34

Globalization and Social Movements

Massimiliano Andretta, Donatella della Porta, and Clare Saunders[1]

Introduction

The issue of how globalization affects social movements and vice versa is very complex and heavily debated in social movement research. Given that globalization takes place within economic, political and cultural spheres of human action, we organize our chapter by focusing on these three spheres separately. Since movements that operate across the entire globe are rare phenomena, we refer mainly in this chapter to transnational rather than global movements. Transnational movements are movements with operations in more than one country at any particular time. They consist of informal networks and formal federated organizations with national chapters. Our primary emphasis in this chapter is on how globalization affects movements and how transnational movements, in turn, emerge and react. In what follows, we will address the socio-economic, political and cultural dimensions of globalization and transnational movements.

Global Capitalism and Social Movements

Several recent social movements have addressed the developments of global capitalism, in particular, neoliberal policies of privatization of social services, the deregulation of markets, and austerity policies. Social movement scholars have developed a useful set of concepts and theories to understand social movements in core capitalist countries with developed welfare states. This kit is, however, insufficient to make sense of contentious politics around the globe since the 2000s, especially of the transnational dimensions of contemporary anti-austerity protests. Such protests have brought fresh attention to the links between capitalist developments and movements. In order to properly understand the scaling of identities, the organizational structures, and framing of transnational movements, attention needs to be given to changes in global

The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements, Second Edition. Edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Holly J. McCammon.
© 2019 John Wiley & Sons Ltd. Published 2019 by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

capitalism. Marxist, neo-Marxist, or post-Marxist theories are particularly useful for drawing attention to the ways in which capitalism has developed.

The World Systems Approach

Some time ago, the *world system approach* (Wallerstein 1990) theorized anti-systemic movements, pointing at internal differences within capitalism – in particular, between capitalism at the core, the semi-periphery, and the periphery. This approach, which has historically had more influence in research on labor than on other social movements, considered that it was anti-systemic movements' task to resist greedy capitalism. As Immanuel Wallerstein noted, "to be anti-systemic is to argue that neither liberty nor equality is possible under the existing system and that both are possible only in a transformed world" (1990: 36). In this vision, capitalist oppression is expected to result in the revolt of the oppressed, but with different dynamics at the core, the semi-periphery, and the periphery. Although the world has changed considerably since the theory was introduced, it can be applied to the new/emergent position of countries in the global system, with China considered by some scholars as a new hegemon.

The world system approach generates the expectation that protests and movements will result because the economically oppressed will rebel. While this approach was criticized for being too structural and for underplaying the political conditions under which these movements emerge, what remains useful is the attention given to the ways in which specific characteristics of hegemonic capitalism influence the socio-economic conditions at the core, the semi-periphery, and the periphery (Arrighi, Hopkins, and Wallerstein 1989). So, in Latin America, movements developed to target the form of neoliberalism existing in the semi-periphery with different timing and intensity than those taking place in western democracies, which are developing and targeting conditions in the economic core (Wallerstein 2010: 141). The prediction that capitalist expansion produces resistance, first of all on labor conditions, appears to be confirmed by research addressing the emergence and development of labor conflicts, including in the BRICS countries (that is, Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) (Silver 2003; Zajak 2016).

Multitudes in the empire

Some expectations about the territorial expansion of capitalism at the global level and its effects on movement mobilizations emerged recently within the debate on the *empire*, as a new capitalist formation. In particular, Hardt and Negri (2000) singled out in the "multitude" the new anti-capitalist subject, which they see as an emerging global opposition. In their analysis, the empire represents a step forward in the evolution of Foucault's bio-political power which is now attributed to international organizations such as the UN or the IMF, and even more to huge transnational corporations. With the precariousness of labor, capitalist exploitation has expanded beyond the factory and now involves significant movement of people from the countryside into global cities. Through this expansion the empire produces its own opposition as the "imperial power can no longer discipline the power of the multitude; it can only impose control over their general social and productive capacities" (ibid.: 211). In this vision, exploitation in the empire would produce rebellion, but in this

case on a global scale. The proletariat would now include all those exploited by and subject to capitalist domination, that is, the multitudes (ibid.: 53).

Reflections on the multitudes contribute to social movement research by giving attention to the ways in which contradictions in social and political systems interact in a global context. Massive expulsions of people produced by climate change, wars, or land acquisition of large corporations (Sassen 2013) produce various forms of everyday resistance to exploitation, for example, of the type that Asef Bayat (2010) has defined as non-movements. Similarly, the revolts during the Arab Spring involved pauperized groups in global cities (della Porta 2014) and asylum seekers in Europe, and "illegal" migrants in the USA have made claims for their rights.

