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ABSTRACT

Few scholars have attempted to document the nature of coalition building within the antiglobalization movement, and this study is an attempt to analyze part of this complex and important social movement. This study is a synopsis of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement and concentrates on the nature of alliances across movements and the numerous dilemmas they encounter. The major assumption of this project is that neoliberalism dominates the globalization process through the policies and practices of various governance institutions and that the anti-globalization movement arose as a counter-movement in response to neoliberal changes. Based on thirteen interviews conducted within Northwest Ohio’s activist community, this study is a qualitative research project that explores the motivations of labor, peace, farm worker, environmental, and anarchist activists, their concerns about the nature of globalization, and their experiences with cross-movement alliance building.

The objective of this study is, first, to provide some historical context on globalization, political and economic thought, coalition building, anti-globalization’s antecedent movements and the broader national and international movement; second, to explain how and why various social movements in Northwest Ohio became part of the anti-globalization movement and identify the problematic issues of cross-movement alliances. The study begins with a review of literature on coalitional movements, anti-globalization activism, and the antecedent movements of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement. I also provide a history of contending liberalisms and the process of globalization. Finally, interviews with Northwest Ohio activists are analyzed to examine personal recollections of the emergence of concerns about the nature of
globalization, anti-globalization activism, and experiences with coalition building across movements. The findings of this study center around the dilemmas of coalition building and the utility of theories on neoliberalism for explaining anti-globalization activism. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement is not a cohesive movement based on a collective anti-globalization identity but rather a diverse group of activists joined together by the perceived threats of neoliberal globalization. As they attempt to form alliances across movements, differences in social characteristics, group structures, leadership styles, decision-making models, and tactics pose considerable challenges.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Northwest Ohio’s Mike Ferner began his work as an activist as a youth, has been involved in numerous environmental, peace, and labor campaigns, and is now active in the anti-globalization movement. In recent years, Ferner’s focus as an activist has shifted from local and national concerns to opposing corporate power in an increasingly interconnected global economy. Capitalism in an era of globalization, Ferner argues, is fraught with problems and guided by a pro-business philosophy that disregards the needs of people. “The problems that we are seeing here domestically,” Ferner suggests, “are occurring, sometimes in a much greater scale, all over the world. […] What we’re seeing with NAFTA and the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas these days is an extension of that same philosophy—that property rights are more important than human rights.” Ferner, like many other Northwest Ohio activists, is alarmed by the nature of globalization, identifies with such themes as anti-corporatism and anti-neoliberalism, and believes his concerns reflect neoliberal changes unbound by national boundaries.

Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activists emerged from peace, labor, environmental, anarchist, and farm workers movements. Many have joined forces to lobby Toledo’s City Council to pass anti-sweatshop, anti-FTAA, and Living Wage resolutions. Some participated in mass anti-globalization demonstrations in Washington D.C., Cincinnati, and elsewhere. In 2002, anti-globalization activists from social justice and labor communities coalesced to form Jobs With Justice, Toledo’s first long-term coalition focused on workers’ rights and issues of globalization. Concerns about globalization are on the rise and numerous activists of Northwest Ohio have rethought their own views to include an anti-globalization viewpoint. Northwest Ohio’s experience with anti-globalization activism raises questions about the motivations of
activists to take part in anti-globalization activism, the antecedent events that prompted activism, and the nature of coalition building across the different social movements involved in anti-globalization activism.

This introduction is an attempt to lay the groundwork for answering questions regarding coalition building between Northwest Ohio’s diverse activists involved in the anti-globalization movement. I begin with a definition of neoliberal globalization and provide a brief description of the broader movement. Next, I describe the procedure and methodology used in this study. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement, I argue, arose in response to neoliberal political, economic, and social transformations occurring on local, national, and international levels. Anti-globalization activists are from a variety of movements with different goals and agendas but share common enemies, the multinational corporations and governance institutions that utilize neoliberal ideology to justify policies that promote maximum corporate profits without consideration of human or environmental concerns. Northwest Ohio’s activists became motivated to act as these changes occurred and oppose neoliberal globalization by confronting the institutions of capitalism that operate under the ethos of neoliberalism.

Conceptualizing Neoliberal Globalization

Neoliberal globalization can best be defined by exploring the terms “globalization” and “neoliberal globalization” separately. For the purposes of this study, globalization is defined as a multi-dimensional process involving the transformation of social relations and transactions. Most scholars conceptualize globalization to include the following: time-space compression (due to technological changes in transportation and communication); accelerated interdependence, interconnectedness, and integration (national economies and societies becoming increasingly enmeshed as borders become less relevant); and a reordering of power relations with the growth
and increased power of supranational governance institutions and multinational corporations.¹ Recent advances in technology combined with the fall of communism and the spread of global capitalism have markedly intensified transnational relations. In short, globalization describes a cross-border intensification of relations on multiple dimensions and is the result of a long-term process.

Globalization following a neoliberal ideology is a phenomenon of recent decades and includes a pro-business political and economic agenda. Neoliberalism, as James Richardson defines it, is an ideology, “that privileges markets over governments and proclaims the need for societies to adjust, apparently without limit, to the supposed imperative of globalization” (1). Ulrich Beck uses the term “globalism” to describe neoliberal globalization or, as he puts it, “the ideology of rule by the world market” (100). Led by the corporate elite, contemporary globalization is more than the expansion of free-market capitalism altered by technological advances; it contains a distinctly pro-business political agenda. Neoliberal globalization advances the interests of the elite, diminishes the power of labor and the left, and attacks forms of socialism (Leys 10-2; Nash 95; Raboy 110; A. Starr 6-7). The neoliberal political project, Richardson suggests, has the primary purpose of producing specific economic changes such as the “transnational organization of production, the global mobility of capital, and the removal of all barriers to the construction of a world market” (94-95). Neoliberalists prefer market forces to state intervention embracing the notion that unfettered capitalism will promote a healthy economy more effectively than government intervention. The neoliberal policies and practices of

¹ This study borrows its definition of globalization from the following sources: Held and McGrew 3; Scholte 63; Buttel 95; Beck 102; and Richardson 94. For other conceptualizations of globalization, see Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s Empire (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2000).
governance institutions contain a rhetorical claim that these changes are inevitable and necessary to be competitive in a global economy (Richardson 95).

