) describe the

Multitude as a force "whose desire for liberation is not satiated except by reappropriating new spaces" (p 396). Along with Robinson (2004) and Smith (2008), they express concern for the apparatus available to Empire or the Transnational Capital Class for advancing its vision of globalization and ideology. In their view, the interest of the media and most government representatives in advanced nations represent the interests of capital and the public sphere. The place for debate and challenge is all but eroded as a result. In line with Habermas's (1989) work on the public sphere, it is the role of social movements to reclaim the spaces necessary to create democratic opportunities to challenge the powers that be.

In terms of the public sphere, the WSF is by design a new attempt at a public sphere centered around experiments in communicative, articulatory, or participatory democracy. Its spaces are designed to bring in diverse actors from around the world and create a common language of resistance among them. In absence of easily accessible, global media outlets to get an alternative to neoliberal ideology out there, the WSF creates its own networks of communication to spread new possibilities throughout the globe. The structure of forums – which is something often found in the academy – was adopted by the WSF architects to encourage debate, discourse, and dissemination of democratic ideals, collaborative techniques, solidarity, and a unified message centered around universal human rights. Activists collaborate to create local, national, and international political agendas and strategies for how to assist one another in carrying them out. Feminists, environmentalists, anti-racists, human rights activists and others

lead talks, facilitate panels, open forums, set up demonstrations, lead workshops to spread knowledge and then coordinate resistance (Byrd and Jasny 2010; Conway and Singh 2009; Grzybowski 2006; Smith et al. 2007; Wallerstein 2004).

The forum model embraces the use of technology and networks in the way that Castells (2010) suggests is necessary to create alternative lines of communication that can rival capitalist interests in the current age. The establishment of a WSF office facilitates communication regarding the forums and gatherings across the globe, but cannot on its own create an alternative media network. The activists themselves, some drawn from alternative media movements, create networked lines of communication that allow participants to articulate a common message, and to coordinate their self-determined action plans once they return home (Byrd and Jasny 2010; Conway and Singh 2009; Grzybowski 2006; Smith et al. 2007; Wallerstein 2004).

In addition to creating an alternative public sphere, space and a reclaiming of the commons is absolutely central to the World Social Forum's mission. As mentioned previously, the World Social Forum has taken place in a northern, advanced capitalist nation only once in its history, and that was with the most recent forum in Quebec, Canada in 2016. According to Wallerstein (2004), the choice to meet in Third World nations was an active statement placing democratic power over globalization in the hands of the southern nations and periphery states, which had for so long had no voice in the world-system. After the first three years of meeting in Brazil, participants called out for the importance of having the forum represented in their own spaces and the forum began

a world tour of sorts to different places in Asia, Africa, South America, and finally, North
America.

The choice to hold massive forums in urban spaces where meetings take place
throughout the entire city in libraries, fairgrounds, universities, churches, schools,
stadiums, parks, coffee shops and many more places sends a message that this is a civil
process that engages all aspects of life to challenge the invasive, power of capital that has
commoditized all aspects of life and governance. Whereas neoliberal capital turned all
areas of life into potential markets and commodities in an attempt to depoliticize action,
then the WSF design is re-politicizing all aspects of life and using public places to do so.
Much of the WSF's concerns center around the privatization and estrangement of basic
human needs and rights. The influx of 150,000 people into one urban area to create a
democratic dialogue argues the basic notion that many of these things should be held in
common for the good of the Multitude (Byrd and Jasny 2010; Conway and Singh 2009;
Grzybowski 2006; Smith et al. 2007; Wallerstein 2004).

