

# Multitude and Anti-Globalisation

*To my parents for their continued support*

*Special thanks to Dr John Armitage and Chris Wharton for their influence and encouragement in my three years at Northumbria University.*

## Abstract

The purpose of this dissertation is to give a detailed analysis of the concept of 'multitude' whilst assessing its relevance to the debate surrounding the many issues associated with anti-globalisation.

The thesis will concentrate primarily on the growing phenomena of what has become known broadly as anti-globalisation. In a period of unstable international relations, an insecure global economy and the ominous threat of war and terrorism, the protests against the forces behind the instruments of global order are frequently relevant. The substantial quantity of contemporary political literature that concerns itself with globalisation, the global economy, war and terrorism, is evidence enough that the political and social plane on which actions are carried out is vastly changing. This not only incorporates cultures and peoples from diverse areas of the world, but the lives and livelihoods of people in the most prosperous nations. In an ever more global world, there is a constant realisation that the actions made not only by governments, but other supranational bodies that exert a political influence, and the actions taken against these, directly affects a global population. Multitude is the latest theory that attempts to explain this phenomenon. Although some writers have been quick to undermine the concept in relation to the anti-globalisation movement claiming it misrepresents the unity of the movement, and instead encourages dangerous resistance tendencies similar to those of the 1960's and 1970's, it is my contention to show how multitude does and continues to explain social struggles in the era of 'Empire'.

There are three key objectives within this dissertation that need to be considered. Firstly, the concept of 'multitude' has to be thoroughly investigated through a process of defining the term within the context of global politics, and looking at the different and overlapping areas in which it can be used descriptively, focusing on the philosophical insights integral to its formation and also the political implications that give it a specific grounding in the context of globalisation. Specific reference will be made to the work of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri who used the term to describe the conflicts that occur within the contemporary global system, something that they label 'Empire'. To understand 'multitude' it is necessary to develop the concept of 'Empire', as this will provide a clearer understanding of the global world within which the multitude operates. A key source at this stage will be <http://slash.autonomeia.org> where the subject of multitude is debated regularly with contributions from Antonio Negri, and extracts from the French journal 'Multitudes' which has began gathering together different aspects of the debate.

Secondly, a recognisable framework from which to understand the many issues associated with anti-globalisation needs to be established. This can be achieved by giving an historical overview of the movement, starting from the Zapatista incursion in 1994. From there it is possible to trace the movement, considering how it has changed and what it has become to symbolise. This can be done by looking at some of the issues that it campaigns for, and the groups and organisations associated with it. Particular consideration will be given to the events surrounding the G8 summit in Genoa in July 2001. This particular demonstration has become a milestone for the movement, as it highlighted the many problems inherent within its decentralised and ambiguous structure. It will also be a clear way of highlighting the concept of multitude in relation to the movement, whilst dually considering the problems of

multitude itself in trying to visualise a united global resistance . Sources will include articles from the journal 'New Left Review' by leading globalisation writers, and also the online Guardian newspaper which keeps an archive of related material.

The third section will be a substantive look at how useful the concept of multitude is in assessing the resistance movements within the global 'Empire'. Now that it is understood what the concept of multitude is and why it has been introduced to the globalisation debate, it is possible to now consider how it can be considered in relation to anti-globalisation. This will entail an analysis of the endurance of the movement in the light of its organisational problems, the issue of violence and also the repercussions of September 11. The intention is to show how the movement continues to be successfully active as it expands its ideas and begins to understand the totality of power it faces. A key argument will be introduced at this stage that highlights the fundamental link between multitude and anti-globalisation and why the former is significant to the latter. This is the idea of defection, and a full discussion of this will entail whereby the argument that multitude is a significant concept will be justified. From here it will be possible to draw the ideas and arguments of the dissertation together to form a conclusion.

## **Chapter Outlines**

### **Chapter One**

The objective of this chapter is to explain what we understand Hardt and Negri's multitude to be. The first task is to determine what we understand 'Empire' to be before suggesting the importance of multitude in this context. This will entail a philosophical analysis of the term, drawing on the work of Benedict Spinoza and Gilles Deleuze as being integral to it. The intention is to show that multitude is the realisation of subjectivity on what can be described as a plane of immanence. Then we can look at why multitude is useful in a contemporary sense, looking at how it can be used to describe a plethora of universal struggles against a fully realised global market, made possible through a new potentia found in the post-industrial organisation of work. This will lead directly to the next chapter whereby its relevance to anti-globalisation can be discussed.

### **Chapter 2**

Here we can discuss why multitude can be useful in describing the anti-globalisation movement, and also why the term itself has been criticised for its insinuations to mob rule. First it will be established why the anti-globalisation movement can be understood in terms of the multitude, focusing specifically on its networked logic and decentred organisation before considering a developing attitude that is appearing in a post-September 11th world and the war on terror. We can then look at the problems within the movement, namely a crucial division of interests and also the problem of violence at demonstrations. This will highlight the criticism the movement has faced and thus why multitude itself has been equally discredited. The next section will detail these criticisms before suggesting that despite them the movement endures.

### **Chapter 3**

In chapter three I can discuss fully why I believe multitude is a significant contribution to the future of the anti-globalisation movement. I will begin by looking at the endurance of the movement in the era of war and terror, introducing my key argument explaining how the movement has continued to do so. This will lead to the final section where I will detail the significance of the multitude to this argument, looking at how it has predicted and can continue to show how an alternative to Empire can be realised, before returning at the end to

the philosophical insights established in chapter one reiterating their importance to understanding freedom in the era of Empire.

## **Chapter 4**

In this chapter I will offer a conclusion, drawing together the main themes and arguments in the dissertation and explaining what I have shown through my analysis. I will briefly suggest some insight to the current situation of global politics.

## CHAPTER ONE

### The multitude's potentia in a global Empire

*'A free man who lives among the ignorant strives, as far as he can, to avoid their favours' (Spinoza trans. Curley, 1994, p.236).*

Before taking the key concept of multitude and considering its implications in detail it is important first to define both 'Empire' and 'multitude' for the context of the dissertation. Empire, in its contemporary understanding is the vision ascribed to the social, political and economic organisation of the world as seen by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000) in their seminal work that takes the same name. It can be best understood as globalisation having reached its objective limits, yet Hardt and Negri do refer to it as 'the coming Empire' (ibid, p. 271, 384) which essentially means they recognise that the integrative processes accredited to globalisation are at an irreversible level such that 'Empire' is the logical conclusion. They argue that the process of integration pursued by states through economic and political imperatives is beginning to form a constitutive power that has no virtual center. Instead there is an elite vanguard of nation states, financial institutions and other key actors who dominate the places of command yet are unable to claim ultimate sovereignty over a system that has no overriding legitimisation. It is paradoxical in that it proposes a golden age likened to that enjoyed by the Roman Empire whilst simultaneously being fundamentally unstable and open to attack. This is where the multitude become important as it is the potential of the mass, the authors argue, to facilitate and maintain the visible decline of structured order.

'The multitude has internalised the lack of place and fixed time; it is mobile and flexible, and it conceives the future only as a totality of possibilities that branch out in every direction. The coming imperial universe, blind to meaning, is filled by the multifarious totality of the production of subjectivity. The decline is no longer a future destiny but the present reality of Empire' (Hardt and Negri, 2000, p. 380).

The term multitude in the past has been used to describe a psychological rather than a physical mass of people, it is in some sense the social consciousness which defines the time, and in Hardt and Negri's (2000) words today it is characterised by its 'will to be against' (ibid, p.210). This means its reaction to 'Empire' is entirely negative and therefore a constant threat to the established powers which constitute its transnational framework. To understand multitude completely it is important to consider the philosophical and political insights that are integral to the concept, these will provide the basis for answering what it is, and why we need the term in contemporary politics.

Essentially multitude is the logical climax of the work of Benedict Spinoza and Gilles Deleuze who both recognised the intrinsic ability of humans to think beyond established representations and truths. Hardt and Negri argue that this process is at its most creative level in contemporary society to the point that the multitude have learnt how to deny all accepted forms in their pursuit of the deconstruction of order. The first section, 'multitude as immanence realised' will discuss this idea in more detail. Secondly, a Marxist diagnosis of multitude is essential, not only to compliment the authors' of Empire and their own political objectives, but also to emphasise the fact that multitude can be understood as the productive forces of labour realised within a global market. This shift enables a clearer understanding that perhaps all potential ruptures in Empire are instantly related in their universal struggle against Capitalist command yet the move to post industrial production has enabled a new potential for labour power to realise unrestricted potentials to change and refine the system subjectively. Because of this a new term such as multitude was needed to explain the shift in alternative politics to a more global and universal level. The second section, 'multitude against capitalism' will expand this hypothesis.