Neoliberal globalization is not solely based on the guidance of U.S. leaders but is certainly based in it. U.S. corporate and political leaders are the primary forces behind neoliberal economic policies and make it costly for countries that refuse to conform (Leys 12). Deregulation and privatization are neoliberal practices that have largely been introduced to many nation-states by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, two institutions dominated by the U.S. (Nash 95). Clearly, U.S. corporate and government influences are largely responsible for the importation of neoliberal political and economic models to non-western countries and this ideological transition has led to widespread neoliberal reforms.

**Activists Opposing Neoliberal Globalization**

Peace, labor, environmental, anarchist, agricultural, consumer, human rights, animal rights, and other movements challenging the neoliberal practices and policies of transnational corporations and governance institutions have been labeled by the mass media as anti-globalization activists. Anti-globalization activists come from an abundance of social movements with frequently shifting coalitions (Buttel 99-100, 109; Seoane and Taddei 100; Ponniah and Fisher 8). Far from being a homogenous community, these activists embrace a diversity of goals, strategies, and tactics and are sometimes divided along class, gender, religion, and race lines. Most of these activists do not oppose globalization per se--what they view as a slow, global process of growing social and economic interconnectivity--but rather corporate-led, neoliberal globalization and share the basic goal of making corporations and governance institutions accountable to all people rather than just to elites (Buttel 100, 109; A. Starr 83; Schonleitner 128). While they lack consensus on tactics, strategies and a common vision, their joint focus is to
confront the perceived agents of neoliberal globalization such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the IMF, multinational corporations, and other powerful governance institutions (Ponniah and Fisher 11). Up to this point, this movement has been reactive rather than proactive in that it opposes the perceived forces of neoliberal globalization but has yet to develop a coherent alternative project (Schonleitner 128; Ponniah and Fisher 10). Seattle, Washington, Melbourne, Prague, Gothenburg, Quebec City, Genoa, and many other cities around the world have been sites of massive anti-globalization demonstrations in recent years and have attracted activists from a wide variety of social movements with differing organizational forms and ideologies.

Fascinated by the notion of such a diverse movement engaging in joint actions, I’m curious about the origins of this movement. How and why did these separate movements become concerned about the nature of globalization and what motivated them to participate in joint actions? How and to what extent do these different groups form alliances? In their attempts to work together, what challenges do they face and how are differences handled? Baffled by the complexities of the movement and impressed by its diversity, I want to understand the anti-globalization movement and its unique history and characteristics. This study is an attempt to tell a small part of the anti-globalization activism story, to explore some of the anti-globalization movement’s antecedent movements and their past alliances with one another, and to describe the nature of anti-globalization activism and coalition building in one community, Northwest Ohio.

Procedure and Methodology

In this study, my investigation takes four major paths. First, I review literature on theories related to coalition building and case studies on cross-movement alliances. Second, I provide a history of neoliberal globalization by including both a record of globalization and the influence
and history of various political ideologies. Third, I supply a history of several antecedent movements of the anti-globalization movement, the notable occurrences precipitating the movement, and the emergence of the anti-globalization movement as a recognizable social movement. Finally, I shift from the broader movement to a local perspective by examining Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activism. By providing a narrative of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activism, I explain how and why various movements developed concerns about the nature of globalization, the extent to which these diverse groups formed alliances, and the challenges they faced in doing so. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement, I argue, contains loose and shifting alliances between a variety of social movements. Typical of other heterogeneous alliances, this movement experiences the frequent challenges of coalitional movements including: differences involving each group’s vision, structure, and preferred tactics and how they respond to issues posed by diversities of race, class, gender, and religion. Motivated to join forces by changes associated with neoliberal globalization, Northwest Ohio’s activists share common concerns regarding trade liberalization, the increased power of multinational corporations, and the ethos of neoliberalism. The concluding chapter discusses the advantages of using neoliberal theory as a framework for the anti-globalization movement, examines Northwest Ohio’s movement characteristics, and explores the dilemmas of cross-movement alliance building and its significance to this movement.

The crux of this study reveals the major historical events and political opportunities leading to the formation of this movement, makes connections between earlier social movements and the anti-globalization movement, and exposes the challenges faced by anti-globalization alliances on a local level. In general, its purpose is to expand the body of knowledge on the nature of coalition building across the diverse social movements located with the anti-
globalization movement. This study is not a complete analysis of anti-globalization activism or a universal guide to alliance building. While its concerns are global in nature, this study’s concentration reflects my own limited standpoint as a peace activist from the United States with my own specific experience of globalization. It lacks in-depth information on anti-globalization activism in the global South and Third World social movements, movements specifically focused on consumer culture, anti-corporate ring-wing movements, and the social, cultural, and political-economic circumstances outside of U.S. society. There is no privileged position from which to view the whole and, although limited, all standpoints are valuable and it is my hope that this focus contributes to the research on anti-globalization activism and social movements in a worthwhile way.
II. SURVEY OF RESEARCH ON COALITION BUILDING BETWEEN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

In this chapter, I review the literature pertinent to coalition building between social movements. I first describe theories typically utilized in the study of coalitional movements including New Social Movement theory, collective identity, identity politics, and the interpersonal and structural elements of coalition building. Next, I review case studies on various alliances between diverse activist organizations. Finally, I summarize the lessons learned by coalitional successes and failures. This framework will provide a foundation for connecting theories on coalition building and other case studies with Northwest Ohio’s cross-movement alliances.