Neoliberalism and global conflicts

When analysing transnational social movements in the new millennium, one has to consider also significant transformations in global capitalist formations. Social movements within neoliberalism are affected by transformations in relations between the state and market. In so-called Fordist societies, Keynesian forms of state intervention were used to overcome periodic crises through fiscal and monetary policies, with an expansion in public expenditure. Welfare policies have been able to reduce social inequalities and buffer the effects of market dynamics. Theorization about new social movements mainly referred to the consolidation of a specific (and quite exceptional) moment in the relations between the state and the market in advanced democracies. New social movements were indeed considered to be stronger in countries in which the class cleavage was pacified, leaving space for the emergence of new cleavages (Kriesi et al. 1995). For scholars like Alain Touraine (1985) and Alberto Melucci (1996), the industrial society and its main conflicts around material productions were eclipsed by the development of new conflicts around immaterial forms of property. Since the 1980s, the rapid decline of Fordism was, however, reflected in a re-emergence of conflicts on economic issues, addressing the increasing social inequalities and the retrenchment of the welfare state (Hutter 2014).

In different forms, social movements have networked at the transnational level, finding expression especially within the Global Justice Movement (see below). Such networks have facilitated the bridging of concerns from "old" and "new" movements within broad and heterogeneous coalitions within which anti-neoliberalism worked as a master frame (della Porta et al. 2006; Smith et al. 2007). While the Global Justice Movement has been the expression of transnational protests in the rampant years of neoliberalism, the wave of anti-austerity movements in the 2010s were reacting to the crisis of neoliberalism. This wave of protest began with the pots-and-pans revolt in Iceland in 2008 (Júlíusson and Helgason 2013), followed by large Occupy protests that spread from the Arab Spring to Southern Europe and then to the USA in 2011, and to Turkey and Brazil in 2013. Increasing inequalities, aggravated by austerity economic policies, were opposed by movements stigmatizing the move toward the free market and away from social protection (della Porta 2015, 2017a).

The social composition of this wave of protests reflected changes in global capitalism, mobilizing broad coalitions of people who had been hit particularly hard by the global recession: from young people in precarious positions in the labor market (who defined themselves as the "generation without a future") to retired

people hit by cut in pensions and in social services, and also those employed in the public sector and blue-collar employees, who had suffered declining labor protection, in the context of the increasing liberalization of the labor market.

Some characteristics of this latter wave of protests resemble those singled out by Karl Polanyi in his influential analysis of the liberalism in the nineteenth century (Polanyi 1957 [1944]). In *The Great Transformation*, Polanyi identified a *double movement* in capitalist development, with movement toward the free market balanced by counter-movements for social protection. Building upon Polanyi, Burawoy (2015: 16) singled out a sequence of three successive counter-movements at the global level, respectively for labor rights, social rights, and human rights. As he notes, "If these movements were globally connected, it was their national framing that drove their distinctive momentum. They may share underlying economic causes but their expression is shaped by the terms and structure of national politics." As in Polanyi's counter-movements, in the second great transformation related to neoliberalism, several movements emerged with a focus on the defense of the rights to housing, health, education, and jobs. These rights developed in the 1960s and 1970s in the First World in social democracies and in developing states, and in the Second World in socialist regimes. In this sense, these movements are to a certain extent backward-looking, aiming at a re-establishment of old rights that are seen as being challenged by neoliberalism (della Porta et al. 2017). At the same time, however, these movements face the important challenge of building a transnational coalition of social groups that are being damaged by different aspects of neoliberalism and its crisis.

With reference to the recent global dynamics in capitalism, Harvey (2003) pointed to the development, together with forms of accumulation by production, of forms of accumulation by "accumulation by dispossession."

> As in the case of labour supply, capitalism always requires a fund of assets outside of itself if it is to confront and circumvent pressures of over-accumulation. If those assets, such as empty land or new raw material sources, do not lie to hand, then capitalism must somehow produce them.
>
> (ibid.: 143)

Neoliberalism results in the privatization and downsizing of public services, while liberalization and deregulation favor the growth of financial capitalism at the cost of production. In different ways in different geopolitical areas, social movements have appeared bifurcated between mobilizations around production (such as factory protests against capitalist expansion), and mobilization around accumulation by dispossession (e.g. protest against a re-commodification of previously de-commodified goods, such as social services). While in the former, "the exploitation of wage labour and conditions defining the social wage are the central issues," the latter include

> resistance to classic forms of primitive accumulation (such as displacement of peasant populations from the land); to the brutal withdrawal of the state from all social obligations (except surveillance and policing); to practices destructive of cultures, histories, and environments; and to the "confiscatory" deflations and inflations wrought by the contemporary forms of finance capital in alliance with the state.
>
> (Harvey 2005: 203)

The very over-exploitative logic of accumulation by dispossession is expected to impact the forms of collective mobilization, both in waves of protest against the flexibilization of the labor market and in protests in defense of public services, such as health or housing, which have been central in the anti-austerity movements in Europe and beyond (della Porta et al. 2017).

The construction of social coalitions among different social groups certainly requires the development of new protest strategies and new identities. To this end, the so-called "movements of the squares" which have mobilized world-wide have developed innovative, participatory, and deliberative conceptions and practices of democracy (della Porta 2013). In Tahrir Square in Cairo, Puerta del Sol in Madrid, Syntagma Square in Athens, Zuccotti Park in New York, Taksim Square in Istanbul,

> a prefigurative politics took priority, imagining what education, family, welfare, and banking might look like in a "really" democratic world. This participatory democracy embraced a new political language of accountability suspicious of all inherited institutions and ideologies, and even of leadership itself.
>
> (Burawoy 2015)

Besides prefiguration, protests against neoliberalism and its crisis, in Latin America as well as in Southern Europe, have produced a wave of movement parties which have been extremely (and surprisingly) successful (della Porta et al. 2017; Roberts 2015).