The purpose of this is to establish that the potential of the multitude lies in its realisation of subjectivity and that this has been mobilised collectively against the accumulation of Capital integral to all struggles. My contention is to emphasise the fact that the global organisation of Capital as it moves into its post industrial phase enables the potential of the multitude to be fully realised on what can be regarded as a plane of immanence. Once I have done this it will be possible for me to summarise, whilst dually considering for the first time the implications of such an oppositional force suggesting in some respect it could be a call for chaos and mass disruption. This will lead directly to the next chapter that will pose the question 'multitude or mob' to the context of the anti-globalisation movement.

### **Multitude as immanence realised**

The overriding legitimisation of the multitude derives from the philosophy of Benedict Spinoza used frequently by the authors of 'Empire'. The importance of Spinoza lies in his universal claims that man is fundamentally sovereign over God. This was perhaps the beginning of a new period of thought, established during the enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to the denial of a transcendent point, that is the divine authority of a particular figure or truth inherent in all human consciousness. The purpose of this section, following Hardt and Negri's model is to show how this process is perhaps reaching its distinguished completion as the multitude's inherent refusal seen through the proposed 'will to be against' emphasises what the authors see as a realisation of subjective power in Postmodernity, a new *potentia*. The philosophy of Gilles Deleuze is important at this stage because he traces this shift in human thought to show that through an acceptance of subjectivity, that is 'any truth, being or world that we know is an experienced world' (Colebrook, 2002, p.72), the denial of any inherent truth including God, ideology or morality is fundamental to individual enlightenment. Instead truth can only be relative to time and thus only 'what is immediately experienced' (ibid) can fully be accepted. Deleuze extended this by claiming that only immanence, or the constant denial or questioning of transcendent points can legitimately make up a true philosophy. For Hardt and Negri it is 'an immanent desire that organises the multitude' (op cit, p. 66), and for this reason its desire to deny as such has given light to a new teleology. With this in mind it is important to consider why we are perhaps experiencing a plane of immanence, and how the multitude are integral to its realisation.

If immanence is absolute now then in the past points or planes of historical period have been characterised by their adherence to transcendent forms. These planes, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argued are recognisable when 'life appears to be grounded' (Colebrook, 2002, p.74) that is when certain material conditions seem certain to explain the universality of life, and therefore it is not questioned but merely accepted. Society is only changed, or an upheaval occurs when a period of uncertainty overwhelms the structures of the time. This can be understood as the plane of immanence whereby conditions are fundamentally questioned by the multitude that inhabits them, and thus the structure falls. Malcolm Bull (2003) dictates that 'everyone therefore has as much right as they have the power to exercise, limited only by the antagonist power of others' (Bull in Balakrishnan, 2003, p.86). The concern of Deleuze however was that a plane of immanence would always be followed by a plane of transcendence, and thus immanence would never fully be realised. Hardt and Negri's contention however is that today's multitude is just this.

They explain by showing that the conditions of society, highlighted through the ominous Empire are susceptible to a upheaval characterised by a plane of immanence. The reason for this is that Empire is completely open, that is it serves no boundaries but instead consists of a convenient mix of organised legitimisation that cannot fully control or govern the multitude. Balakrishnan (2003) explains this well through summarising Hardt and Negri's (op cit) own deliberations. In his words the contemporary global system has reached a

similar level of a balanced constitutional framework to that of imperial Rome. Through a direct mix of monarchical, aristocratic and democratic forms of interaction, where 'US nuclear supremacy represents the monarchical principle, the economic wealth of the G8 and transnational corporations the aristocratic principle, and the Internet the democratic principle' (Balakrishnan in Balakrishnan, 2003, introduction, p.xii). Yet Rome's expansion became its fundamental weakness, as Ortega Y Gasset (1963) explains, 'it could not count on the patriotism of others, and had to defend itself exclusively by bureaucratic measures of administration and warfare' (Ortega, 1963, p. 130), or in other words it no longer held any realistic sovereignty over its Empire. Hardt and Negri argue that the global organisation seen today, recognisable through a fully realised global market means that 'government and politics come to be completely integrated into a system of transnational command' (op cit, p.307), that is, no one power can claim sovereignty over a system that accommodates for all, and whom everyone relies on. Because of this no one can control the multitude and its subjectivity, and everything is threatened by the ridicule of the mass. So, as Laclau (2004) argues, now that the state can no longer operate in an autonomous or sovereign way and that people are aware of this, the multitude is 'the realisation of full immanence' (Laclau in Passavant and Dean, p.24).

The intention of this section was to familiarise the concept of multitude within the philosophical sphere as chosen by the authors of 'Empire'. Spinoza's ideas incorporated into globalisation show how power is legitimately claimed at certain points in history by those who have the ability to do so. Because globalisation, in Hardt and Negri's view is rapidly approaching its objective limits the projected Empire that has been created has become susceptible to innumerable threats by the very essence that wills it into being, the multitude. Yet in Postmodernity the idea of a removal of one power in order to establish another is something that clearly belongs to a bygone age, instead the revolutionary imperatives already instigated are recognisable through their integrated desires to refine the system subjectively. An integral part of this is by the growing dissatisfaction with traditional and established systems of control and power which are frequently undermined by their own inability to act in an autonomous manner in the interests of the multitude. So the multitude must 'push through Empire to come out the other side' (Hardt and Negri, op cit p.218 ). It will only do this when it fully appreciates and is able to confidently ridicule the system which subordinates it. The importance of Spinoza and Deleuze in this respect can be understood on two counts. Firstly, that the evolutionary immanence of this realisation is present now in the mindset of a global population and secondly, and with reference to Spinoza's quote at the start, in order to transform this realisation into action they must begin to refuse the world around them. As Hardt and Negri (ibid) argue, this won't be a violent confrontation but an acceptance to the fact that they can do this with their own creative instinct, 'the actual activity of the multitude, its creation, production and power' (p.66). The next section, from a Marxist trajectory will explain why we need 'multitude' to describe a shift in alternative politics whilst simultaneously showing that it is an integrated struggle against Capitalism that unites the multitude and gives it a political grounding.

## **The Multitude against Capitalism**

If the multitude's 'will to be against', seen through its refusal of transcendence and the realisation of a plane of immanence, then the 'materialist teleology' (Hardt and Negri, op cit, p. 66) instigated in this evolutionary process will be characterised by a change. This change, as the authors of Empire argue is the rise of a new Communism that will surpass the faded structures that uphold modern Capitalism. As Maurer (2004) argues, Spinoza hailed the death of God and thus the rise of Capitalism and the democratic free market principles of modern economics whereby sovereignty rests in the rule of money. Yet as Grasby (2003) explains 'economic activity has shifted from the national to the global' (Grasby, 2003, p.22) and because of this the totality of the global market marks the end of the potential of this system. In Maurer's (op cit) words 'under the principles of immanence, the market is the

horizon of democracy' (Maurer, 2004, p. 68). The unity of the multitude resides in its ability to establish a political imperative for the reclaiming of the market and its deconstruction into a radical plural democracy. This section will show how changes in Marxist thought have helped in emphasising the need for a collectivity of actions centered on the global organisation of Capital.

This process began and is evident in the autonomous struggles that occurred in the 1960's. The logic of the rather conservative Marxism centered around factory politics and wage earners began to disappear and be replaced by a more liberal if not radical approach to defining the subordinated subjects. Just as Capital went global and syncopated, universal struggles came to light that inevitably included 'students, woman and the unemployed... as well as those of the peasants in the third world' (Cleaver, 2000, p.70). Thus alternative politics became all inclusive as a reaction to the indistinguishable outside of the integrated money system. Panitch and Gindin (2004) document this as the rise of 'the American informal empire' (Panitch and Gindin, 2004, p.33) whereby the imperatives of shareholder dividends for leading American multinationals and the new policies of transnational financial institutions (GATT, IMF) instigated by American governments to pursue the interests of their industries became the defining feature of global capital organisation. By this it is meant that the entire system was intended to facilitate and maintain a global Capitalist environment, and the pursuit of surplus value the overriding feature of any national politics. This shows that anyone could become a victim and thus a subordinated subject of the Capitalist system. Empire is the realisation of this, and as one contemporary globalisation writer argues 'One of the paradoxes of modern capitalism is that it offers unfettered choice in every sphere bar one; the choice of system itself (Elliott in Gunnell and Timms, 2001, p.12).

According to Stile (2002) Negri and his affiliates find this 'vastly preferable to the old form of Capitalism, which was strictly connected to the nation state' (Stile, 2002, p. 47). As Negri (2003a) claimed in an interview, he as well as others were pleased to see the end of Soviet Communism as it too provided an overwhelming paradox in its ability to refuse the pull of the Capitalist expansion. At least now the grand vision of Capitalism can be realised on a global scale and as Bull (2001) says, the burgeoning reality that 'ordinary people trying to live in the way they want' (p. 5) are always going to be contradicted by 'the system of power that defeats them' (ibid) is the present and central issue at hand. For Hardt and Negri (op cit) this means the concerns of Marx, as documented in the Grundrisse becoming ever more clear to an explanation of how the system will fall and the subject of the multitude realised.