Coalition Building and New Social Movements

Comprehending the anti-globalization movement requires a basic understanding of the characteristics of recent social movements along with theories on how coalitional movements function. One traditional approach to looking at coalition building and understanding the anti-globalization movement is to utilize New Social Movement theory. New Social Movement theory stresses the internal dynamics of a movement by focusing on issues like shared culture, attitudes, and identities. Older social movements are characterized as homogenous and class-based whereas new social movements (NSMs) transcend class structure by involving non-class identities or ideologies (Tarrow 51-52; Buechler 16; Johnston, Laraña, and Gusfield 6). Class as a form of identity remains important to participants of NSMs and is closely tied to cultural tools and political participation but class homogeneity is rare (Tarrow 52; Croteau 15, 47). Beginning in the 1960s, emergent social movements were characterized as pluralistic and heterogeneous composed of interclass groups with often differing interests and various identities (Tarrow 51-52;
Anti-globalization activists identify with ideologies that extend beyond class issues, focusing instead on their opposition to a system that promotes neoliberal globalization at the expense of justice, community, national sovereignty, cultural diversity, and ecological sustainability. NSMs embrace organizational forms that are segmented, diffuse, decentralized, egalitarian, and participatory (Buechler 16; Johnston, Laraña, and Gusfield 8). Today’s anti-globalization movement is made up of loose and shifting coalitions of various movements that utilize a plurality of group goals and tactics and have no centralized control or official message. New Social Movement theory provides a useful framework for the characterization of the anti-globalization movement.

Conceptions of “collective identification” and “identity politics” are central to New Social Movement theory and help explain why certain groups build coalitions and why others do not. Collective identity, as defined by Johnston, Laraña, and Gusfield, refers to “the agreed upon definition of membership, boundaries, and activities for the group” (15). Identity politics provide movements with an organizational framework and allows participants to feel a shared sense of purpose, solidarity, and empowerment and validates the experiences of historically marginalized people (Johnston, Laraña, and Gusfield 10; Kauffman 29). Identities may be inherited or constructed whereas the former bases solidarity on shared characteristics and experiences, the later bases unity on shared principles, beliefs, and values (Tarrow 119; Bystydzienski and Schacht 7). Some anti-globalization activists embrace an inherited identity, others accept a constructed form, and some embrace multiple identities. For example, both migrant farm workers and peace activists are involved in anti-globalization activism and may embrace multiple identities. Migrant workers may share a sense of solidarity based in part on a common ethnic identity, peace activists base their identity on a political position, and both groups may
identify as anti-globalization activists. In each case, collective identity provides a sense of community and motivates group members to remain committed to the movement.

While movements grounded in identity politics certainly contain advantages, single identity groups tend to be exclusionary, diminish other aspects of one’s identity, and discourage coalition building. Identity politics, Bystydzienski and Schacht suggest, “often work against coalition building and open debate among diverse groups and can discourage new and challenging ideas” (4). Instead of building bridges and understanding differences, identity politics translates into an us versus them politics where the “other” is at best viewed as irrelevant or at worst seen as the oppressor and barred from interaction and participation (Bystydzienski and Schacht 5-6). Additionally, Robnett argues, identity is not static and even within movements centered on a single ethnic identity a collective identity often conflicts with individuals who embrace multiple identities (15-17). Assuming that all members share a collective culture and experience dismisses the objective reality of multiple identities and identities based on gender, class and other characteristics are marginalized (Robnett 15-17; Edelman 301). Unfortunately, Kauffman suggests, the ethos of identity politics has too often fragmented the Left and created barriers to communication and alliance building (30). Nevertheless, identity politics is an important component of NSMs including the anti-globalization movement.

Multiplicity, particularly within the anti-globalization movement, is part of any broad-based social movement and poses special challenges to discovering commonalities. How do differing groups unify and find common ground without relinquishing their differences? How do heterogeneous movements cooperate and find common ground without sacrificing important identity issues? Inclusive social practices and organizational strategies, Brecher and Costello argue, will facilitate cooperation and provide space for diversity (337). Social justice
communities composed of a variety of community organizations have the potential to become a cohesive group committed to common values like economic and political justice (Brecher and Costello 337). Collective identities can be based not only on shared social characteristics and experiences but also on shared values and principles (Bystydzienski and Schacht 7). If anti-globalization activists, for example, share a commitment to the ideals of democracy and social justice while also recognizing difference and maintaining separate identities as well, alliance building becomes possible without the marginalization of certain identities. Inclusive political communities and collective identities open the doors to coalitional building across movements.

Successful coalition building among anti-globalization activists, like other cross-movement alliances, involves struggle and change at interpersonal and structural levels. On an interpersonal level, Fred Rose suggests, successful coalitions go through four stages. Stage one involves the building of trust and the discovery of shared goals and interests (F. Rose 160). During this stage, each group accesses whether or not an alliance serves their own interests. If they discover commonalities they proceed to stage two, the relationship-building phase (F. Rose 160). Joining each other’s social networks, each group continues to build their relationships with each other. Social integration is key because social isolation creates barriers to coalition building and identifying common interests (F. Rose 25). Once a certain level of trust is attained, coalitions move to stage three where they negotiate areas of agreement and disagreement and learn to appreciate each other’s perspective (F. Rose 161). Success requires a willingness to deal with questions and criticisms, to learn about diverse viewpoints, and a willingness to work through tensions (F. Rose 212-13). By stage four coalitions members have overcome major internal tensions and have rethought their own views to include a more comprehensive and inclusive viewpoint (F. Rose 162). Coalitions often fail or succeed based on the quality of interpersonal
relationships across movements (F. Rose 31). On a structural level, Bystydzienski and Schacht suggest that coalitional members examine organizational issues such as patterns of relating or practices and procedures (11). Successful alliances identify and delete processes that marginalize certain groups and promote structural practices that are open, nonhierarchical, and participatory (Bystydzienski and Schacht 12). Once coalition members take this interpersonal and structural inventory, building a strong alliance and finding a common vision and goals becomes possible. Given the vast heterogeneity of the anti-globalization movement, coalition building across movements is vital to its success.