Contrary to the expectation that *movements of crisis*, sparked by unemployment, food shortages, and dislocations, are short-lived, small, violent and unsuccessful (Kerbo 1982), anti-austerity protests have instead often been long-lasting, huge, peaceful, and successful. A noticeable difference with the Global Justice Movement, which addressed neoliberalism in its rampant years, is the anti-austerity protests' stronger focus on issues of national sovereignty. Transnational campaigns against neoliberalism in crisis are emerging, for example, in Europe with the Blockupy protests against the European Central Bank or the first European Strike against Austerity. But transnational coordination seems rather different given the different timing and intensity of economic recession (della Porta 2017a, 2017b).

All the transformations in global capitalism that we discuss clearly have an effect on the forms of protest that have emerged and developed at different geographic levels. Economic structures are, however, to be considered in their links with the political and cultural developments at global level.

Social Movements and Political Globalization

A global political environment: between threats and opportunities

The globalization process also implies the set-up of political tools to regulate and reproduce this social structure through, among others, the proliferation of international governmental Organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (Boli and Thomas 1999). From this perspective, the international system based on the nation state seems to be mutating into a political system composed of

overlapping multi-level authorities with scant democratic legitimacy (Held and McGrew 2000: 27). The emerging global political environment filters the different ways social movements frame economic or financial globalization and the ways they mobilize.

From World War II onwards, there has been growth in the number of IGOs, both with a worldwide scope of action (like the United Nations) and a regional one (like the EU, but also the Mercosur in Latin America and NAFTA in North America). They often have military power (like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or the now defunct Warsaw Pact) or economic objectives (like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, or the World Trade Organization). The scope of changes in international governance can be seen in the growth of IGOs, which rose from 37 to 309 between 1909 and 1988 (Princen and Finger 1994: 1).

IGOs have been at once tools for economic globalization through policies liberalizing trade and the movement of capital, and expressions of an attempt to govern processes that can no longer be handled at a national level. If opposition has arisen to the neoliberal policies of the so-called international financial institutions, which wield strong coercive power through the threat of economic sanctions and conditionalities on international credit, some international institutions have started to pressure national governments to enhance democracy and human rights and promote peace (Pevehouse and Russett 2006; Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink 1999). In this sense, the global political environment produces a complex system of interactions which might either help or threaten social movement concerns.

Likewise, the manifest "deficit of democracy" of many of these international governmental organizations, especially in international negotiation processes, has opened the window for non-governmental organizations (the more formal organizations within social movements) to discuss and evaluate the decisions of these international government groups. This, in turn, produces a complex environment of interactions that spreads, through diffusion and pressure, norms, frames and visions of democracy and human, social, and environmental rights, while creating transnational networks that could be activated in specific protest campaigns (Keck and Sikkink 1998). In sum, the globalization of politics created a complex environment in which different patterns of interactions between international governmental organizations, states, and social movement organizations are possible, ranging from cooperative to overtly conflictual.

Global politics and social movement mobilization

If social movements, conceived as particular patterns of network interactions challenging dominant codes (Melucci 1996), have traditionally mobilized on domestic issues, they are increasingly focused on transnational politics, and are contributing to the creation of transnational public opinion, restructuring network relations on a transnational scale, infusing global politics into domestic dynamics, and interacting with transnational NGOs, IGOs, international institutions, and negotiations.

By drawing on, and re-elaborating, a typology of contention based on work by Imig and Tarrow (2001: 17) concerning European mobilizations, we can isolate four types of social movement mobilizations dealing with global politics (Table 34.1). We now briefly discuss each type.

Table 34.1 Typology of social movements mobilizations engaging in global politics

Level of coordination	*Target level*	
	Transnational	Domestic
Transnational	Collective transnational	Cooperative transnational
Domestic	Rooted cosmopolitan	Domesticated

The best example of *collective transnational mobilization* dealing with global politics is certainly the Global Justice Movement (della Porta et al. 2006). After Seattle, ever more frequent mention was made of a global movement, built upon networks of networks based on multiple identities and organizational formats: ranging from environmental organizations to religiously-based NGOs and associations; from traditional leftist groups to anarchist and anti-capitalist movements.