The importance of the Grundrisse lies in the fact that Marx's assessment of Capitalist accumulation is far more open than in other texts. They are open because he relies primarily not a critique of Capital but a critique of labour and its universal struggle against Capital. In Marx's (1993) words:

'the productive power of society, if you want, is the productive power of labour itself - such as results from science, invention, division and organisation of labour, improved communications, creation of the world market, machinery, and so on - does not enrich the worker, but capital, and thus increases the power that dominates labour' (Marx, 1993, p.214).

For Negri and other theorists associated with autonomous Marxism it is the labour power inherent in all production that determines not only the strength of the multitude but its capacity to create crisis in Capitalist accumulation and force it to redirect its processes. As Hardt and Negri (op cit) explain, Capitalism 'would never abandon a regime of profit' (ibid, p. 268) unless it was forced too, and therefore it can be understood that it is the proletariat that 'dictates the terms and nature of the transformation' (ibid). The crisis that occupies Empire today was first realised in America through the autonomous struggles of the un-unionised American workforce. As Bifo (2003) explains, it was the demands for 'freedom

from the lifetime prison of the industrial factory' (Bifo, 2003, online) that lead to a rise of refusal, and ultimately flexibility from work. As Cleaver (1993) argues 'it is the ability of workers to define their own interests and struggle for them' (Cleaver, 1993, online) that determines a realistic challenge to Capitalism as a whole, as opposed to a structured union based opposition. Their refusal of work both in the factory and other production areas successfully instigated a crisis due to a new subjectivity in workers struggles. For Hardt and Negri (op cit) therefore, the current shift from industrialised production to post-industrialised or immaterial production was Capitalism's reaction to this, as it inevitable moved away from the manipulation of the non - capitalist environment to 'its own capitalist terrain' (ibid) and thus the production of knowledge in the virtual area of global communications networks. Again Bifo (op cit) confirms that this was Capital's method of restructuring the new flexibility of work back into the process of accumulation, with the aid of labour saving technologies.

Yet crucially it created a new kind of workforce, operating within the global network of communication and enhanced by the potential of workers to become entrepreneurs in this new field. The apex of which could be seen in the 'dotcommania' (ibid) period of the mid to late 1990's, yet the mythical evidence that virtual business literally created a free market was expelled when the market crashed as small enterprises were inevitably swallowed by established monopolies. Bifo's argument is therefore, that cognitive labour has also been defeated by monopoly Capital such that it can potentially see itself as 'a cognitariat, building institutions of knowledge, of creation, of care, of invention and of education that are autonomous from Capital' (Bifo, ibid). This new terrain of discourse, as Castells (2001) calls 'the space of flows' is where 'a kind of spontaneous and elementary Communism' (Hardt and Negri, op cit, p. 294) is possible as the subjectivity of the new workers struggles can be realised on a global and universal level. As Hardt (2004) claims this kind of communist thought is 'much bigger than Marx' (Hardt in Passavant and Dean 2004 p. 170) as it incorporates a more inherent and perhaps species orientated community similar to that proclaimed by both Deleuze and Spinoza and is realised in the form of the multitude.

To summarise, through a re-evaluation of Marx drawing on the critique of labour in the Grundrisse it has been possible to show the totality of Capitalist subordination made clear by the expansion and realisation of a global market. Because of this a universal struggle has come to light concerning the productive power of labour and the constant restructuring of Capitalist accumulation, that can be expressed collectively in the will of the multitude. Capital has now turned on its processes, seen in the rise of knowledge production and services dominating the economy, creating a new terrain where this struggle can be fought. The new cognitariat together with the subjectivity seen in autonomous struggles now has the ability to permanently 'throw the system into crisis' (Cleaver, op cit) and recreate it to its own benefit. In Kraniauskas' words 'Empire, the multitude and the new proletariat have become one; but one that is not one. The multitude exists as singularities' (Krniauskas, 2000, p. 36), because of this new unity and freedom the potential of the multitude is realised on the plane of immanence. I would now like to show that the potential of labour power in its global, networked structure visible on the projected plane of immanence is viewed as the hypothesis for potential mass disruption and chaos by various critics of the multitude who have related the concept to the anti-globalisation movement. Yet it is my contention to show that the 'mob rule' that has been associated with 'the multitude' is an unfounded claim that seeks to discourage the creativity and autonomous power of the anti-globalisation movement and its potential to become realised as part of Hardt and Negri's multitude. The next chapter 'The Anti Globalisation Movement: Multitude or Mob?' will detail this conflict.



## CHAPTER TWO

### The Anti-Globalisation Movement: Multitude or Mob?

*‘...there are those who can tell you how to make molotov cocktails, flame-throwers, bombs, whatever you might be needing. Define your aim clearly, choose your ammo with that in mind. It is not a good idea to tote a gun or a knife, unless you are proficient in it's use. All swords are two edged, can be used against you, by anyone who can get them away from you. Success will depend mostly on your state of mind. Meditate, pray, be prepared, at any time, but don't get uptight. What will win is the sustenance we give each other, the energy we plug into, the fact that we touch, share food, the Buddha nature, from everyone friend and foe, like a million earthworms, tunnelling under the structure until it falls’*  
**(Anonymous announcement at an anti-globalisation demonstration)**

Now that the theory of the multitude has been established, whereby it can be recognised as a psychological imperative of the mass to question society and grounded on a universal will against the global organisation of Capital, realised through an ability to network and form virtual alliances that seek to disrupt the totality of power expressed through Empire, it is necessary to relate it to an actual body that itself incorporates these principles into its organising structure. The Anti-Globalisation movement has in recent years become the dominant expression of alternative or reactionary politics on a global scale incorporating issues and struggles from around the world and internally represented by numerous organisations in most states. The expansive diversity of the movement is summarised by Grasby (op cit) who confirms there are over one thousand organisations ranging from self styled anarchists to traditional religious groups (Grasby, op cit, p. 168). It is no secret that, and as Passavant and Dean (2004) confirm ‘Empire’ is ‘the movement’s new bible’ (Passavant and Dean in Passavant and Dean, op cit, p. 316) as it not only expresses the forces of power which the movement confronts but it also tries to understand what the movement is, expressed under the ambiguous term of multitude. This has already become a buzz word for activists trying to visualise some kind of universality to the actions and aims of the movement and because of this raised the ultimate question of whether it actually can describe or indeed become the movement itself. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the implications of this question. On the outset the movement could indeed be the visual representation of the multitude with its decentred structure that indeed represents a multitude of interests and is built around global networks specifically focused on the inadequacies of global Capitalism. Yet its reputation, especially since the infamous Genoa protest together with the complications surrounding the abundance of interests it speaks for suggests it could be something rather different, and multitude is merely a means to establish some mythical compromise and encourage disruption. It is my intention to first discuss the evidence that suggests the Anti-Globalisation movement can be recognised as the multitude, focusing primarily on its networked logic and decentralised organisation before considering the opposing view that multitude itself is an insinuation to mob rule. This will lead to the final chapter which will consider how the movement could perhaps become the multitude of Hardt and Negri’s vision.

### The serpent structure of Anti-Globalisation

As discussed in the previous chapter, the new productive power of labour is realised in its ability to network and form alliances in a virtual place of discourse. This of course is the Internet which has become to dominate not only the organisation of business and Capital but also its discontents, the movements against Capitalist exploitation and monopoly. This kind of community of association outdates unionising and creates a new and perhaps more powerful form of resistance politics. The first section of this chapter is intended to show the importance of the networked organisation of Anti-Globalisation in the context of globalised Capital.

The importance of networks is something Deleuze (1995) was aware of when he wrote about the 'societies of control' or today's societies, that are no longer defined by sovereign institutions and states. Instead control is exercised by the flow of money which seeps into all social spaces from mammoth corporations. Castells (op cit) documents this shift as the 'rise of the network society', whereby the global organisation of business in relation to the increased use of ICT's (Information Communication Technology) has created a new and perhaps more parasitic system of accumulation whereby 'spatial patterns of behaviour' are broken down into a 'fluid network of exchanges' (Castells, 2001, p. 398). The implications of this are that spaces, both physical and virtual are no longer stable but permanently threatened by the forces of Capital as it moves across the globe exploiting areas for their accumulative potential. The result of this is that the pursuit of profit now determines the viability of a space, and ultimately the jobs within it. Therefore the networked logic of Capital creates a permanent crises for the stability of labour. So, what is the importance of this to the establishment of an alternative or reactionary movement?