**Case Studies**

Several scholars have studied alliances across social movements and many of those same movements are involved in anti-globalization activism. In the next several pages, I review numerous case studies on a variety of coalitional campaigns or movements. These studies feature alliances between feminist organizations and male-dominated liberal organizations, a variety of progressive community organizations, Native American tribes and rural whites, labor and community organizations, interfaith coalitions, labor and religious organizations, and feminist and labor groups. Most of the coalitions are local grassroots campaigns and some develop into national movements. Some focus on single-issues campaigns, others are multi-issue, some are electoral, and others are based on geographical related commonalities. All of them provide insight on the challenges of coalition building across the diverse movements involved in anti-globalization activism.

Strong alliances with a variety of groups increase the likelihood of success for social movements and Hartmann’s research on the allies of the women’s movement underscores this notion. Hartmann researched feminist activism within male-dominated liberal organizations and
argues that several key allies helped fuel the development of feminist consciousness and pushed for gender equity (1-11). On her list of organizations supporting feminist goals are individuals from the American Civil Liberties Union, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the Ford Foundation, and the National Council of Churches (Hartmann 1, 213). These organizations, Hartmann argues, validated the claims of feminist leaders and acted as links between the women’s movement and government officials (210). Her study underscores the importance of alliances and highlights the contributions of individuals and organizations on the periphery of the women’s movement. Perhaps similar trends are occurring as part of the anti-globalization movement. Anti-globalization alliances between various social movements and liberal organizations are likely to spark increased anti-globalization activism and greater public acceptance. Growing alliances across movements and organizations may offer a partial explanation of how and why separate movements become concerned about the nature of globalization.

Jerold Starr’s study on Pittsburgh’s Alliance for Progressive Action (APA) provides an excellent example of a long-term, community-based, multi-issue coalition along with a detailed description of the coalition building process and the challenges APA experienced. APA began in 1991 with thirty-four member organizations with representatives from labor, peace, environmental, racial and ethnic minority, gay and lesbian, women, and several other movements (J. Starr 107). Early meetings involved discussions on issues of inclusion, learning about each other’s goals and agendas, and discussing various points of contention like women’s reproduction and gay and lesbian rights (J. Starr 110). Once these issues were resolved and a certain level of trust had developed, the coalition went to work designing a decision-making process that was democratic and encouraged solidarity (J. Starr 110). Within a relatively short
time, APA gained the resources to hire part-time staff which enabled them to make a concerted effort to support select programs, create a newsletter, and conduct workshops (J. Starr 107). Continuing to grow, APA now has a full-time staff and has supported three major actions: Western Pennsylvania’s Living Wage Campaign, Citizens for Police Accountability, and a campaign opposed to a local public television station converting one of its stations to commercial status (J. Starr 108). Interestingly, their strong interpersonal relationships, inclusive decision-making process, and many successes did not lead to a strong collective group identity (J. Starr 113). APA members identify with their original group or organization demonstrating that identity issues do not diminish even within strong coalitions and that coalitional groups contain members in need of a space of their own to deal with more contentious issues (J. Starr 113-15). Additionally, coalitions have limitations and APA’s experience suggests that successful coalitions limit their focus by taking direction from the broader community and avoiding campaigns that are controversial (J. Starr 113-15). When applied to an analysis of coalition building within the anti-globalization movement, Jerold Starr’s study offers interesting points of comparison and raises questions about the nature of anti-globalization coalitions and whether or not they are experiencing similar challenges relating to issues of identity and involving the limited focus of coalitions.

Under certain conditions, coalitional movements can minimize the problems associated with identity issues as evidenced by Grossman’s research on local community-based environmental coalitions between Native American tribes and rural whites. Using the coalition that occurred in Northern Wisconsin during 1990s as his primary example, Grossman describes the alliance between rural white members of sport fishing groups and the Ojibwe (Chippewa), Menomimee, and other tribes and their fight against the metallic sulfide mines that polluted the
waters they both wanted to protect (148). Despite their past conflicts over treaty-backed fishing rights, Native American groups and sports fishermen made the decision to unite to protect the fish and environment (Grossman 148). Grossman compared the Wisconsin coalition with other interethnic alliances between Native Americans and rural whites and found common patterns of formation. First, local geography played an important role as both groups held a shared “sense of common place” and held cultural ties to the environment (Grossman 154). Second, despite their past differences, rural whites and Native Americans agreed to cooperate based on the identification of common political adversaries, a desire to protect the environment, and the shared realization that they were both “in it together” (Grossman 154-56). Finally, members of these coalitions were committed to overcoming ethnic conflicts in order to attain their goals and developed new cultural understandings of one another (Grossman 154-57). Perhaps interethnic anti-globalization coalitions also overcome differences in part by limiting their focus to mutual goals and opposing common political adversaries.