Perhaps one example of the importance of public spaces for the process of the
World Social Forum stands above all the rest: the 2011 World Social Forum in Dakar.
Andy Scerri (2013) describes the events as the worst outcome that could be imagined.
The local organizers of the Forum chose to house the forums on a University campus far
from the city center. The government had been inclined to support the WSF gathering in
the beginning, but shortly before the gathering convened, the Senegalese President began
to announce through radio that free market solutions were more effective than social

movements in eradicating poverty and addressing inequalities. It is possible that the events of the Arab Spring caused concern within his administration about the possibilities of uprisings. As a result, the University, which had been given holidays for the duration of the events, had their holidays revoked and 70,000 attendees to the World Social Forum were suddenly without space. The issue of space deepened as it became clear that NGO administrators and activists with means were quickly able to regroup and facilitate spaces of their own for some semblance of a spontaneous plan B, while participants without means were left without food, adequate water, space and programming, creating a divide in a forum that centers on equality.

The government control of the public space and the ability to pull that space in support of free market interests and opposition to the democratic process of the forum illustrates the challenge of taking back the commons in its starkest form. Capital interests and government interest colluded to pull space and political power from the people in the final moments before the gathering and derailed the forum for the entire year. This jeopardized morale, commitment, and momentum for the following years. If eviction from space ended the Occupy Movement, this blocking of space shows the potential to seriously hinder the future of the WSF. The movements that seek to take back the commons and leverage themselves in public spaces depend upon those spaces to act. The case of the 2011 fiasco suggests that the local, national and global networking of the World Social Forum allows it to absorb these kinds of situations and maintain its efforts despite interference.

Networked Engagement at the Local, the National and the Global Level

By design, the World Social Forum needs to be able to compete and challenge the highly

resourced and organized networks of the Transnational Capitalist Class and the apparatus

of Empire. According to Smith (2008), any movement wanting to challenge such a

transnational network must find a way to network on the global, national and local levels

in order to effectively raise awareness and fight for policy at every level of government.

The WSF's structure and organization as a forum, localized with global

intentions, allows it to address many of the difficulties that theorists such as Smith

(2008), and Hardt and Negri (2004) have identified. Its localized nature each time the

'gathering' occurs allows it to begin to connect the local to the global. Its focus on local

organizations networked together for global ends effectively makes the global process

real to individuals, along with the idea of joining a global movement feasible for a person

whose life is bound to one locale. As Smith (2008) asserts, its model includes various

"alternative political activities," which are,

> Important in two major ways. First, they help socialize large numbers of
> people by creating accessible, fun, and personally rewarding ways for
> them to be politically active. When people attend protest events of all
> kinds, they not only express political ideas, but they also learn about them
> at the same time as they cultivate networks of friends and other personal
> connections that can support their ongoing political engagement. By
> bringing politics to the spaces of people's everyday lives, activists help
> bridge the gaps between global institutional arenas and the locally lived
> experiences of individual citizens (p. 202).

Grzybowski (2006) argues that the WSF maintains its structure by constantly

shifting alliances and coalitions in order to avoid hegemony and preserve diversity. In

many ways, the WSF operates as a communication hub to facilitate the collaboration of multiple movements, and the synergy that comes from activists gathering in one place to reimagine possibilities together, always exercising collective caution to avoid prioritizing any one over the other. This is the reason it is described as a movement of movements. Drawing from the example of the feminist movement, the WSF is designed to help create global solidarity around particular issues as well as a universal call for general human rights. An issue such as women's rights has to be fought and codified at the local and national level, but solidarity at the global level is needed to evoke the support of leading nations and intergovernmental agencies and to leverage pressure on localities to bring change.

In regards to issues such as global warming and labor rights, national laws are no longer enough on their own to challenge capital excess as capital is mobile and not bound by national borders. The Transnational Capitalist Class benefits regardless of where their enterprises are located. It takes local, national and international awareness campaigns to challenge company practices and norms among the consumer class, and it takes globally coordinated demands and political actions at all three levels to codify laws that hold companies accountable worldwide.