Hardt and Negri (2003) explain through Marx and then Deleuze. For Marx, all struggles occurred in cycles and could be symbolised by the mole that 'would surface in times of class conflict and then retreat underground again - not to hibernate passively, but to burrow its tunnels' (Hardt and Negri, 2003, online), appearing again in times of economic crisis. However the permanent crisis of Capital as seen in its globalised state means the mole is no longer a suitable analogy. Instead Capital, as expressed by Empire is open to permanent scrutiny by, if initially, un co-ordinated conflicts. Deleuze (op cit) details the change claiming 'the old monetary mole is the animal of the space of enclosure, but the serpent is that of the societies of control' (Deleuze, ibid, online). By this he means that contemporary conflicts are immediately present on the plain of Empire and are recognisable in their ability to network causing a crucial antithesis to the networked structure of Capital throwing it into a permanent state of conflict. The serpent best describes this kind of association as it represents the infinite potential for networks to grow on the plane of immanence. Now that the importance of networked organisation has been established I want to show why this is integral to the developing movement of Anti-Globalisation.

Much has been written about the phenomenal rise of anti-globalisation often cited as originating exclusively since the Zapatista incursion in 1994. However true this is will be discussed later yet the Zapatista experience certainly expresses how crucial and how novel information networks were to mobilising a realistic alternative to the neo-liberal project both in Mexico and across the world. As Ronfeldt et al (1998) claim 'the information revolution is leading to the rise of network forms of organisation whereby small, previously isolated groups can communicate, link up and conduct joint actions as never before' (Ronfeldt et al, 1998, summary). The Zapatistas have become the iconic representation of the potential of the Internet, instigating as Cleaver (1998) claims 'a new wave of hope and energy among those engaged in the struggle for freedom all over the world' (Cleaver in Holloway and Palaez, 1998, p.81). It is certainly my belief that whether or not the new movements have integral associations and subjective affiliations with past protests, the power of the Internet used exclusively in this instance brought the inadequacies of global Capitalism to a global audience for the first time. The result of this in some respects, is history, as what Naomi Klein (2001a) calls the 'coalition of coalitions' (Klein, 2001a, p.86) has continued to grow and expand and indeed be recognised on a scale that could never have been imagined. This section will emphasise the importance of the dissemination of information through global networks to the organising of the movement, whilst also discussing what seems to be a new kind of political behaviour in the era of war and terrorism. The intention is to show why the movement can be recognised as the Deleuzian serpent and how its expansion can be seen in terms of the multitude.

As previously discussed, it was the proliferation of information through global communication networks that mobilised support for the Zapatistas in Mexico, and successfully opened a gateway into global anti-capitalism in general. In a similar instance Naomi Klein (2001b) documents the rise of grass roots activism in the 1990's through sweatshop labour actions and anti advertising campaigns that gradually lead to bigger demonstrations against multinational corporations and the process of economic globalisation itself. Again she emphasises the importance of networks in creating a powerful resistance claiming 'today, every time Shell sneezes, a report goes out on the hyperactive...bouncing into the in-boxes of all the far flung organisers' (Klein, 2001b, p. 394). This is very much the new language of political activism, centered on an urgency to generate information in order to disrupt the enemy of the moment. Kingsnorth (2003) furthers this analysis when he argues that events such as Seattle, The World Social Forum or indeed any of the numerous anti-globalisation events and demonstrations could not have happened with such an effect without the power of networks. In his words, 'Internet activism, unlike more traditional forms of mobilising, cannot easily be crushed. It is democratic, non-hierarchical and entirely keeping with the global nature and principles of the movement' (Kingsnorth, 2003, p.75), he also stresses as does Klein (op cit) other new technologies such as mobile phones and video conferencing to name two.

The argument goes, and has its origins in cyberpunk fiction that in the age of information, struggles are fought over access to it and it is hard to disagree with the anarchist Hakim Bey (2001) when he claimed what we live everyday is an 'information war' whereby conflicting interests are played out through the media trying to legitimate their truth, such as the struggles between corporations and activists. And the information war continues today with new innovations occurring all the time. For example the new craze of Internet 'blogging' whereby links to discussions are set up on established sites to encourage debate and interest in the form of global interaction and exchange. This was used exclusively during last years WTO ministerial in Cancun and it succeeded in raising awareness as 'it brought people of all political persuasions from around the world together to discuss policy and tactics' (The Guardian, 18th September, 2003). On the opposing side protesters in Cancun were banned from copying and distributing information in the hotel zone on the ground that potential propaganda had been made illegal within the zone (<http://cancun.mediosindependientes>). So we can see how this process evolves as it becomes apparent to both sides the need to provide or indeed restrict the dissemination of information as it can ultimately tip the balance.

This all shows that the networked organisation of anti-globalisation, whereby it can actively compete with the forces it opposes through providing information about the various aims and representatives, ultimately sustains the movement's ability to demonstrate and gain in numbers, and confirms the Deleuzian analogy of the serpent to how struggles are fought today. Yet is information enough to mobilise resistance to globalisation and ultimately Capitalism? Or is there another factor involved in opening gateways into alternative politics? Now it has been established why networking is important to anti-globalisation it is possible to consider how it can be related to the multitude.

It can be taken for granted that information concerning the discrepancies of multi-nationals, the plights of indigenous people or the policies of the American government and international monetary organisations is their to look at. Yet since September 11th there has been a new urgency to politics in general suggesting a new kind of political behaviour is growing, the resulting wars in Afghanistan and perhaps more importantly in Iraq are useful in analysing this. An interview with a young protester at the G8 summit in Geneva last year uncovered an important attitude. According to the Guardian article the Belgian claimed he was not an activist but an 'anti-globalisation tourist' (The Guardian, 1st June, 2003) who had travelled to Geneva out of curiosity and frustration after the Iraq conflict had gone ahead. This shows that people (as it is assumed he is one of many) see the movement as something that can

realistically challenge the dominant actions of states and perhaps more importantly they understand the wars were fundamentally linked to economic priorities and Capitalism itself. This was confirmed before the Cancun ministerial as many leading globalisation writers adopted this attitude. Naomi Klein (2003) in particular summarised the mood claiming 'activists must follow the money', meaning in the past anti-war protests have been fought with little regard for the economic interests behind them, now it was becoming clear that some of the key principles behind the conflict were 'mass privatisation, unrestricted access for multinationals and drastic public sector cutbacks' (Klein, 2003, online). Essentially the anti war and the anti-globalisation movements should unite as it is important 'never to lose sight of the economic interests served by violence, or the violence of Capitalism itself' (ibid). The significance of this is that the movement it would seem is beginning to represent all struggles as people begin to associate it directly with the way of life or perhaps the bio-power that exists in the world. Furthermore the movement can therefore be recognised in this respect as the multitude as not only do they represent the powers of networking directed at Capitalism but, as this example shows, the movement understands the universality of the situation and the autonomous power that exists in its decentred organisation to confidently take on these challenges. Yet, although on the outset the movement seems united and positively expanding its association globally in the struggle against Capitalism, internally there is a visible division of interests beginning to emerge. Furthermore, the violence which occurred in Seattle and later in Genoa have led to many doubts concerning the actual ability of the movement to act politically and itself and the concept of multitude have been criticised for both acting like and insinuating a mob. The next section will look at these problems in detail. This will lead to the final chapter that will consider the future potential of the anti-globalisation movement vis a vis the multitude.

### **Division and Violence in Anti-Globalisation**

The anti-globalisation movement was unofficially coined after the events in Seattle when 50,000 protesters successfully stopped the WTO summit from going ahead. The term itself was awarded by the American press in what would seem to be a method of discrediting the ambitions of the movement in a somewhat Orwellian style of doublespeak. Yet the name has been adopted by the people involved in order to establish a common term for the actions it takes, however in recent years questions have been raised over how united the movement actually is and also what can it actually achieve politically. Immediately after Seattle it was believed the movement would inevitably grow in opposition to the 'sheer imperialist ambition of the corporate project at this moment' (Klein, 2001a, p86). Yet in the last chapter I discussed a significant shift that has occurred linking corporate injustice to the ambitions of states and inevitably war. Yet although the movement continues to not only grow but understand the powers it faces, there are emerging problems that need to be discussed. This section will emphasise what they are.

Firstly, it is necessary to consider the problem of division in the movement before looking at the issue of violence. Generally the problem of division is pooled into two camps, the movement for alternative democracy and the return to sovereign democracy. Michael Hardt (2002) explains that the initial 'euphoria of commonality' (Hardt, 2002, p.114) was slowly displaced as the new movement inevitably clashed with old interests. As the protests grew and the networks were established it became imperative to many to maintain a decentralised and non-hierarchical structure in order to not create an elitist or indeed vanguard wing for the movement. Essentially, if this was to be a new movement it had to have new principles. Yet for the movement to successfully operate on a global scale some began to argue it needed some degree of centrality to the organising. As Seymour (2001) explains, key spokespeople such as George Monbiot (2001) and to some extent Naomi Klein began to focus on state based actions in an attempt to reclaim the state from Capitalist injustice suggesting despite the potential of unruly spontaneity, the movement 'was always reformist in tendency' (Seymour, 2001, p.3). Hardt (op cit) furthers this analysis claiming it is the national

sovereignty groups who dominate the media attention, as the media inevitably needs leaders to legitimate stories and they also dominate the forums perhaps due to experience in this field. Notorious old alliances such as the SWP (Socialist Workers Party) in particular form these groups and it is their views that become dominant and clearly articulated. Mertes (2002) also looks at the importance of large organisations within the movement again showing the importance of centrality. In particular MST (Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra) who represent landless families and farmers in Brazil with over 20,000 members and who regularly select key members democratically down to the lowest level. For them the ability of the movement to act politically is 'literally a matter of life and death' (Mertes in Balakrishnan, 2002, p.149) and they see organisation as being key to this. Basically, the movement is not as universally united as some would think as internally there are key problems over organisation and agenda. Yet another issue causing repercussions for the movement is the violence that occurs at demonstrations and the association it has with the movement's aims.