Although the majority of demonstrators against the World Trade Organization in Seattle in 1999 were North American, the international nature of demonstrations is confirmed by the parallel initiatives organized in more than a hundred cities in the world's North and South for the "Global Action Day." In the early 2000s, every international summit of any importance was accompanied by counter-summits and protest demonstrations that often got wider press coverage than the official agenda. The number of counter-summits and transnational protests continued to rise in 2002 and 2003 (Pianta and Silva 2003), while the threat of an armed conflict in Iraq led to an additional wave of demonstrations. The movement organized not only transnational protests and counter-summits, but also its own global events. "Another Possible Globalization" was discussed at the World Social Forums (WSF) in Porto Alegre (Schönleitner 2003). In thousands of seminars and meetings, proposals of a more or less realistic and original consistency were hammered out for a bottom-up globalization; alternative politics and policies were debated, and some of them were already tested (including the "participatory budgets" which, among others in Porto Alegre, involve citizens in public decision-making). From 2002 onwards, especially, the experience of the Social Forums as a place to meet and engage in debate has been extended to local and macro-regional levels (della Porta et al. 2006).

The complexity of such collective transnational mobilizations brought forth different ideas about how to reconfigure global politics in a more democratic fashion. Although some networks were engaged in bringing the "state back in," the dominant frame of the movement pointed to the building of a cosmopolitan democracy with different levels of governance interacting with each other and all levels involving civil society actors and citizens in a deliberative discussion on the decisions to be taken (della Porta 2009).

In *cooperative transnational mobilizations*, social movements coordinate transnationally but their main targets are domestic. One glaring example of such mobilizations is the coordinated anti-war global day of protest against the Iraqi invasion by the USA and its allies (the so-called "coalition of the willing") under the Bush administration and following the terrorist attack on the USA in 2001 September 11. The global day against the war was coordinated within the Global Justice Movement WSF, but the protests were nationally organized by domestic social movements in hundreds of cities, involving millions of people worldwide (Walgrave and Rucht 2010).

Paradoxically, the biggest event coordinated by the Global Justice Movement was also its point of decline: the peace movement that mobilized beginning in February 2003 started to follow domestic logics and absorbed the energy of the original movement, bringing about a gradual abandonment of the issue related to neoliberalism, and the dismantling of transnational infrastructures (Andretta and Chelotti 2010; Hadden and Tarrow 2007).

Other kinds of cooperative transnational mobilizations can be found in support of weak domestic groups facing closed states. Especially on the issues of human rights, environmental threats, and women rights, in the world periphery (Latin America, Africa, and Asia), domestic social movements have been trying to change their governments' behavior and policies by making connections with transnational advocacy groups, which in turn push democratic governments and IGOs to pressure those states. This is what Keck and Sikkink (1998) called the "boomerang effect."

Finally, some sort of cooperative transnational mobilizations have supported the so-called Arab Spring: especially through the role of social media, domestic groups in the Middle East have interacted with each other by sharing ideas, tactics, and frames, as well with the West to gain support (Howard and Hussain 2011).

We derive the locution "*rooted cosmopolitan*" from Tarrow (2005), who refers to citizens who draw on local resources and settings but get involved in transnational mobilizations. We adapt the application of the concept here to refer to mobilizations that are domestically based, though influenced by some sort of transnational diffusion of tactics, ideas, and organization, and which target transnational institutions and actors. Examples are the Occupy movement which spread from the USA to Europe targeting financial institutions (Uitermark and Nicholls 2012), the Indignados movement in Spain (Castaneda 2012) targeting the World Bank, the IMF and the EU, and citizens mobilizing through political forms of consumerism, often supported by national and local consumerist organizations, which promote boycotting to put pressure on transnational corporations accused of unfair behavior, or to criticize the global market of food production and distribution (Micheletti and McFarland 2009). Those mobilizations are "cosmopolitan" because their main concerns are related to global issues, and they are "rooted" because they draw on domestic, local, and even individual resources and networks.

The most spectacular financial crisis in recent world history seems to have produced fragmented and nationally based mobilizations dealing with the same issues known as *domesticated mobilizations*. These mobilizations domesticate global politics, in terms of level of coordination, network building, and defining relevant targets. Certainly domestic and local protests against neoliberalism, which targeted national and local institutions and actors, were already dominant in the Global South: in Africa (Dwyer and Zeilig 2012); in Asia (Broadbent and Brockman 2011); and Latin America (Almeida 2014). The domestication of global politics through local and domestic mass mobilization has even led to a "theory of local opposition to globalization" (ibid.). The social costs of global transformations have been intensified by the recent economic crisis (Tamamović 2015). A study of the most affected European countries has shown that the type of domestic anti-austerity movement and its impact on domestic politics depended on the intensity of the economic crisis, and the consequent rigidity of the austerity policies, mediated by specific political opportunities and national social movement traditions (della Porta et al. 2017).

In domesticated mobilizations, national and local institutions are targeted for different reasons: on one hand, they are considered blind implementers of decisions made elsewhere; on the other, they are accused of making democratic representation an empty promise, as the voice of affected interests and citizens is systematically excluded by the decision-making processes and in some cases also by the public debate in mainstream media.