Religious coalitions are the dominant method of grassroots organizing and Altemose and McCarty’s study identifies the advantages and disadvantages of such coalitions. Their study focuses on the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), a successful organization that trains local coalitions of religious organizations to work together and address the concerns of their community’s most needy. IAF’s success is due largely to their focus on quality interpersonal relationships and their commitment to communitarian values and to creating coalitions that reflect the diversity of the communities in which they function (Altemose and McCarty 134-36). While religious coalitions have multiple advantages, Altemose and McCarty argue, they are typically limited to what they refer to as “bread-and-butter issues” and avoid dealing with controversial issues like women’s reproductive rights and gay and lesbian issues (137-43). Anti-
globalization coalitions involving faith-based organizations are likely to experience the same limitations and advantages.

Strong community-based coalitions can serve as the foundation and model for national campaigns as demonstrated by Fine’s research on the Rainbow Coalition. Fine’s interview with Mel King, the founder of Boston’s Rainbow Coalition, reveals the coalition’s early history including the process of coalition building, identification of common ground, and dilemmas faced in allying with the labor community. Boston’s Rainbow Coalition emerged from King’s experience of working with diverse groups and was used as a model for the national coalition led by Jesse Jackson (Fine, “Rainbow” 144). As a state legislator and candidate for mayor and U.S. Congress, King developed relationships with Latinos, gay and lesbian groups, women’s organizations, and members of African American communities (Fine, “Rainbow” 144). Through his experiences King discovered a common thread, that all these groups lacked access to the political process and shared experiences of oppression (Fine, “Rainbow” 144). King’s goal was to form a multi-issue coalition composed of diverse individuals sharing an opposition to oppression in all its forms and constructed around electoral campaigns (Fine, “Rainbow” 145-47). King’s first step in organizing the Rainbow Coalition was to learn about each group’s self-interests and then sought groups willing to form alliances to oppose all kinds of oppressions (Fine, “Rainbow” 145). King experienced the typical challenges of alliance building with several groups, but he commented most on his dissatisfaction with Rainbow’s relationship with the labor community. His complaint is best summed up in this statement: “Rainbow frequently supports Labor on principle, yet often does not get anything back from them” (Fine, “Rainbow” 148). Some unions, King suggests, maintain oppressive policies and practices and fail to represent the needs of women and people of color (Fine, “Rainbow” 148-49). While King welcomes the labor
community into the Rainbow Coalition, he insists that if they do not share the same broad vision to end all oppressions, they are part of the problem (Fine, “Rainbow” 149). King’s complaints about building alliances with labor organizations raise similar questions about anti-globalization coalitions. Have anti-globalization activists also experienced difficulties in building coalitions with labor organizations?

Coalitions between religious organizations and labor unions face considerable challenges as evidenced by Mirola’s study of the 1995 to 2000 Detroit newspaper strike. His case study focuses on a strike involving the Detroit News and Detroit Free Press and a coalition of six area unions and Detroit’s religious community (Mirola 444). Alliances between labor and religious organizations, Mirola suggests, can be beneficial but also face numerous challenges. Clergy typically have status that attracts media attention and the religious community’s moral stance on economic justice is an effective method for applying public pressure to the corporate elite, however mobilizing religious communities to rally around labor issues involves the difficult challenge of overcoming organizational and cultural differences (Mirola 446-47). African American pastors, for example, felt caught between the desire to support labor in its fight for economic justice and the reality that some members of their congregations replaced striking workers and gained decent well-paying jobs (Mirola 452). Muslim leaders, concerned about anti-Muslim sentiment and putting forth a positive image of Islam, had concerns about public image and some reluctance to openly support the strike and boycott (Mirola 452). Jewish leaders were concerned about offending middle and upper class members of their congregation who owned businesses (Mirola 452-53). Some religious leaders also feared alienating the newspaper’s management because they depended on media coverage of community events and issues (Mirola
Detroit’s religious leaders felt caught between the conflicting interests of labor and congregational members.

Differences in organizational culture, Mirola contends, led to disagreements over strategies and tactics (454). Operating from a top-down approach, union leaders are traditionally the decision makers and the rank and file implement those decisions (Mirola 454, 457). Religious organizations, on the other hand, are less hierarchical, organize around notions of inclusiveness, and typically operate using a consensus model where everyone offers ideas until the group agrees on a course of action (Mirola 454, 457). Labor leaders within the Metro Council, for example, made decisions on strike strategies and tactics and when religious groups wanted to debate their decisions, the Metro Council refused to participate (Mirola 454). Both groups felt alienated and frustrated by such events (Mirola 458). These groups also differed in their notions of appropriate tactics. Committed to nonviolence, religious organizers rejected the tactics of some labor activists who used slingshots to shoot guards monitoring the picket lines (Mirola 455). Detroit’s religious community relies on mediation to resolve differences while the labor community depends on lawyers and legal action against their employers (Mirola 455-56). Mediation, from a labor perspective, weakens their legal case while religious organizations dislike the notion of giving control to lawyers and the legal system (Mirola 458). Both labor and religious groups lacked information and awareness of differences based on race, ethnicity, class, and organizational structure and preferred different strategies and tactics (Mirola 452, 457). Based on Mirola’s judgment, this particular alliance between Detroit’s labor and religious community failed. Anti-globalization coalitions are likely to face similar struggles involving differences based on organizational structure, race, ethnicity, and class.
Labor and feminist organizations have also struggled to form alliances. Ferree and Roth analyze the interaction between union and feminist organizations in their attempts to support West Berlin day care workers on strike during the winter of 1989-90. They ask the question: what mistakes did these two movements make and what could they have done to be more successful in allying with one another and supporting the day care worker strike? Both feminist and labor movements, Ferree and Roth conclude, envision their movements in exclusive terms and framed their own issues of concern without a recognition of the interconnectedness of systems of oppression (642-43). Labor organizations were insensitive to the particular economic burdens placed on women and feminist organizations were slow to discuss, much less support, the strike due to their lack of identification with labor issues and personal ties to unions (Ferree and Roth 637-38, 642-43) The isolation of these movement organizations demonstrates the limitations of exclusionary solidarity. Successful alliances and coalitions, Ferree and Roth argue, must foster inclusive coalition politics that attempt to recognize intersectional issues and interests and create frameworks that consider class, race, gender, and other identities as well (644). Ferree and Roth’s study raises similar questions about anti-globalization alliances. Does identity politics create barriers to cross-movement alliances within the anti-globalization movement in a similar fashion?