The problem of violence again raises the question of what one movement hopes to achieve? And whether or not the 'multitude of protagonists' (Hardt, op cit) can indeed become a united force. Although it is commonly known that certain anarchist groups are associated with anti-globalisation and there're tactics often involve direct action against institutions and symbols of Capitalism, it was the G8 summit in Genoa that brought the harsh realities to the streets and significantly to a global audience. The events in Genoa, although it remains the 'biggest anti-globalisation demonstration in history' (Kingsnorth, op cit, p.60) are forever marred by the violence that occurred that day which resulted in the death of a protester. Blame has been accredited both within the movement and to other external factors. Radical groups such as Black Bloc, Tute Bianche and Ya Basta are associated with demonstrating tactics that involve confrontation with the police as well as 'smashing the symbols of Capitalism' (ibid, p.55), or in the case of Ya Basta issuing a declaration of war (Neale, 2002, p.20) on the day of the G8 summit. This has, especially since Genoa resulted in a lot of bad press directed at the movement as a whole, and every demonstration is now equalled by a significant police presence. Although in the years following the protest and the investigations that have taken place, some disrepute has been levelled concerning the actions of the police themselves. As Neale (ibid) points out in his personal account 'the black block ran away and the police attacked the pacifist crowd' (ibid, p.143). This argument has raged since and on some counts it has been agreed the police were very unchoosening in who they blamed for the disruption, how high up their orders came from however, we will probably never know. Despite this, politicians as well as others have been keen to undermine the movement, especially since September 11th with George Bush and British secretary of state for international development Claire Short suggesting it was time for the protesters to take sides in the war on terror (Klein, 2001b), an attitude which will be considered in more detail in the final chapter. In all, the violence at Genoa and other demonstrations has further undermined the movements ability to establish a political voice, and to exclude certain groups from its ranks would go against its democratic principles. All it can do is to discourage violent action. Now it has been established what the key problems are within anti-globalisation it is necessary to show why they are associated with the term multitude itself, before briefly giving some inclinations of how these problems can be overcome thus leading directly to the final chapter.

For numerous critics the term multitude merely confirmed the inability of theorists to establish some form of political unity to the anti-globalisation movement and for others provided further evidence that the movement itself was lacking in any realistic challenges to the global market. Instead it was simply an opportunity for old alliances and political figures to flaunt their discrepancies with the system on a global scale. There are three main principles to this argument that fundamentally point towards the idea that multitude essentially insinuates a mob. Firstly there is the involvement of Antonio Negri in giving multitude its introduction to the globalisation debate. According to Stile (op cit) 'Empire is

Negri's most moderate book to date' (Stile, op cit, p. 47) as it moves away from the idea of overthrowing the state in a revolution. However it doesn't go as far as to provide a challenge to the policies of transnational monetary organisations, instead it relies on 'vague' notions of resistance and demands which essentially don't provide adequate solutions, instead it relies on what appears to be 'mob rule'. Calinicos (2003a) is also doubtful about Negri's influence. He sees the autonomous politics as suggested in 'Empire' as being a threat to a more grounded and successful movement. Negri's involvement with organisations such as Potere Operaio and later Autonomia Operaia in the 1970's, both of who followed projects of 'mass illegality', have resemblance's with contemporary groups and tactics such as Black Bloc and Tute Bianche. The latter of which is a fall out from Autonomia Operaia which disbanded some years ago. He can only see multitude as encouraging such organisations through abstract terminology and sees the events at Genoa as highlighting 'the limits of autonomous politics' (Calinicos in Balakrishnan, 2003, p.139). Held and McGrew (2002) take this a step further suggesting this radical approach is 'no different from the more extreme neoliberalisers' (Held and McGrew, 2002, p.115).

The second issue is linked to the first and it concerns the rhetoric of the multitude. In 'Empire' Hardt and Negri (2000) use the terms 'posse' and 'militant' as fundamental characteristics of the multitude. The term 'posse' is directly linked to the Spinozist principle of potentia, as it represents the psychological ability for the human mind to resist. In this sense, and as suggested earlier, the multitude's imperative is to deny all accepted forms in its deconstruction of order. In Hardt and Negri's (ibid) words 'posse refers to the power of the multitude and its telos, an embodied power of knowledge, and being, always open to the possible' (Hardt and Negri, ibid, p. 408). However, this again only suggests a strategy of resistance and not a political project. Again 'militant' becomes the 'life of the multitude' as it resists imperial command in a creative way' (ibid, p.413), only harks back to subversive action such as that of the Situationists in the 1960's and similar off-shoots since. Moving onto the third point, the serpent structure of struggles in relation to the internal Empire can as Balakrishnan (op cit) suggests 'catapult' 'local struggles' 'up to the global level as unforeseen media events' (Balakrishnan, 2001, p.146). However in relation to the anti-globalisation movement it negates the internal problems that Mertes (op cit) spoke of concerning the real concerns of landless peasants. As Bull (op cit) suggests the concerns of many anti-globalisation protesters is 'more a care of sympathy rather than sovereignty, justice rather than power' (Bull, op cit, p.71), and in this sense the multitude becomes a dangerous compromise.

To summarise, the division and violence in anti-globalisation are the key problems it faces today. The term multitude, it can be argued, merely reiterates resistance tendencies likened to that of the autonomous groups of the 1960's and 70's, whilst simultaneously negating the real issues of organisation that seem inherent in anti-globalisation. Yet it seems the case that the anti-globalisation movement continues to grow and expand its ideas, and does not look like simply disappearing as a failed project. Instead it has reached a turning point in its history whereby some compromises and collaborations need to be made. It is my contention to show in the final chapter that it is wrong for critics to merely dispel with the term multitude in this instance as I believe some of its principles can become crucial in the future development of the anti-globalisation movement.

## CHAPTER THREE

### The 'becoming' of anti-globalisation

*'Our movements are multiplying at an incredible rate. Everyday new connections are developing both face to face and virtually as the Internet grows to connect more sentient beings than any other technology before it. New webpages, email lists, and Indymedia centres are springing up like grass after a downpour, leading to more networking, more co-ordination and more actions. The crowd has always terrified those in authority, but a crowd where each individual is able to think and act autonomously, a crowd where everyone is connected to everyone else, will cause more shiver down their spine, because it behaves in ways that no one will ever be able to predict' (Notes from Nowhere in Notes from Nowhere, 2003, .p. 71).*

In the final chapter it is now imperative to consider fully the significance of multitude vis a vis anti-globalisation. It has already been established what multitude is as a concept, why it was introduced to the globalisation debate and how it has been received and interpreted. In the last chapter particularly, the positive and negative implications of the term were discussed whereby it was established that perhaps, despite its critics, multitude can indeed teach us important lessons on the future organisation and development of anti-globalisation. It is now my contention to show exactly why I believe this, drawing together the philosophical and political insights in chapter one and also the current debates and problems in focus in chapter two. In doing this it will be possible to establish not only what can be understood as a new political fervour that enables the anti-globalisation movement to endure in the era of war and terrorism, but also how Hardt and Negri's multitude and its influences can help us to understand why, all over the world, people still resist the proposed inevitable totality of Capitalism whilst dually rejecting the violence and destruction of the new Islamic fundamentalism. Again, I would like to use Deleuze, and on this occasion his concept of 'becoming' as it best describes the new attitude that is developing not only in the West but also across the developing world. This in turn will lead to the conclusion where it will be possible to summarise fully the process and production of this essay drawing on some recent events and developments. Firstly, however the current situation of anti-globalisation needs to be discussed in relation to the proposed changing attitudes in politics.

### The endurance of the movement

In the last chapter it was briefly mentioned that in the events surrounding September 11th key political figures were quick to undermine the anti-globalisation movement suggesting it held some of the same values as that of the terrorists responsible for the attacks on the WTC. This section will specifically condone such an attitude implying that the movement recognises itself as above such criticism, and that to incite such opinions only goes to show that it has become an important actor in international politics and one which poses a threat to the dominant forces of power in the world. Furthermore, its ability to overcome criticism not only on this occasion but also after the events in Genoa, whereby it has continued to be successfully active on the political scene, again shows how the potential ascribed to the multitude can be a useful factor in furthering the movement's aims.