The architects of the forums foresaw the need for this multilevel networking, but wanted to avoid the hierarchy that many wanted enacted to facilitate it. Instead they created a loose charter that created a WSF office, an International Council (IC), and called for each forum to establish a local organizing committee (OC). The WSF office is

located in Sao Paolo Brazil and exists only to facilitate communication between the IC

and the OCs. It is specifically designed not to organize, plan or administrate any aspect of

the World Social Forum. The transnational networks depend upon a reliable hub for

communication, but endowing the office with any other responsibilities, in the eyes of the

forum architects, would open the door for administrative or organizational power to grow

within the office and therefore produce some sort of hierarchical dynamic. The IC is

simply an advisory council that explores and facilitates the locations of each forum,

collaborates and connects with the varied regional forums that have begun to arise

throughout the world in-between annual gatherings, and to keep the OCs within the

bounds of the movement's philosophies and charter. The OCs operate on the local level

at the site of each forum, establishing themes for the forums but going no further in

determining the political efforts that may take place in those open spaces (Anon 2016;

Grzybowski 2006; Scerri 2013; Smith et al. 2007; Smith 2008; Wallerstein 2004).

Although the forum has had its fair share of critics, as does any social movement

or adventure in innovative practices, it still moves forward today with an ever

increasingly effective system of networks. According to Smith et al. (2007) the forum's

annual meetings have begun to spawn regional meetings that occur throughout the world

in the interim to continue the coordination of more regional efforts. Participants of the

forums return to their home nations with clear agendas to challenge the excesses of

capital through local and national policies and to articulate new cultural norms related to

human rights and consumption. Many participants of the regional and annual forums

have collaborated to challenge intergovernmental agencies of the U.N., denounce

ineffective and support effective NGOs and IGOs, and call out the negative practices of

governments and corporations. It is possible that the World Social Forum is the best

example of a global movement that the world has seen to date.

Conclusion

Similar to the Occupy Movement, the World Social Forum's existence is a critique on the balance of social power in the world system. The movement arose out of the frustrations of anti-globalists in the Battle for Seattle, indigenous and national sovereignty movements in the face of economic imperialism and imbalanced trade relations, dissatisfaction with the efficacy of global institutions chartered with guaranteeing universal human rights, and the rising power of transnational movements (e.g., the feminist movement). All of these movements came together to challenge the sources of social power at their core, and they quickly recognized that the neoliberal economic agenda had subordinated the other sources of social power and enlisted them in its own advancement. In this system, or Empire, during this current age of capitalism, inequality has widened throughout the world and citizens challenging that power have struggled to effectively temper it. The WSF became the open space for a local, national and global coordination of efforts to reverse that trend and fight for an alternative vison of globalization that puts political power back on par with economic forces.

The World Social Forum shares much with the Occupy Movement, including its connection to a series of global movements and eruptions of unrest that were all responses to the economic issues throughout the world. Both movements sought above all to offer a critique of the capitalist world system and to leverage the gap left by crises of legitimacy. Actors from both movements chose their symbolism carefully, with Occupy taking ground in the center of the financial world and the WSF setting itself as a Third

World, global counterpart to the World Economic Forum. OWS and the WSF both took the innovative form of nonhierarchical, consensus based movements that sought to avoid a clear political agenda or list of demands that would have necessarily created an exclusive hierarchy. Each movement leveraged the widespread sense of outrage and frustration at the excesses of global finance in order to draw a large cross section of the populace, calling for the Multitude to unite toward a common vision.

There are a few key places where the Occupy Movement and the World Social Forum have differed. First, the World Social Forum is still alive and active today. Although the Occupy Movement has perhaps left a legacy that is still contributing to discourse across the United States and even the world, it was never on par with becoming a process rather than a protest. The World Social Forum is self-identified as a permanent, global process and not a protest. The OWS meant to send a message loud and clear to the finance industry and to government that the trajectory of financial inequality was reaching unbearable heights and the legitimacy of neoliberalism was being challenged. Their protests created an alternative public sphere to challenge the priority given to market forces and its persistence depended on the occupation of the sites its players chose. As a protest, it was not designed for longevity and it provoked a response from law enforcement evicting it from its space. The World Social Forum was designed not as a protest but as a way to facilitate networking and the coordinating of action through connecting in public spaces. As it operates with little disruptive tactics and does not

depend upon around the clock occupation, it provokes less of a response from the establishment or law enforcement.