Some labor groups are realizing a need for community support as evidence by the formation of Jobs With Justice (JWJ). Designed to be a locally controlled grassroots project, the JWJ model is a coalitions of labor, community and student groups involved in specific or multi-issue labor-based campaigns (Banks 29, 35). Andrew Banks helped coordinator the nation’s first JWJ rally in July of 1987 and his personal experience and research on JWJ offers insight into its history, successes, and struggles. Detroit area’s organizational director of the Communication
Workers of America, Larry Cohen, first came up with the notion to form JWJ after the area experienced multiple labor setbacks (Banks 28). In late 1986, General Motors announced the opening of a new plant in Mexico and the lay off of fifteen thousand United Auto Workers, three thousand janitors and members of Service Employees International were given the choice of taking a forty percent cut in pay or lose their jobs, and four hundred MCI employees, predominantly black women, lost their jobs when operations moved to Iowa (Banks 28). Shocked by these events, Cohen believed that if labor could suffer such losses in Detroit where labor is quite powerful, it could happen anywhere (Banks 28). Ten international union presidents and organization directors met to discuss Cohen’s JWJ conception and agreed to form a JWJ Committee of the Industrial Union Department of AFL-CIO (Banks 28-29). Detroit attempted to organize the first JWJ rally but labor leaders seemed threatened by the idea, expressed doubts that rank and file labor would support the initiative, and the coalition disintegrated (Banks 29).

In 1987, JWJ experienced a rebirth. Dan Miller, president of Miami, Florida’s AFL-CIO, was struggling to identify ways to support Eastern Airline machinists and flight attendants, learned about the JWJ vision, and organized Florida’s largest labor rally ever (Banks 29). Unlike Detroit, Miami’s labor community battles the corporate elite from a position of weakness with few members and many immigrant workers (Banks 30). JWJ’s July rally mobilized over eighty unions and twenty-four community groups (Banks 30). Supporters included the Rainbow Coalition, the National Organization for Women, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Florida’s Consumers Federation, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and clergy from numerous religious denominations (Banks 31). Gathering momentum from the rally’s success, three thousand JWJ picketers effectively shut down the Associated Building Contractors’ (ABC) trade show, five hundred people demonstrated on
Martin Luther King, Junior’s birthday in support of the predominantly black workers of Dade County Transit Union, and JWJ led a campaign to successfully unseat three incumbent county commissioners who opposed labor’s agenda (Banks 32-33). JWJ coalitions sprung up in numerous cities around Florida and in 1988 blossomed into a national movement with sixty locations throughout the U.S. (Banks 33). Most of JWJ’s major successes, Banks notes, have taken place in parts of the country where labor organizations have the least strength (33). In those areas, Banks reasons, union organizers are most willing to try new things and ally with community groups (33). Banks’ interpretation of the reluctance of a strong labor community to participate in JWJ may extend to the labor community of Northwest Ohio. Are activists from Northwest Ohio struggling to build a local JWJ chapter because Toledo’s labor community is strong and has little need or desire to build alliances with the broader community?

**Characteristics of Successful Coalitions**

By analyzing successful and failed coalitions, scholars have identified characteristics that support coalitional movements. First, in order for memberships to be maintained, coalitions must serve the self-interests of group members (Fine, “An Organizer’s” 347). If marginalized groups believe their goals and agendas are not being considered, they are likely to withdraw their participation (Simmons 231). Second, group members need a high level of commitment, a willingness to spend time, money and other resources on coalition projects, and to work through points of contention in order to promote social integration among members (Fine, “An Organizer’s” 346-47; F. Rose 212). This requires a willingness to deal with differences based on race, ethnicity, class, organizational structure and culture and preferences for certain strategies and tactics. Third, functional coalitions need bridge builders, individuals with strong interpersonal skills that understand diverse cultures and political practices (F. Rose 167, 183).
They should be comfortable and competent within diverse social groups and capable of convincing group members of the merits of the “other” view (F. Rose 167, 183). Effective bridge builders are key instruments in developing quality relations across movements and in facilitating the discovery of shared goals and interests. Fourth, campaigns and projects should be framed in simple, clear language with distinct goals and targets (Fine, “An Organizer’s” 347). Frameworks should appeal to all coalitions members and to the wider community (F. Rose 187). Inclusive frameworks work best because they recognize the interconnectedness of systems of oppression (Ferree and Roth 642-43). Fifth, coalitional groups need coherent political strategies that include a variety of approaches including interest-based and educational-based approaches (F. Rose 196, 213). Educational, value-based campaigns tend to be preferred by the middle class while the working class and poor actors like actions that focus on addressing immediate needs and interests (F. Rose 196). Finally, coalitions should develop structural practices that embrace participatory democracy, promote clear understandings of the decision-making processes, and hold leaders accountable (Fine, “An Organizer’s” 348). Organizational processes that marginalize certain groups should be eliminated and replaced with structural practices that are open, nonhierarchical, and participatory (Bystydzienski and Schacht 12). One key to successful coalitions is to develop group processes that encourage solidarity. Creating functional coalitions is challenging and hard work.

