For a number of reasons, following WWII, the US, whose economy flourished, whose industrial capacity grew, assumed domination of the “free” world. Following various agreements established at the 1944 Bretton Woods conference, the foundations were laid for an unprecedented expansion of capitalist markets and their integration. Given the encouragement, investment capital and expertise of the US, as nations recovered from the consequences of the war, between the development of new technologies of production, as well as the new information technologies, there was a greater integration of national economies. While multi national corporations had a long history as essential agents in the modern world system, with expanded trade came more and more globally dispersed factories, distribution centers and/or financial centers. With such expanded trade, these enterprise began to lose their national moorings and identities and a trans national capitalist system of global corporations. As the economic power of capital grew, its intellectuals began to argue that various governmental restriction, the public ownerships of common resources and various entitlement programs thwarted economic growth. The Keynesian framework was increasingly under attack. But the time of Thatcher and Reagan, the economics of Smith and Ricardo, as resurrected by Milton Friedman, assumed hegemony. This was often combined with right wing politics, if not military dictatorships.

As neo-liberalism transformed the nature of international markets, as its intellectuals promised, it would promote rapid economic growth, and, as they say, the rest is history. Transnational capitalist corporations now dominate the world economy; transnational regulatory agencies, beholden to capital, regulate and control trade and investment. But globalization, as a force of ‘creative destruction’ has not only created vast profits and transformed the nature of contemporary life but has created major social disruptions, stresses, strains, and hardships starting
with declining wages for industrial workers and many service workers in the advanced countries. The forces of globalization have led to massive social dislocations and migrations as destitute and often landless peasants have flocked from rural hinterlands to big cities—only to find unemployment, underemployment, and the impersonality and anonymity of the city. Many people from poorer countries have migrated, often illegally, to the richer countries and find the conditions of the poor slums, barrios, favelas, banlieues, and ghettos filled with hardship, crime, violence, and despair. Environmental despoliation has not just become rampant, but the proliferation of toxic waste, global warming, species depletion, and desertification threaten the very viability of human life. The problems generated by globalization transcend national boundaries and cannot be addressed by national actors; therefore, new kinds of global social movements are necessary to meet the new kinds of challenges (Cf. Bennett 2003).

Part I: Global Justice Mobilizations

A. Crisis Tendencies of Global Capital

The dialectical understanding of society, rooted in a Hegelian-Marxist framework, rests on the concept of negation, understood as the inherent nature of contradiction that would seek to resolve itself; the ‘power of negativity’ would seek the ‘negation of negation’ to overcome contradictions. As such, negativity fosters change. But how does contradiction foster its resolution. In terms of political economy, the contradiction of class domination fosters crises and, in turn, disposes changes/challenges that would transform class relations to overcome crises tendencies based on those inherent contradictions. Such crises evoke emotional reactions that in turn impel actions. Systems of domination foster pain and suffering, as well as various ways that neutralize, control, or deflect efforts at change. Sociologically, social mobilizations become one means of mediating between structural and/or ideological domination/contradictions and overcoming these contradictions that are experienced as crises. Various collective stresses and strains may be individually and collectively experienced as anxiety, anger, shame, humiliation, etc. But how do crises and contradictions, and in turn personal and/or collective distress then foster social mobilization? Habermas (1975) formulated a comprehensive theory of legitimacy crises fostering social mobiliza-