The second departure between the two movements centers around agency and action. Like Occupy, the Forum chooses not to dictate from the top down what actions are to be taken to challenge the system, but instead focuses on articulating an alternative ideology and vision to that of global capitalism and it seeks to create space for various actors to determine what actions they deem best. Its annual gathering format allows activists to share space and create strategies of their own for execution on the local, national and global levels. Its longevity and focus on facilitating the building of capacity and encouraging agency, rather than just focusing on revealing a crisis of legitimacy, has allowed its actors to create and execute political actions throughout the globe. The World Social Forum is not just engaging with ideology, it encourages a clear engaging with structure in order to challenge and change those structures.

Third, the Occupy Movement joined a series of global protests and was reflexive of its own position as a challenger to global powers, encouraging solidarity with other global actors. However, it was not attempting to challenge global processes or targeting the process of globalization itself. The World Social Forum at the outset was determined to become a global actor and shaper of global policy, and as such set out to build the space for local, national, and global interests to merge. Where the Occupy Movement was swept into the movements of the global Multitude, the World Social Forum was designed to mobilize it.

The World Social Forum today represents a movement of movements, a collective and coordinated effort that challenges the hierarchy of power that is drastically out of balance in this epoch of global capital. The Forum's embrace of the process gives the impression that it is slow, that it does not bring the urgency and rage against inequality that was so evident in the Occupy Movement. However, it does suggest it is steady. The progress it encourages suggest reform more than revolution, and the promise that democratic, political power can come to eventually check the excesses of corporate greed and transnational sidestepping of regulation and accountability. Where Occupy raged against the system and created awareness, the World Social Forum is teaching people to demand a voice in an increasingly globalized world, to coordinate their actions so they generate more power, and to engage the system and challenge its injustices by placing human rights at the center of our world system.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Throughout its history, the capitalist world-system has been a dynamic system influenced by national agendas, the opening and closing of new markets, wars, scarcity and abundance of resources, labor movements, innovation, and the democratic process. The agricultural revolution and the first and second industrial revolutions certainly brought their share of inequalities and imbalance to the sources of power, but social movements and national policies enacted in the interest of the people were able to challenge that imbalance and buffer the extent of inequality. In these past occurrences, action could be taken at the national level to mitigate these strains, and there were clear ways to challenge the system to bring a new balance. Liberalism triumphed in these times, especially following the Great Depression and World War II clearing the way for massive Keynesian reforms, including market regulations and programs that lessened the impact of accumulation and spread wealth and resources in a way that lent legitimacy to capitalism as the basis of the world system.

With the move into the information age, the increased integration of global markets, and the rise of a neoliberal ideology and agenda, the last forty years have produced a significant shift from these kinds of efforts. As a result, the accumulation of wealth into fewer hands has intensified and benefited a network of global investors and corporate entities more than everyone else. During the financial collapse of 2008 the wealthy became wealthier while 90% of the world became poorer. In a global system,

the apparatuses that once held this kind of accumulation and inequality in check during

the previous cycles and industrial revolutions have failed to do so in the information age.

As inequality deepens and the other sources of social power fail to put economic power

in check, the legitimacy of the system has come into question. The neoliberal vision of

globalization depends upon a strong adherence to an ideological system of belief that

connects democracy, freedom, and opportunity to a global free market system that

benefits from little regulation. The crisis of legitimacy has deepened as people have

begun to feel their democratic power lessen, their personal freedom jeopardized in a

market that commodifies every aspect of their life and then fails to deliver the

opportunities they were promised.