The immediate response of Western states to the WTC attacks was that it was a fundamental assault on the way of life as enjoyed and indeed created in this part of the world. Time and again the notions of freedom and democracy were used as the principles that 'we' had and 'they' didn't. And as Kingsnorth (op cit) explains one of the initial actions of the Americans was to 'push its free trade agenda even faster' (Kingsnorth, op cit, p. 78) as the market represents the pinnacle achievement of these values. What the West wanted to articulate was that there were two sides in the prevailing war on terror, those who supported terror and those who supported the market. The anti-globalisation movement however was quick to

point out that it supported neither. In fact one of its enduring responses was to condone all terror including the state supported terrorism by America in such places as Latin America, thus adding a crucial dimension to the rather black and white rhetoric of Western governments. Now it has been established what criticism the movement faced after September 11th, it is important to consider reasons of perhaps why it continues to endure on the political scene.

O'Neil (2001) agrees that in some respect protests, both peaceful and non peaceful have become or certainly articulated as being 'anarcho terrorism' (O'Neil, 2001, p. 198 ), yet this has largely left any radical protests as incommunicable. That is they are beyond media definition but instead suffer as do many issues at the hands of the 'postmodern cannon of pastiche' (ibid, p.199), unable to establish a realistic grounding to their motives and policies. As Guy Debord (1990) would argue 'returning to the same shortlist of trivialities' (Debord, 1990, p. 13), being re - absorbed by the 'society of the spectacle'. Debord's spectacle is something Hardt and Negri (op cit) accredit as being an adequate definition of Empire, as Lowy (1998) explains it represents the 'whole economic, social and political system of modern Capitalism' (Lowy, 1998, p. 31), whereby the individual becomes 'a passive spectator who watches the movement of commodities and events in general' (ibid). Yet with this in mind, O'Neil's (op cit) deliberations suggest that perhaps the anti-globalisation movement has an advantage in this respect. Because the media concentrates on 'self indulgent violence and anarchy' (ibid), this can be seen in the case of Genoa, or at last years Cancun ministerial where the media attention increased after the explicit suicide of a protester at the edge of the red zone (The Guardian, September 16th, 2003), the movement's radicalism as expressed in its ideas cannot be discredited but instead continues to endure and indeed win the battle of ideas outside of the inadequate media interpretations. However, why do people continue to become interested and involved in the movement and not merely passive spectators? Again it is important to look at developments since September 11th to answer this question. This will lead to considering how a new political fervour can help in establishing a political voice for the movement.

Negri (2003b) was right to claim that after Genoa and indeed after September 11th the movement had reached 'a situation where there is a block we must find our way around before we can continue on our way' (Negri, 2003b, online). Yet, the positive aspect of this whole process as it reached its first obstacle was a realisation to the fact that resistance, in its contemporary bio-political understanding remained the only definite continuation. As whenever the relations of power as expressed in Empire are negated, something else is produced or revealed that inevitably becomes the focus of a new defection. Calinicos (2003b) details the shift from identity politics in the 1970's and 1980's to more macro-political concerns as showing exactly how this process works. Using Klein's (2001b) account of the failure to establish equality in the real world by interacting with the represented world (for example, a belief that equal representation of race in Soaps would inevitable lead to a change in society) resulted in the realisation of a fundamental problem with identity politics, in that it is limited in how far its criticism can be taken. Thus for Calinicos (op cit) 'the great debate over Capitalism has resumed' (Calinicos, 2003b, p. 13).

Passavant and Dean (op cit) bring this debate into post September 11th territory claiming that indeed the poststructuralist adherence to culture has been met by an adequate response by the 'new right' (op cit, p.323) in the guise of multiculturalism, the rather over-hyped idea of respecting other cultures and beliefs as being fundamental to Western and democratic principles. The reality of this is of course rather ambiguous as these problems are still very much inherent in democratic societies, the classic example being the Israeli disregard for Palestinian life. Homer (2001) summarises this, arguing the dominant expression of multiculturalism can be understood as 'the cultural expression of a consolidated global economy' (Homer, 2001, p. 10). Therefore in their view it is the representation of the event that must be challenged. As Zizek (2002) argues the event of September 11th revealed the



realities of the world to a largely inept Western populace, and instigated a larger cultural explosion for a 'passion for the real', or something beyond what Baudrillard termed the 'blind and brilliant ambience of the simulacra' (Baudrillard, 1983, p.150). He believes it was dangerous to elevate the WTC attack 'to a point of absolute evil' (Zizek, op cit, p.136), as this surely undermines and indeed misrepresents other atrocities as being less evil despite their blatant brutality. Instead of playing the postmodern game of triviality and as Zizek says 'make fun of our beliefs whilst continuing to practise them' (Zizek, ibid, p. 71) it is time to stand back and fundamentally question the societies we belong to, in the knowledge that the brutality of September 11th has been, and continues to be equalled in the name of the West in the guise of war and American support for Israel. This is why the anti-globalisation movement continues to endure, as it refuses to adapt to the frames of discourse as presented by the war on terror. It fundamentally rejects the proposed respect and passivity as offered by the dominant idea of multiculturalism and indeed the representations in trying to establish this mythical compromise in international and social relations, and its success lies in its continued ability and understanding of the power of defection and resistance to maintaining its growth and expansion and the hope this offers across the world. Just as identity politics lead to a clearer understanding of a deeper economic and political system. The initial anti-globalisation protests have brought to light the importance of resistance and the totality of power they face. This as Negri argues, gives it a 'high degree of ontological consistency' (op cit), and therefore the ability to continue to operate and develop its political voice on the international scene. It is now possible to discuss briefly how this proposed new political fervour can help in the constant construction of the anti-globalisation movement's ability to become a political force. This will lead to the final section where the significance of multitude will be given to this analysis.

If it is agreed that there is a new passion for the political present in the world, then it is crucial for the anti-globalisation movement to maintain its ability to articulate an alternative response to the dominant discourse of the states and institutions it opposes. It can do this by realising the imperative it has to reject any actions or opinions that are given by the forces of power expressed in this instance as Empire. Just as we saw in the last chapter, political activism is focused on the enemy of the minute. The movement has already established sufficient yet expanding networks against corporate injustice and its transnational ambiguity. It resents terrorism in all its forms and now it must continue to build support against the war on terror as it too expresses the fundamental problems it has always challenged as a movement. This, as will be shown in the final section can all be expressed in the creative and intelligent potential of Hardt and Negri's multitude.

### **The significance of multitude and the process of becoming.**

In chapter two, key problems in relation to the organisation and behaviour of the anti-globalisation movement were highlighted whereby it was shown how critics of the multitude merely denounced the term as insufficient in detail and fanciful in its content and ability to understand a universal global resistance. Yet in the last section it has been argued that despite the criticisms levelled at the movement, it itself, regardless of internal problems has continued to operate globally, finding new and fundamentally related issues in the war on terror. Looking at the role of the media and key political figures and their priorities to create specific sides from which to understand contemporary political issues, has lead to the further establishing of an ontological role for anti-globalisation. This can be expressed in what Negri and others have called 'defection', meaning to frequently negate the dominant cultural and political frames of discourse. Yet to elude in taking sides would again benefit the position of global Capital. Instead the only side, if there is one to take is the position of anti-capitalist. Now that this has been established we can return to the deliberations of chapter one to see how Hardt and Negri's multitude does indeed call for such behaviour and not merely vague resistance tendencies and potential disorder.

Chapter one established the idea that multitude could be understood as the power of subjectivity present on a plane of immanence, whereby the psychological imperative to doubt any truth, opinion, idea, the big Other etc. is the norm of the day. In the last section it was proposed that any act or discourse presented by the monopolies of power that exist in Empire, be it corporate injustice, war, terror and so on must be negated as it has become clear that it is adamant refusal that allows any form of continuation and thus freedom from the totality as expressed by these forms. As Virno (2002) explains, it is 'free thinking inventiveness that changes the rules of the game and disorients the enemy' (Virno, 2002, online). We can see already, through the multitudes refusal, the totality of the project that the anti-globalisation movement faces. The second aim of chapter one was to establish a common antithesis for the multitude which was the global organisation of Capitalism. The totality of the market, as was argued, becomes the potential of this economic system and therefore the limits of its structured order. As Habermas (1999) confirms 'markets only respond to messages coded in the language of prices. They are insensible to their own external effects' (Habermas, 1999, p. ). When the pursuit of profit, money, surplus value becomes the totalising force in the world then the need to resist it is also brought to a universal level. In the last section it was shown how merely resisting the minor intricacies, such as through identity politics or anti-corporate actions, will only serve to be re-absorbed by the system itself. Instead a rejection of the whole process needs to be established. This is what the anti-globalisation movement is leaning as it too is expanding its ideas to this level. As Chomsky (1991) once argued, the policies of western governments has largely been to 'eliminate public meddling in policy formation' (Chomsky, 1991, p. 76). Now it is the case whereby the state, the place where this process once took place, is no longer recognised by the multitude as being able to represent, at all, its needs. Instead, as seen in the anti-globalisation movement, people have taken to the streets, and have built alternative alliances outside of state institutions because the formal mechanisms of government no longer work in their favour. The multitude also represents this change as in Virno's (op cit) terms remains 'anti-state' and against political unity. The movement, despite being represented by political groups is also learning not to give such groups dominant roles as that would only serve to be a regression from the progress it has made globally. Its endurance on a global scale is reliant on the continued rejection of state and political unity. Instead, the anti-globalisation movement can only learn from the principles of Hardt and Negri's multitude in that it must continue to be creative and productive, building networks and forming an alternative sphere of discourse to that expressed by the dominant powers of Empire. This is the significance of the multitude, an idea coined well before September 11th, Genoa, Cancun and the war on terror, yet that frequently explains how an alternative force must continue to operate in what is imminently becoming an Empire of powers. Here it has been shown what the significance of multitude is and why it relates directly to the future progress of anti-globalisation. Now I would like to discuss how this can, and indeed is continuing to be a relevant argument in the context of global politics before drawing on the Deleuzian term of 'becoming' as an adequate summary of the developing attitudes that are present in alternative politics. This will, like the dissertation began, reiterate the importance of thinking beyond accepted forms.