Many of the social movements recently mentioned are also involved in anti-globalization activism and have broadened their focus to look at global power structures and international connections. Coalitional movements like the anti-globalization movement typically arise in response to some crisis and the conditions of neoliberal globalization provide such an opportunity. Neoliberal globalization has intensified the problems of capitalism and has raised
numerous concerns about democracy, national sovereignty, human rights, labor rights, weapons proliferation, and the environment. Opposition to trade agreements that weaken environmental protections and fail to protect labor, the undemocratic practices of supranational governance institutions such as the WTO, IMF, and World Bank, and the unmitigated power of multinational corporations draw activists together. Common corporate enemies, overlapping interests and values such as mutual responsibility, social justice, opposition to oppression, and human solidarity often serve as common ground between these diverse activists. Worldwide concerns about trade, the environment, economic justice, and cultural diffusion create conditions for a new global consciousness, a sense of world community, and the possibility of diverse and inclusive political communities.
III. HISTORICIZING NEOLIBERAL GLOBALIZATION

Changes brought about by the neoliberal economic and political practices of corporations and governance institutions are the primary concerns of anti-globalization activists. In a global economy where neoliberalism is the hegemonic economic rationale, countries struggling to create or maintain a strong national economy have been required to “cut labor, social, and environmental costs to attract mobile capital” in what Brecher, Costello, and Smith call a “race to the bottom” (5). Union memberships have dropped, wages have stagnated, working conditions have worsened, and job security has lessened in the U.S. and abroad under the impact of neoliberal globalization (F. Rose 93; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 5, 7; A. Starr 16). Many countries have been forced to strip away their welfare programs to gain or maintain a competitive edge in a global economy (F. Rose 93; A. Starr 16). Environmental protection laws have been under attack as the WTO has declared them “impediments to trade” and some countries have lowered their own environmental standards to attract investors (F. Rose 93; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 9). Supranational governance institutions, such as the WTO, IMF, and World Bank, push policies of market liberalization and deregulation without democratic controls or accountability (Stiglitz 216; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 8). Much of the anti-globalization discourse reflects concerns about the degradation of democracy and its consequences as corporations and elites gain greater economic and political power (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 4, 8). Economic instability, decreasing numbers and power of unions, attacks on environmental protection laws, the dismantling of social welfare systems, increased corporate mobility, and the loss of local and national control of all of these issues have sparked the concern of a variety of social movements.
Neoliberalism emerged slowly as the hegemonic economic rationale. During the 1970s, U.S. conservatives and liberals agreed that state welfare policies and practices had failed to reduce social ills and maximize equality, a conclusion that helped spark a shift from the then dominant ideology of social liberalism to neoliberalism (N. Rose 141). The collapse of communism combined with rapid advances in technology provided pro-business forces an opportunity to prove the superiority of free-market capitalism and encouraged the worldwide expansion of neoliberal capitalist practices and policies. By the 1990s, neoliberal economic and political rationalisms dominated the thinking and practices of governance institutions and corporations worldwide. Anti-globalization activism, I argue, emerged in response to this gradual ideological shift and the numerous changes brought about by neoliberal globalization. Comprehending Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement and its response to neoliberalism first requires a look at past political and economic ideologies and the history of globalization.

Neoliberal globalization is best understood as part of a larger historical narrative that includes contending political and economic ideologies and the major events of globalization. In this chapter, I explore how various U.S. political and economic ideologies evolved over time, how neoliberalism emerged, and the conditions that have led to time-space compression, accelerated interdependence, interconnectedness, and integration, and a reordering of power relations. Since neoliberal globalization is based primarily on the Washington Consensus, the United States’ history of economic-political rationales is vital to the story of globalization and anti-globalization activism. This next section provides a history of political and economic thought in the United States’ followed by a separate section on the history of globalization.
Political and Economic Thought: Contending Liberalisms in U.S. History

Historically, U.S. liberalisms have come in several forms and with differing visions of liberty, economic freedom, and citizenship. Four liberalisms have dominated at various times in U.S. history: classic, laissez-faire, social, and neoliberal. Classic liberalism embraces republican thought, the notion of a weak central government and that liberty requires citizens share in self-government (Sandel 5; “Free Trade”). Its rival, laissez-faire liberalism, suggests governmental support of a domestic manufacturing base but with a hands-off approach to corporate activities and that liberty demands the support of individual rights (“Free Trade”; Richardson 29; Sandel 4). Social liberalism implies egalitarian thought and the support of the welfare state, civil liberties, and social and economic rights along with governmental regulation of the market economy (Sandel 11, 123; Kingsnorth 66). Neoliberalism, the hegemonic political-economic ideology in the U.S. today, embraces libertarian thought, defends free-market capitalism, and claims that redistributing wealth is a violation of rights (Sandel 11). As the social, cultural, and political-economic landscapes changed, these four liberalisms achieved dominance and--except for our present-day ideology, neoliberalism--eventually faded into the background.

Throughout the formative years of the new republic, classic liberalism and republican thought shaped notions of liberty, citizenship, and economic freedom. Republican thought reflected the influence of such Renaissance thinkers as Machiavelli and Locke (Richardson 26-27). Traditional republican thought required an educated, active, and independent citizenship to debate the common good, reach consensus, and influence state actors (Sandel 5; Richardson 26). Citizens, according to traditional republican standards, had a duty and obligation to serve the community and liberty required them to do so (N. Rose 166; Sandel 5). Concentrated governmental power, republican thought espoused, led to corruption at the expense of the public
(Richardson 27). In practice, the elite dominated classic liberalism, democratic participation was only available to educated, property holders and full participatory democracy was discouraged because it had the potential to threaten the privileges of the propertied (Richardson 28).