The two case studies above have demonstrated this discontent and revealed the

possibility inherent among the world's population, the 99% or the Multitude, to reclaim

political power, to force a new balance among the sources of social power in determining

the nature of social relations throughout the globe. In the absence of any real attempt at a

liberal compromise, these movements will continue to ferment and new iterations will

erupt whenever and wherever inequality and disillusionments are found. It has required

synthesizing the work of many theorists to understand the dynamics represented in these

two significant challenges to the priority of capitalism within the world system: the role

of the information revolution, the rise of a transnational capital class, the formation of

Empire and the convergence of the Multitude within networked global movements

seeking to create an alternative vision for globalization.

Many activists and theorists have seen the Occupy Movement and the World Social Forum as experiments in the process of global democratization and modern modes of mobilization that present the real possibility of a democratic revolution. The rapid rise of the Occupy Wall Street and World Social Forum Movements, their adept use of the public sphere to critique global capitalism, and their ideological assault on neoliberalism demonstrate a political will capable of altering the course of the world system. These two case studies present the very real possibility that a cross section of the world's population, drawn from a wide array of political agendas and social movements may in fact be able to effectively unite under a global and universal vision of human rights and equality. These two movements effectively networked at the local, the national and the global levels to a degree that mirrors their elite, transnational counterparts. If the Occupy Movement turns out to indeed be a test case, and the World Social Forum continues in its long term vision for global democracy then the course of globalization and the future balance of social power is likely to see greater contests in the future.

REFERENCES

Alcoff, Linda Martín1. 2012. "Then and Now." *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 26(2):268–78.

Allahwala, Ahmed and Roger Keil. 2005. "Introduction to a Debate on the World Social Forum." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(2):409–416.

Álvarez, Rebecca, Erika Gutierrez, Linda Kim, Christine Petit, and Ellen Reese. 2008. "The Contours of Color at the World Social Forum: Reflections on Racialized Politics, Representation, and the Global Justice Movement." *Critical Sociology* 34(3):389–407.

Anon. n.d. "World Social Forum 2016 | Another World Is Needed. Together, It Is Possible!" Retrieved September 9, 2016.

Appel, Hannah. 2014. "Occupy Wall Street and the Economic Imagination." *Cultural Anthropology (Society for Cultural Anthropology)* 29(4):602–25.

Baiocchi, Gianpaolo. 2015. "The Party and the Multitude: Brazil's Workers' Party (PT) and the Challenges of Building a Just Social Order in a Globalizing Context." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 10(1):199–215.

Ballantyne, Glenda. 2007. *Creativity and Critique; Subjectivity and Agency in Touraine and Ricoeur.* Boston, MA: Brill.

Bashir, Rizwana. 2011. "Occupy Wall Street." *Pakistan & Gulf Economist* 30(43):69–71.

Blumer, Herbert. 1986. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 1993. "Beyond Resource Mobilization?" *The Sociological Quarterly* 34(2):217–235.

Buechler, Steven M. 1995. "New Social Movement Theories." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36(3):441–464.

Buechler, Steven M. 1999. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism.* 1 edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Byrd, Scott C. and Lorien Jasny. 2010. "Transnational Movement Innovation and Collaboration: Analysis of World Social Forum Networks." *Social Movement Studies* 9(4):355–72.

Calhoun, Craig. 2013. "Occupy Wall Street in Perspective." *The British Journal of Sociology* 64(1):26–38.

Castells, Manuel. 2008. "The New Public Sphere: Global Civil Society, Communication Networks, and Global Governance." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616:78–93.

Castells, Manuel. 2011. *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Castells, Manuel. 2015. *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. 2 edition. Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity.

Chafkin, Max. 2012. "Revolution Number 99." Vanity Fair, February 20. Retrieved December 12, 2013 (http://www.vanityfair.com/politics/2012/02/occupy-wall-street-201202).

Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Peter Grimes. 1995. "World-Systems Analysis." *Annual Review of Sociology* 387–417.

Chase-Dunn, Christopher, Christine Petit, Richard Niemeyer, Robert A. Hanneman, Rebecca Giem, Erika Guitierrez and Ellen Reese. 2006. "Contours of Solidarity and Division Among Global Movements." *Institute of World Systems Research, UC Riverside.* (http://irows.ucr.edu/papers/irows26/irows26.htm).