Global Social Movements and Culture

For Jasper (2010: 60) culture "consists of shared mental worlds and their perceived embodiments." A contrasting definition considers culture to refer to the things that people (in our case, activists) share (Lofland 1995; see also Swidler 1986). Thus, movements can be thought of as cultural in two ways: through the actions that activists take as carriers of culture *and* as challengers of mainstream cultural norms (see Chapter 3 by Jasper and Polletta, in this volume). First, thinking of social movements as a global cultural phenomenon in themselves draws attention to the way movements organize, define problems, and craft repertoires. In this sense, transnational movements carry cultures which diffuse across nations. Second, transnational movements pose a direct challenge to dominant cultural norms such as economic growth, consumerist culture, and bias against ethnic minorities across multiple nations. We introduce these two facets of culture in transnational movements in turn. The first is associated with transnational networks and diffused behaviors, whereas the second is associated with global targets. Both are a reaction not only to the global homogenization of culture, but also to the economic and political trends we identify above. Both types of culture are mutually co-constituted by each other and by the economic and political arenas.

Culture across global movements

Movement tactics, ideas, and organizational forms diffuse across countries (see Chapter 13 by Soule and Roggeband, in this volume). Evidence of the diffusion of tactics, ideas, and organizational forms provides scholars with one means of assessing the extent of a common culture among movements across the globe. Here we discuss examples of diffusion across very different types of nations in terms of political regimes, domestic economies, and local cultures.

Until relatively recently, the diffusion of culture across social movements from one country to others was largely assumed to originate in the Western developed world (Chabbot and Duyvendak 2002). This way of thinking about diffusion was challenged by the reality of global activism in two main ways: by the diffusion of movement tactics and ideas *to* rather than from the West; and by social movement organizations (SMOs) from across the globe organizing *together* in dialogue within face-to-face global forums (e.g. the World Social Forum) and on the Internet.

The Occupy movement provides an illustration of *tactical diffusion* and also challenges the dominant idea that diffusion originates in the West. While the origins of the global Occupy movement are diverse, common to most accounts of its genealogy is its inspiration in the Arab Spring, particularly the Tahrir Square occupations

(Kerton 2012). Spreading to Southern Europe in May and to the USA in September 2011, when protesters "occupied" Zuccotti Park, Manhattan (Chomsky 2012; Gitlin 2012; Graeber 2013), the protest went on to inspire similar protests in more than 700 cities around the world (Roth, Saunders, and Olcese 2014).

The Zapatistas provide an example of how movement *ideas have diffused* from the South to the West. The Zapatista army, a Chiapas-based (south Mexico) insurgent group, has been instrumental in the spread of arguments against neoliberalism across the world (Ramirez et al. 2008). Zapatistas have been especially concerned about social justice. Their struggle came to global attention when, in 1994, the Zapatistas engaged in an armed "war" against the Mexican government. The coup failed and the group more recently has turned its attention toward sharing its critique of neoliberalism with the world. Its ideas spread to Europe from 1994 onwards, as a result of European activists' attendance at Intercontinental Encuentros Against Neoliberalism and for Humanity conferences held in Chiapas, Mexico, in 1996 and Spain in 1997 and a 16-day tour with the Zapatistas from Chiapas to Mexico City in Spring 2001 (Chesters and Welsh 2006). The Encuentro – a gathering of activists – is a Latin American means of organizing activism. It motivated the WSF which manifests as an event using democratic innovations from movements across the globe, particularly, consensus decision-making with spokes and hubs.

Diffusion of social movement culture is facilitated not only by organizational structures (including the Internet), but also by the cultural status of items being diffused (Strang and Soule 1998). For example, a movement tactic, idea, or organizational form is only going to diffuse around the globe if it is able to generate cultural resonance in multiple countries. Thus, it is important to discuss the "meaning work" of movements. Movement entrepreneurs select cultural symbols that will appeal to their target audience (Snow et al. 1986). Feminist movements, for example, reach out across national borders by drawing on the cultural concept of "sisterhood" (Rupp and Taylor 1999). Similarly, Carroll and Ratner find that activists and organizations that possess a "political economy master frame" – in which "power is viewed as systemic, institutional, structural and materially grounded, for instance, in wealth" (1996: 609) are most likely to be involved in cross-movement and presumably cross-national activity.

Challenging global cultural norms

Mass culture is often conceived as hegemony of the ruling class, which dupes everyday publics into compliance (Adorno and Horkheimer 1997 [1944]). Thus, to change the global neoliberal system requires challenging cultural hegemony. In this line, Flesher Fominaya writes about cultural resistance as "movement culture consciously created for political resistance" (2014: 82). Transnational movements do this in multiple ways, but we only have the space in this chapter to focus on some key ways in which activists have resisted globalized consumer culture.

Although they have precedents as far back as boycotts of sugar from slavery plantations in the eighteenth century, transnational anti-consumerist movements have more recently been motivated by Naomi Klein's (2001) seminal *No Logo*. This book has become a cultural icon, even "a cultural manifesto for the critics of unfettered capitalism worldwide."[2] Anti-consumerist actions include buying nothing, buying

only good things, avoiding the purchase of ethically or environmentally dubious products, changing the meanings of adverts, and stealing from unethical corporations.