Before Genoa, Hardt and Negri (2001) wrote a short essay summarising what they saw as the objective of many anti-globalisation protesters at the G8 summit. One of the key issues or demands they recognised was for 'the democratisation of the globalising process' (Hardt and Negri in Jones et al, 2001, p. 102). That is, for the transnational institutions such as the WTO and the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and also the vanguard of states who together with such institutions determine how the global economy will be organised, must be made accountable to the people, at the lowest level thus giving them the political power to determine their own fortunes. This aim is still present within the movement, and in some respects it has evolved. In September last year the WTO met in Cancun to discuss the prospect of coming to a compromise on global trade. The developed countries wanted the developing countries to pay for a better deal on foreign investment, whilst the poorer

countries continued to lobby against the inability for them to brake into the leading markets (The Guardian, September 15th, 2002). Furthermore, agreement was still unachievable due to the reluctance of the EU and the USA to reform the Agricultural policy (New Statesman, January 12th, 2004), which allows them to offer huge subsidies to their farming industries again reducing the ability for fair competition with less established states. Inevitably, just as in Seattle in 1999, the talks collapsed. Yet new calls were being made from the protesters concerning the viability of an organisation such as the WTO. Instead of reform, people were beginning to ask for the abolition of the WTO, as it frequently undermined the process of democracy in its inability to act in the needs of all its members, but continued to adhere to the needs of industry and its profits. Once again, the anti-globalisation movement was able to confidently ridicule the ability of the traditional forms of power in the world and further legitimise its calls for a better world, one considerably different to the one visualised by the faded institutions that govern the present. More importantly however, it had learned again how important it was for the movement to pursue this cause as, although the process may be slow, attitudes were definitely changing.

Similarly in Chiapas, the Zapatistas were celebrating the tenth anniversary of their initial incursion this year. Yet in Mexico, despite the change of government, they were still largely discredited by the political elite, and actual reform in their favour was little to show for (The Guardian, 27th December). However, they too are aware that their cause has taught important lessons across the world, and inspired a whole movement, and because of this the struggle must continue. As Holloway (2002) explains, Marcos's (self proclaimed spokesperson for the EZLN) intention was never revolution in the traditional sense, as it is commonly recognised that 'revolution is a means to achieve an end' (Holloway, 2002, p. 159). Instead, revolution is something that must be learnt, that is what is happening now as obstacles are reached and need to be overcome. The Zapatistas have used their anniversary to reassert a local initiative to their policies, setting up local governments within their autonomous zones to consolidate their refusal of state power and attempt to pool international donations. Basically, the revolution of ideas continues. In the anti-globalisation movement itself Bromley (2001) takes a similar stance to that of Mertes (op cit) discussed previously. The ideas for organisation, whether rejectionist or national protectionist are dominated by the groups of the northern states, when it is the southern states that rely on their co-ordination. It is imperative to forge greater links between the two in order to establish realistic solutions to the problems within the movement. All three of these examples show how the anti-globalisation movement remains, like the multitude, open to possibilities, and despite the obstacles it faces today there continues to be a sense of hope and confidence in maintaining and furthering its networks and more importantly its ideas. In an interesting way, Negri (2003b) echoed these developments claiming the Spinozist principle of multitude was always 'the freedom and joy of liberation from slavery' (Negri, 2003b,online), yet he himself admits the term multitude needs work, and that is what he and Hardt intend to do in the next year. As the latest un-official guide to anti-globalisation says, 'Emergence teaches us that not to know everything is a strength and that local knowledge is sovereign (Notes from Nowhere in Notes from Nowhere, 2003, p. 71). The concept of multitude is intended to show how resistance in the era of Empire relies on the perpetual production of free thinking, of new ideas and to never accept or adhere to the principles of Empire itself. This is how people can perceive their freedom today, and just like the movement continues to develop and scrutinise its own aims, Negri too sees the need to develop multitude as an idea that can and will continue to evolve and remain a significant proposal in the struggle against the totality of Capitalism.

Finally, to round off this thesis I would like to return to the philosophy that was established in the first section. As we have seen, the fundamental link between multitude and anti-globalisation, and thus the significance of the latter to the former is the idea to always look ahead to what is possible, and never adhere to accepted or dominant forms. This attitude continues to prevail in the era of Empire and confirms what Deleuze always saw as a

fundamental characteristic of human nature, of being, and that is 'becoming'. In Colebrook's (op cit) terms, Deleuze deconstructs man or the self to the process of thought, 'thought is becoming' (op cit, p. 126) and thus 'the task is to think without models, axioms or grounds' (ibid) but always beyond them. In a recent essay by the cultural critic Frederic Jameson (2004), he argues that the concept of utopia has been reduced to the level of dangerous or subversive, or against human nature. Yet in a world where this idea exists it is imperative to never fear utopias, as although 'they are non-existent' (Jameson, 2004, p. 54) they always represent what may be possible even if they never materialise.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Conclusions

The production of this dissertation was based around an initial belief that multitude, as proposed by Hardt and Negri, could be an adequate definition for the attitudes and actions of the burgeoning anti-globalisation movement. Yet, my research highlighted distinct problems with this hypothesis. Firstly, that anti-globalisation itself was frequently undermined by its ability to act in a unified way as internally it is often represented by conflicting interests both ideologically and tactically. Furthermore, established critics had begun to question the concept of multitude itself, offering suspicions of its real objectives and its limited focus on actual problems, relying instead on philosophical notions of togetherness. This is why I adapted my argument, to go against the plethora of criticisms to establish an analysis in favour of multitude, and its ability to explain social struggles. My method was based on establishing what these philosophical insights were and relating them to the body of work that follows the evolution of anti-capitalist thought, looking at a new potential realised in post-industrial production and relations. The intention was to show how the multitude could be considered a useful way of bringing a collectivity of struggles to a global and universal level, against what is frequently thought of as an Empire of powers. Once this had been established I was able to relate my proposals to the anti-globalisation movement. This was done in two ways. Firstly to concentrate primarily on the importance of networking and new technologies to the expansion and maintenance of the movement. Showing how initially, its ability to disseminate information about what it opposed, led to a greater understanding to the totality of the powers it faced. The apex of which can be seen in its growing understanding of the economic imperatives of war in the aftermath of September 11th. I used this idea to suggest that this could indeed be an inclination to the objectives of Hardt and Negri's multitude. Yet to continue the analysis it was imperative to consider the criticisms. Not only those faced by the anti-globalisation movement but also those directed at multitude itself. Dealing first with the problems of the movement, I established the issue of organisation whereby a significant divide over how the movement should continue to operate globally was emerging, considering in particular the role of certain large organisations and also the geographical dominance of ideas. Then I looked at the problem of violence, suggesting how this also highlighted inherent problems within the movement that needed to be considered, mentioning for the first time the conflicts this incited with emerging attitudes in politics in a post-September 11th environment and how it could disrupt the movement's potential. This led to an analysis of the criticism of multitude, whereby the insinuations of how the concept could be understood in terms of a mob were detailed. The conclusion of this section was to emphasise the fact that despite these problems the movement endured and in this respect it could perhaps be understood in the same light as that of the multitude, drawing on the philosophical insights established in chapter one. This led directly to the concluding chapter which detailed my hypothesis in full.