Connolly, William E. 2013. *The Fragility of Things: Self-Organizing Processes, Neoliberal Fantasies, and Democratic Activism*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Conover, Michael D., Emilio Ferrara, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. 2013. "The Digital Evolution of Occupy Wall Street." *PLoS ONE* 8(5):1–5.

Conway, Janet. 2004. "Place Matters: India's Challenge to Brazil at the World Social Forum." *Antipode* 36(3):357–60.

Conway, Janet. 2005. "Social Forums, Social Movements and Social Change: A Response to Peter Marcuse on the Subject of the World Social Forum." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(2):425–28.

Conway, Janet and Jakeet Singh. 2009. "Is the World Social Forum a Transnational Public Sphere? Nancy Fraser, Critical Theory and the Containment of Radical Possibility." *Theory, Culture & Society* 26(5):61–84.

Costanza-Chock, Sasha. 2012. "Mic Check! Media Cultures and the Occupy Movement." *Social Movement Studies* 11(3/4):375–85.

Crane, N. J., and I. Ashutosh. 2013. "A Movement Returning Home? Occupy Wall Street After the Evictions." *Cultural Studies; Critical Methodologies* 13(3):168–72.

Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Reissue edition. New York: Vintage.

Gitlin, Todd. 2012. "Occupy's Evolution." *Nation* 294(14):17–18.

Gitlin, Todd. 2013. "Occupy's Predicament: The Moment and the Prospects for the Movement." *The British Journal of Sociology* 64(1):3–25.

Grzybowski, Cândido. 2006. "The World Social Forum: Reinventing Global Politics." *Global Governance* 12(1):7–13.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hammond, John L. 2015. "The Anarchism of Occupy Wall Street." *Science & Society* 79(2):288–313.

Hannigan, John A. 1985. "Alain Touraine, Manuel Castells and Social Movement Theory a Critical Appraisal." *Sociological Quarterly* 435–454.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2009. Commonwealth. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2001. Empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2005. *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. Reprint edition. New York: Penguin Books.

Harvey, David. 2007. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Hegeman, Susan. 2015. "A Sociological Imagination." *Studia Neophilologica* 87:97–103.

Hjelmgaard, Kim. 2014. "Oxfam: Richest 1% Own Nearly Half of World's Wealth." USA TODAY. Retrieved November 28, 2016.

Holmes, Alison R. 2009. *The Third Way: Globalisation's Legacy*. Leicester: Troubador Publishing Ltd.

Jaffe, Sarah. 2013. "Occupy Wall Street Was Humbling to Many of Us." *The Sociological Quarterly* 54(2):198–202.

Juris, Jeffrey S. et al. 2014. "Movement Building and the United States Social Forum." *Social Movement Studies* 13(3):328–48.

Juris, Jeffrey S., Michelle Ronayne, Firuzeh Shokooh-Valle, and Robert Wengronowitz. 2012. "Negotiating Power and Difference within the 99%." *Social Movement Studies* 11(3/4):434–40.

Kim, Richard. 2011. "The Audacity of Occupy Wall Street." *Nation* 293(21):15–21.

Kreiss, Daniel and Zeynep Tufekci. 2013. "Occupying the Political Occupy Wall Street, Collective Action, and the Rediscovery of Pragmatic Politics." *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 13(3):163–67.

Langman, Lauren. 2013. "Occupy: A New New Social Movement." *Current Sociology* 61(4): 510-524.

Macpherson, Robert and David A. Smith. 2013. "Occupy as a World Anti-Systemic Movement." *Peace Review* 25(3):367–75.

Mann, Michael. 1986. *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 1, A History of Power from the Beginning to AD 1760*. 2 edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, Michael. 2012. *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 4, Globalizations, 1945-2011*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McLuskie, Ed. 1993. "Against Transformations of Communication into Control: Continuities in the Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas." *Journal of Communication* 43(1):154–65.