Adbusters' International Buy Nothing Day draws attention away from the consumerism that supports the current economic system (Boivie 2003; Rumbo 2002). Other buy nothing movements include intentional communities that retract entirely from consumerist society and engage in self-sufficiency (Trainer 2000) and grow-your-own-food movements. La Via Campesina, founded in 1993, supports small and medium-sized farmers, the landless, and agricultural workers (Martinez-Alier 2011). Its cultural resistance work pushes for everyone's right to food from small-scale agriculture. One consequence is a glocal (i.e. in many localities across the globe) food resurgence (Starr 2010). The purchase of ethically sound products, that we mentioned earlier, is on the rise as a form of global resistance (Stolle and Michelleti 2015). In particular, it is a hot topic in relation to fashion. No Sweat campaigns have been raising awareness of sweatshop labour since the 1990s (Ross 1997). Fashion Revolution has recently been using the Internet technology of "hauling," to reveal "the labour behind the label."

Subvertising involves subverting the messages of advertisements to reveal unpleasant truths about brands and to challenge globally homogenizing culture. In the words of Holt (2002: 86), the emphasis is on "peeling away the brand veneer." Subvertising specialists The Yes Men have taken subvertising to its limits. Since the early 2000s, their spoof World Economic Forum website (http://www.we-forum.org/en/index.shtml) has led to multiple invitations to transnational economic and corporate events at which they masquerade as official representatives of international financial organizations and corporations. One stunt involved one of them pretending to be a spokesman for Dow Chemicals (the owners of Union Carbide) and admitting full responsibility for the Bhopal pollution catastrophe on BBC news (Carducci 2006).

Ethical shoplifting has a long tradition in the environmental movement. Wall (2002), for example, reports on how Earth First! activists stole illegally harvested timber from a warehouse. A new ethos around stealing has been developed by Yo Mango, which claims to be a political network of shoplifters. The term Yo Mango literally translates as "I steal." Goods are appropriated from supermarkets and re-appropriated for community enjoyment. Yo Mango creates its own parodies of consumer culture through stickers and slogans such as 'Happy Shoplifter' (Flesher Fominaya 2014: 108–109).

There are points of critique for all these forms of cultural resistance. Lasn (1999) refers to "meme wars" which involve mainstream culture counteracting or absorbing memes of resistance activists. An unintended consequence of cultural resistance is that it provides the mainstream with inspiration for re-branding. Moore (2004), for example, found that it was after the punk movement had gained popularity that it became possible to purchase ready-ripped jeans with safety pins. Attempts to reclaim culture remain thwarted by the financial and political power of corporations. Intentional communities run the risk of isolating themselves from broader communities (Connelly et al. 2012). This is not to suggest, however, that cultural resistance is entirely fruitless. Millions have become empowered through acts of cultural resistance. Diffusion of movement culture (tactics, ideas, and organizational structures) allows the ripples of the effects to be felt globally.

Conclusion

Our discussion of globalization and social movements has revealed the complexity of the processes of globalization and the multiple ways in which they affect and are affected by social movements. Many strands of scholarship have been used to explain the rise and fall of global social movements. As we have noted, the field is rich with contributions from political theory, political economy, sociology, and cultural studies. Much progress has been made in adapting old theories to suit new situations, but there is still a need to merge different theories to provide a coherent analytical framework to understand the socio-political context of global movements, their actions, and the outcomes that they have. This is a difficult challenge for scholars in the context of globalization processes, the effects of which vary over time and from place to place.

Indeed, while the Global Justice Movement had spread the impression of a growing trend towards a globalization of contentious politics, the anti-austerity protests appeared as a turning point testifying to (or even pushing for) a return of power to the domestic level. A cross-time comparison of the moment of globalization or domestication of protest will certainly help us understand the conditions and mechanisms for the two processes.

Additionally, if we look at the challenge of transnational protests in constructing not only the image of a common enemy but also a cosmopolitan self, we can see two contrasting paths emerging, On the one hand, the concept of the multitude points to the potential for the multitudes to revolt, even without prior development of common identities and solidarities. On the other, however, these protests are seen as addressing the need of the constitution of a new (post-national) concept of citizenship (Gerbaudo 2016).

Although the role of the technological revolution in both globalization processes and social movement coordination is not made explicit in our discussion, we do not deny its importance. Other future research might consider how the Internet, vis-à-vis face-to-face interaction, facilitates interactions between institutions and movements, and between and across movements across the world. An integrated economic, political and cultural multitudes perspective could be a useful approach to understanding the impacts of on-line media on movements.

Notes

1 As some assessment process requires formal attribution, we declare that Donatella della Porta is responsible for the section on “Global Capitalism and Social Movements,” Massimiliano Andretta for “Social Movements and Political Globalization,” and Clare Saunders for “Global Social Movements and Culture” and “Conclusion.”

2 See http://www.naomiklein.org/no-logo

References

Adorno, Theodor, W. and Max Horkheimer. 1997 [1944]. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. London: Verso.

Almeida Paul. 2014. *Mobilizing Democracy: Globalization and Citizen Protest*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Andretta, Massimiliano and Nicola Chelotti. 2010. "The G8 in Italy between Politics and Protest: A Case of Success?" In *Italian Politics: Managing Uncertainty*, edited by Marco Giuliani and Erick Jones, 130–148. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Arrighi, Giovanni, Terence K. Hopkins, and Immanuel Wallerstein. 1989. *Anti-Systemic Movements*. London: Verso.