Chapter three is where I was able to establish not only why I believed the anti-globalisation movement continued to endure in the war on terror, but also the significance of multitude in visualising how this would take place. In the first section I looked specifically at the criticisms levelled at the movement after September 11th and how it overcame these. I then criticised the methods of Western governments and the media in trying to establish specific sides in the war on terror and how the anti-globalisation movement did and should continue to negate these frames. This is where I introduced my crucial argument, as it frequently becomes clear that for the movement to endure it must follow the principle of defection, that is by refusing the actions and rhetoric of the proposed powers of Empire and instead continue to build an alternative discourse outside of the accepted frames in a unified struggle against Capitalism. To further my conclusion I detailed three key developments in certain aspects of anti-globalisation, namely the aftermath of Cancun, the continuing struggle of the Zapatistas, and the need to create deeper links between the organisations involved. I then

related this specifically to the multitude, showing how Negri himself understands the need to keep thinking about the concept, as it too becomes an integral part of understanding and furthering the movement of global resistance. To summarise the dissertation, I returned to the philosophy in chapter one thus giving a circular dimension to the thesis, urging the importance of becoming and free thinking as integral to individual freedom in the age of Empire. In closing I would like to reiterate this point and look ahead to the G8 summit in June and to how the anti-globalisation movement will continue to articulate its message in the prevailing war on terror, and the expansion and consolidation of Capitalism.

## **Bibliography**

Arie, S 'How war changed the protest virgins', *The Guardian*, Sunday, June 1st, 2003, available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,6903,968061,00.html>

Balakrishnan, G 'Introduction' in Balakrishnan, G (2003) (ed), *Debating Empire*, London: Verso, p.1-19.

Baudrillard, J (1983), *Simulations*, New York: Semiotext(e).

Bey, H 'The Information War' in Trend, D (2001) (ed), *Reading Digital Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 115-121.

Bifo, F. B (2004) 'What is the meaning of autonomy today?' (online), available at <http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=04/01/16/1733237&mode=nested&tid=9>

Bromley, S (2001) 'Two views on recent anti-capitalist protests: The golden straightjacket: Moving on from Seattle in *Radical Philosophy*, 107, May/Jun, 2001, p. 5-10.

Bull, M 'You can't build a new society with a Stanley knife' in Balakrishnan, G (2003) (ed), *Debating Empire*, London: Verso, p. 83-97.

Bush, J 'How to defy the US and EU bullies' in *Newstatesman*, 12th January, 2004, p.34-36.

Calinicos, A 'Toni Negri in perspective' in Balakrishnan, G (2003) (ed), *Debating Empire*, London: Verso, p.121-144.

Calinicos, A (2003b), *An Anti-Capitalist Manifesto*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Castells, M (2001) *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture Volume 1: The Rise of the Network Society*, second edition, Oxford: Blackwell.

Chomsky, N (1992), *Deterring Democracy*, London: Vintage.

Cleaver, H (1993) 'An interview with Harry Cleaver' with De Angelis, M (online), available at <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/3843/cleaver.html>

Cleaver, H 'The Zapatistas and the electronic fabric of struggle' in Holloway, J and Palaez, E (1998) (eds), *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*, London: Pluto Press.

Cleaver, H (2000) *Reading Capital Politically*, second edition, Edinburgh: AK Press.

Colebrook, C (2002), *Routledge Critical Thinkers: Gilles Deleuze*, London: Routledge.

Debord, G (1990), *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Malcolm Imre, London: Verso.

Debord, G (1992), *The Society of the Spectacle*, Trans. Nicholson-Smith, D, New York: Zone Books.

Deleuze, G and Guatarri, F (1987), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Massumi, B, University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G (1995) 'Postscript on the Societies of Control' (online), available at <http://total.confusion.net/pipermail/cx-1/2002-September/001471.html>

Elliott, L 'Free trade, no choice' in Gunnell and Timms (2001) (eds), *After Seattle: Globalisation and its discontents*, London: Catalyst.

Elliot, L. Denny, C and Munk, D 'Blow to world economy as trade talks collapse', *The Guardian*, September 15th, 2003, available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/international/story/0,3604,1042269/00.html>

Grasby, J (2003), *Revolution in the 21st Century: A Rough Guide to Revolution for Academics and Activists*, Washington (England): TUPS Books.

Habermas, J (1999) 'The European Nation State and the Pressures of Globalisation' in *New Left Review*, 235, Aug/Sep, 1999.

Hardt, M (2002) 'Today's Bandung?' in *New Left Review*, 14, Mar/Apr. 2002, p. 112-118.

Hardt, M 'Theory and event interview: Sovereignty, multitudes, absolute democracy' with Dumm, T. L in Passavant and Dean (2004) (eds), *Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*, London: Routledge, p. 163-175.

Hardt, M and Negri, A (2000), *Empire*, Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M and Negri, A 'What the protesters in Genoa want' in Jones et al (2001), *On Fire: The battle of Genoa and the anti-capitalist movement*, One Off Press.

Hardt, M and Negri, A (2003) 'Marx's mole is dead! Globalisation and communication' (online), available at <http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=03/07/24/0248201>

Held, D and McGrew, A (2002), *Globalisation/Anti-Globalisation*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Holloway, J (2002) 'Zapatismo and the Social Sciences' in *Capital and Class*, 78, Autumn 2002, p. 153-161.

Homer, S (2001) 'Its the Political Economy Stupid: On Zizek's Marxism' in *Radical Philosophy*, 108, July/August 2001, p. 7-15.

Jameson, F (2004) 'The Politics of Utopia' in *New Left Review*, 25, Jan/Feb, 2004, p. 35-54.

Keegan, V 'Blogging On', *The Guardian*, September 18th, 2003, available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/economicdispatch/story/0,12498,1044625.html>.

Kingsnorth, P (2003), *One No, Many Yeses: A Journey to the Heart of the Global Resistance Movement*, London: The Free Press.

Klein, N (2001a) 'Reclaiming the Commons' in *New Left Review*, 9, May/Jun. 2001, p. 85-88.

Klein, N (2001b), *No Logo*, second edition, London: Flamingo.

Klein, N 'Activists must follow the money: Protesters in Cancun understand neo-liberalism is a form of war', *The Guardian*, September 12th, 2003, available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story0,3604,1040412,00.html>

Kraniasuskas, J (2000) 'Empire or multitude? Transnational Negri' in *Radical Philosophy*, 103, Sep/Oct, 2000, p. 29-37.



Laclau, E 'Can immanence explain social struggles?' in Passavant and Dean (2004) (eds), *Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*, London: Routledge.

Lowy, M (1998) 'Consumed by night fire: The dark romanticism of Guy Debord' in *Radical Philosophy*, 87, Jan/Feb, 1998, p. 31-34.

Marx, K (1993), *Grundrisse*, third edition, London: Penguin Group.

Maurer, B 'On divine markets and the problem of justice: Empire as theodicy' in Passavant and Dean (2004) (eds), *Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*, London: Routledge.

Mertes, T 'Grass-Roots Globalism' in Balakrishnan, G (2003) (ed), *Debating Empire*, London: Verso, p. 144-155.

Monbiot, G (2001), *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain*, London: Pan Books.

Neale, J (2002), *You are G8, We are 6 Billion: The Truth Behind the Genoa Protests*, London: Vision Paperbacks.

Negri, A (2002) 'Ruptures within Empire, the power of exodus: An interview with Toni Negri' with Cocco, G and Lazzarato, M (online), available at <http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=02/01/30/2044216>

Negri, A (2003) 'Empire and Multitude: A dialogue on the new order of globalisation' with Zolo, D (online), available at <http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=03/01/31/1410242>

Nicolaus, M 'The Unknown Marx' in Blackburn, R (1975) (ed), *Ideology in Social Science: Readings in Critical Social Theory*, Glasgow: William Collins Sons and Co. Ltd. p. 306-334.

Notes from Nowhere 'Networks: the ecology of the movements' in Notes from Nowhere (eds), *We are everywhere: the irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*, London: Verso, p. 63-74.

O'Neil, J (2001) 'Empire versus Empire: A Post Communist Manifesto' in *Theory, Culture and Society*, vol. 19 (4), p. 196-201.

Ortega y Gasset, J (1963), *The Revolt of the Masses*, second edition, London: Unwin Books.

Panitch, L and Gindin, S (2004), *Global Capitalism and American Empire*, London: Merlin Press.

Passavant, P and Dean, J 'Representation and the event' in Passavant and Dean (2004) (eds), *Empire's New Clothes: Reading Hardt and Negri*, London: Routledge.

Ronfeldt, D et al (1998), *The Zapatista Social Netwar in Mexico*, RAND.

Seymour, B (2001) 'Two views on recent anti-capitalist protests: Nationalise this !: What next for anti-globalisation protests?' in *Radical Philosophy*, 107, May/Jun. 2001, p. 2-5.

Spinoza, B. de (1994), *A Spinoza Reader: The Ethics and other works*, edited and translated by Curley, E, Princeton University Press.

Stile, A (2002) 'Apocalypse Soon' in New York Review of Books, Vol. XLIV, no. 17, Nov. 7, 2002, p. 47-50.

Virno, P (2002) 'Virtuosity and Revolution: The Political Theory of Exodus' (online), available at <http://info.interactivist.net/article.pl?sid=02/11/14/134217>

Watts, J 'Field of tears', The Guardian, September 16th, 2003, available online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,3604,1042733,00>

Zizek, S (2002), Welcome to the Desert of the Real! , London: Verso.