Milkman, R., M. A. Bamyeh, W. J. Wilson, D. Williams, and D. B. Gould. 2012. "Understanding 'Occupy.'" *Contexts* 11(2):12–21.

Milkman, Ruth. 2014. "Millennial Movements." *Dissent* 61(3):55–59.

Parsons, Talcott. 1960. The Distribution of Power in American Society. In *Structure and Process in Modern Societies*. New York: Free Press.

Perera, Verónica. 2003. "Globalization from Below and New Political Identities: The Case of the World Social Forum." *Journal of Economic & Social Research* 5(1):73–93.

Pichardo, Nelson A. 1997. "New Social Movements: A Critical Review." *Annual Review of Sociology* 411–430.

Piore, Michael J. and Charles F. Sabel. 1984. *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.

Piven, Frances Fox. 2014. "Interdependent Power: Strategizing for the Occupy Movement." *Current Sociology* 62(2):223–31.

Read, Jason. 2012. "Commonwealth, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Cambridge, MA.: Belknap-Harvard, 2009." *Historical Materialism* 20(1):211–21.

Roberts, Alasdair. 2012. "Why the Occupy Movement Failed." *Public Administration Review* 72(5):754–62.

Robinson, William I. 2004. *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Production, Class, and State in a Transnational World*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Robinson, William I. 2014. *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*. New York City: Cambridge University Press.

Rowe, James K. and Myles Carroll. 2014. "Reform or Radicalism: Left Social Movements from the Battle of Seattle to Occupy Wall Street." *New Political Science* 36(2):149–71.

Sassen, Saskia. 2008. *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Savio, Gianmarco. 2015. "Coordination Outside Formal Organization: Consensus-Based Decision-Making and Occupation in the Occupy Wall Street Movement." *Contemporary Justice Review* 18(1):42–54.

Scerri, Andy. 2013. "The World Social Forum: Another World Might Be Possible." *Social Movement Studies* 12(1):111–20.

Schneider, Nathan. 2011. "From Occupy Wall Street to Occupy Everywhere." *Nation* 293(18):13–17.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. 1st edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, Jackie et al. 2007. *Global Democracy and the World Social Forums*. Boulder, CO: Routledge.

Smith, Jackie. 2008. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Baltimore, MD: JHU Press.

Smith, Jackie and Ernesto Verdeja, eds. 2013. *Globalization, Social Movements, and Peacebuilding*. First Edition. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Taibbi, Matt. 2012. "We Should Always Make Demands." *Rolling Stone* (1159):57–57.

Talcott, Molly and Dana Collins. 2012. "Building a Complex and Emancipatory Unity: Documenting Decolonial Feminist Interventions within the Occupy Movement." *Feminist Studies* 38(2):485–506.

Tejerina, Benjamín, Ignacia Perugorría, Tova Benski, and Lauren Langman. 2013. "From Indignation to Occupation: A New Wave of Global Mobilization." *Current Sociology* 61(4):377–92.

Thompson, John B. 1993. "Review Article - The Theory of the Public Sphere." Theory, Culture & Society 10(3):173–89.

Touraine, Alain. 2002. "The Importance of Social Movements." *Social Movement Studies* 1(1):89–95.

Turner, Ralph Herbert and Lewis M. Killian. 1972. *Collective Behaviour*. 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Vidal, John. 1999. "Real Battle for Seattle." *The Guardian*, December 4. Retrieved October 23, 2016.

Wagner, A. 2000. "Reframing 'Social Origins' Theory: The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 29(4):541–53.

Wagner, Gerhard. 1991. "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society." *Theory, Culture & Society* 8(4):119–23.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2011a. "Structural Crisis in the World-System." *Monthly Review* 62(10). Retrieved September 2, 2016

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2011b. *The Modern World-System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2014. "Antisystemic Movements, Yesterday and Today." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 20(2):158–72.