Bayat, Asef. 2010. *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Boivie, Illana. 2003. "Buy Nothing, Improve Everything." *The Humanist* 63(3): 7–9.

Boli, John and George M. Thomas. 1999. *Constructing the World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Broadbent, Jeffrey and Vicky Brockman, eds. 2011. *East-Asian Social Movements: Power, Protest and Change in a Dynamic Region*. New York: Springer.

Burawoy, Michael. 2015. "Facing an Unequal World." *Current Sociology* 63(1): 5–34.

Carducci, Vince. 2006. "Culture Jamming: A Sociological Perspective." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 6(1): 116–138.

Carroll, William K. and Robert S. Ratner. 1996. "Master Framing and Cross-Movement Networking in Contemporary Social Movements." *The Sociological Quarterly* 37(4): 601–625.

Castaneda Ernesto. 2012. "The Indignados of Spain: A Precedent to Occupy Wall Street." *Social Movement Studies* 11(3–4): 309–319.

Chabot, Sean and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2002. "Globalization and Transnational Diffusion Between Social Movements: Essentialist Diffusionism and Beyond." *Theory and Society* 31: 697–740.

Chesters, Graeme and Ian Welsh. 2006. *Complexity and Social Movements: Multitudes at the Edge of Chaos*. London: Routledge.

Chomsky, Noam. 2012. *Occupy*, London: Penguin.

Connelly, James, Graham Smith, David Benson, and Clare Saunders. 2012. *Environmental Politics: From Theory to Practice*, 3rd edn. New York: Routledge.

della Porta, Donatella. 2009 "Democracy in Movement: Some Conclusions." In *Democracy in Social Movements*, edited by Donatella della Porta, 262–274. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

della Porta, Donatella. 2013. *Can Democracy Be Saved?* Cambridge: Polity.

della Porta, Donatella, 2014. *Mobilizing for Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

della Porta, Donatella. 2015. *Anti-Austerity Protests in the Crisis of Late Neoliberalism*. Cambridge: Polity.

della Porta, Donatella. 2017a. "Neoliberalism and Its Discontents: An Introduction." In *Late Neoliberalism and its Discontents in the Economic Crisis*, edited by Donatella della Porta, Massimiliano Andretta, Tiago Fernandes, Eduardo Romanos, Francis O'Connor, and Markos Vogiatzoglou. London: Palgrave.

della Porta, Donatella. 2017b. *Riding the Wave*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

della Porta, Donatella, Massimiliano Andretta, Lorenzo Mosca, and Herbert Reiter. 2006. *Globalization from Below: Transnational Activists and Protest Networks*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

della Porta, Donatella, Joseba Fernandez, Hara Kouki, and Lorenzo Mosca. 2017. *Movement Parties*. Cambridge: Polity.

Dwyer, Peter and Louis Zeilig. 2012. *African Struggles Today: Social Movements since Independence*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Flesher Fominaya, Cristina. 2014. *Social Movements and Globalization: How Protests, Occupations and Uprisings Are Changing the World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gerbaudo, Paolo. 2016. *The Mask and the Flag*. London: Hurst.

Gitlin, Todd. 2012. *Occupy Nation: The Roots, the Spirit, and the Promise of Occupy Wall Street*. New York: HarperCollins.

Graeber, David. 2013. *The Democracy Project: A History. A Crisis. A Movement*. London: Allen Lane.

Hadden Jennifer and Sidney Tarrow. 2007. "Spillout or Spillover? The Global Justice Movement in the United States after 9/11." *Mobilization* 4: 195–213.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David. 2003. *New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, David and Anthony McGrew. 2000. *The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge: Polity.

Holt, Douglas B. 2002. "Why Do Brands Cause Trouble? A Dialectical Theory of Consumer Culture and Branding." *Journal of Consumer Research* 29(1): 70–90.

Howard Philip N. and Muzammil M. Hussain. 2011. "The Role of Digital Media." *Journal of Democracy* 22(3): 35–48.

Hutter, Swen. 2014. *Protesting Economics and Culture in Western Europe: New Cleavages in Left and Right Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Imig, Doug and Sidney Tarrow. 2001. "Studying Contention in an Emerging Polity." In *Contentious Europeans: Protest and Politics in an Emerging Polity*, edited by Doug Imig and Sidney Tarrow, 3–26. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jasper, James M. 2010. "Cultural Approaches in the Sociology of Social Movements." In *Handbook of Social Movements Across Disciplines*, edited by Bert Klandermans and Conny Roggeband, 59–110. New York: Springer.

Júlíusson, Árni Daníel and Magnús Sveinn Helgason. 2013. "Roots of the Saucepan Revolution in Iceland." In Understanding European *Movements: New Social Movements, Global Justice Struggles, Anti-Austerity Protest*, edited by Cristina Flesher Fominaya and Laurence Cox, 189–202. London: Routledge

Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Groups in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kerbo, Harold R. 1982. "Movements of 'Crisis' and Movements of 'Affluence': A Critique of Deprivation and Resource Mobilization Theory." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 26: 645–63.

Kerton, Sarah. 2012. "Tahrir, Here? The Influence of the Arab Uprisings on the Emergence of Occupy." *Social Movement Studies* 11(3–4): 302–308.

Klein, Naomi. 2001. *No Logo*, London: Fourth Estate.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Marco Giugni. 1995. *The Politics of New Social Movements in Western Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lasn, Kalle. 1999. *Culture Jam: The Uncooling of America*. New York: Eagle Brook.

Lofland, John. 1995. "Charting Degrees of Movement Culture." In *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans, 188–216. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Martinez-Alier, Joan. 2011. "The EROI of Agriculture and its Use by Via Campasina." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(1): 145–160.

Melucci, Alberto. 1996. *Challenging Codes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Micheletti, Michele and Andrew McFarland, eds. 2009. *Creative Participation: Responsibility-Taking in the Political World*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Moore, Ryan. 2004. "Postmodernism and Punk Subculture: Cultures of Authenticity and Deconstruction." *The Communication Review* 7(3): 305–327.

Pevehouse, Jon and Bruce Russett. 2006. "Democratic International Governmental Organizations Promote Peace." *International Organization* 60(4): 969–1000.

Pianta, Mario and Federico Silva. 2003. *Globalisers from Below. A Server on Global Civil Society Organisations*. GLOBI Research Report.

Polanyi, Karl. 1957 [1944]. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. London: Beacon Press.

Princen, Thomas and Matthias Finger. 1994. "Introduction." In *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the Local and the Global*, edited by Thomas Princen and Matthias Finger, 1–25. London: Routledge.

Ramírez, Gloria Muñoz, Laura Carlsen, and Alejandro Reyes Arias. 2008. *The Fire and the Word: A History of the Zapatista Movement*. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers.

Risse Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. 1999. *The Power of Human Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, Kenneth. 2015. *Changing Course in Latin America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, Andrew. 1997. *After the Year of the Sweatshop*, London: Verso.

Roth, Silke, Clare Saunders, and Cristiana Olcese. 2014. 'Occupy as a Free Space: Mobilization Processes and Outcomes." *Sociological Research Online*, 19(1). Available at: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/19/1/1.html. doi: 10.5153/sro.3201.

Rumbo, Joseph D. 2002. "Consumer Resistance in a World of Advertising Clutter: The Case of Adbusters." *Psychology and Marketing* 19(2): 127–148.

Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 1999. "Forging Feminist Identity in an International Movement: A Collective Identity Approach to Twentieth-Century Feminism." *Signs* 24(2): 363–386.

Sassen, Saskia. 2013. *Expulsions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schönleitner, Gunther. 2003. "World Social Forum: Making Another World Possible?" In *Globalizing Civic Engagement: Civil Society and Transnational Action*, edited by John Clark, 109–126. London: Earthscan.

Silver, Beverly. 2003. *The Forces of Labour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Jackie, Marina Karides, Marc Becker, et al. 2007. *The World Social Forums and the Challenge of Global Democracy*. Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr, Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51: 456–481.

Starr, Amory. 2010. "Local Food: A Social Movement?" *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies* 10(6): 479–490.

Stolle, Dietland and Michelle Michelleti. 2015. *Political Consumerism: Global Responsibility in Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strang, David and Sarah A. Soule. 1998. "Diffusion in Organizations and Social Movements: From Hybrid Corn to Poison Pills." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 265–290.

Swidler, Anne. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review*, 51(2): 273–286.

Tamamovic', Aleksandra Ivanković, ed. 2015. *The Impact of the Crisis on Fundamental Rights Across Member States of the EU: Comparative Analysis*. Report commissioned by the LIBE Committee, European Parliament. Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/510021/IPOL_STU%282015%29510021_EN.pdf

Tarrow, Sidney. 2005. *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Touraine, Alain. 1985. "An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements." *Social Research* 52: 749–788.

Trainer, Ted. 2000. "Where Are We, Where Do We Want to Be, How Do We Get There?" *Democracy and Nature* 6(2): 267–286.

Uitermark, Justus and Walter Nicholls. 2012. "How Local Networks Shape a Global Movement: Comparing Occupy in Amsterdam and Los Angeles." *Social Movement Studies* 11(3–4): 295–301.

Walgrave, Stephan and Dieter Rucht, eds. 2010. *The World Says No to War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wall, Derek. 2002. "Snowballs, Elves and Skimmingtons? Genealogies of Environmental Direct Action." In *Direct Action in British Environmentalism*, edited by Ben Seel, Matthew Paterson, and Brian Doherty, 79–92. London: Routledge.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1990. "Antisystemic Movements: History and Dilemma." In *Transforming the Revolution*, edited by Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, André Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2010. "Structural Crises." *New Left Review* 62: 133–142.

Zajak, Sabrina. 2016. *Transnational Activism, Global Labor Governance, and China*. London: Palgrave.