Not everyone embraced classic liberalism and fierce rivalries occurred between the United States’ founding fathers. Alexander Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury under President George Washington, sought to promote U.S. commercial and manufacturing industries while Thomas Jefferson and James Madison opposed manufacturing for fear that it would create a dependent polity and a political-economy based on privilege and connections (Sandel 125, 134, 138). Viewing the agrarian way of life as virtuous, Jefferson and Madison represented the dominant agricultural interests and believed that a powerful central government would harm national interests (“Free Trade”; Sandel 137). Hamilton rejected the notion of a virtuous agrarian republic and took the mercantilist position supporting the notion of protective tariffs and federal subsidies (“Free Trade”; Sandel 138). The clash led to the development of two political parties with opposing political-economic ideologies: Hamilton’s party, the Federalists, and Jefferson’s party, the Democratic-Republicans (Sandel 133). During the new republic era, economic events were territorialized and competition occurred between discrete economies, a reality that began to shift with the industrial revolution (N. Rose 142-43).

Classic liberalism and republican thought were gradually replaced by laissez-faire liberalism and liberal thought as the agrarian economy yielded to the industrial revolution. Political parties debated on how best to organize society under conditions of industrialization resulting in a period of capitalism with few regulations and a shift towards a laissez-faire political-economic rationale (Sandel 139, 171; Kingsnorth 66; Richardson 32). Laissez-faire liberalism suggested governmental support of a domestic manufacturing base but with a non-
interference approach to corporate activities and reasoned that liberty demands the support of individual, private rights ("Free Trade"; Richardson 29; Sandel 4). President Andrew Jackson, for example, took a laissez-faire approach to the economy allowing corporations to become monopolies (Richardson 29). Industrialization was no longer viewed as a threat to the populace’s civic virtue but rather the very economic conditions necessary to freely choose one’s employ, i.e. a voluntaristic conception of work (Sandel 189). Included in liberal thought was the notion that liberty required the government to refrain from defining the “good” life and instead provide a framework for rights with a focus on fair procedures and individual rights (Sandel 4). Liberal thought touted values of moral neutrality, toleration, freedom, and fairness (Sandel 8). Laissez-faire liberalism defended industrial capitalism and gave birth to individualism (Sandel 171; N. Rose 133). Capitalism is not an inherently just system and the U.S. government’s laissez-faire approach was not without shortcomings.

During the liberal era, the laissez-faire liberalist approach to industrialization led to excesses, urban misery, and unsuccessful challenges from the left. In the early nineteenth-century, workers protested the harsh working conditions and low pay and used the republican argument that industrialization produced a dependent citizenship too exhausted from over-work to participate in public affairs (Sandel 170-72; Richardson 32). Reactions to the extreme conditions of industrialization prompted notions of socialism within academia, however, those ideals were severely marginalized by U.S. elites (Richardson 36-39). Young American economists like Richard Ely, John Bates Clark, and Henry Carter Adams abandoned their interests in socialism in exchange for professional success (Richardson 38). By the late nineteenth-century, large manufacturers replaced most small workshops, and the voluntarist conception of wage labor gained greater acceptance (Sandel 183-84). Republican ideals faded
into history and laissez-faire liberalism and liberal thought were welcomed as business flourished
and the economy boomed.

By the 1930s, economic prosperity came crashing down with the Great Depression. Unable to absorb industrialization’s immense production of goods from industry and agriculture, over-production became a severe economic malady as President Herbert Hoover struggled to respond (Richardson 39-40; “Free Trade”). Within a few months of his inauguration, the stock market crashed “in response to declines in industrial production, construction, and retail sales” (Freidel 255). By enacting the Smoot-Hawley Tariff, Hoover hoped to create a protective measure designed to give U.S. farmers an advantage over international competition (“Free Trade”). Foreign governments felt U.S. tariffs on foreign goods were exorbitantly high and retaliated by placing tariffs on U.S. goods (“Free Trade”). A global tariff war ensued and the Depression worsened worldwide (“Free Trade”; Kingsnorth 66). With the failure of Hoover’s anti-Depression measures, the ethos of laissez-faire liberalism and free trade came into question, and suffering U.S. citizens petitioned the government to regulate the economy and provide a social safety net.

During the postwar era, laissez-faire liberalism fell from influence and was replaced with social liberalism. In a search for social and economic order, the U.S. government actively intervened in the market economy, developed the welfare state, regulated capitalists, and passed legislation to support strong labor unions (Sandel 123; Kingsnorth 66). Social liberalism favored social or egalitarian thought suggesting support for the welfare state and envisioning a scheme of civil liberties and certain social and economic rights such as the right to education and healthcare (Sandel 11). Social problems, N. Rose suggests, were starting to be understood in terms of social relationships and the environment and the dominant political culture embraced the notion that
societal influences, not the individual, were to blame for social problems (133). Individualism and private property rights were trumped by the socialist notion that the government should provide citizens with a modest level of material goods and services needed for a dignified life (Sandel 11).

With the New Deal and new trade policies, the U.S. experienced sustained economic growth from late 1940s through the early 1970s. Roosevelt’s New Deal and trade policies included Keynesian economic policies, the conception that capitalism should be managed by the state with the primary purpose of employment-generation (Richardson 40; Dunkley 24). Roosevelt’s programs included numerous reforms involving the banking industry and stock exchange; relief for farmers with the Agricultural Adjustment Act; development of power and irrigation projects; labor friendly legislation such as the National Labor Relations Act, the Wagner Act, and the Fair Labor Standards Act; and aid to the elderly, unemployed, differently-abled, and children with the Social Security Act (“New Deal”). In addition to the New Deal, Roosevelt expanded global trade by signing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 that reduced tariffs on foreign goods if the other country reciprocated (“Free Trade”). Concerns about expanding communism brought about trade policies that excluded communist countries from the free world’s trading system and benefitted the Western world (“Free Trade”). Both trade liberalization and protectionism were used to obtain the Keynesian goal of full employment (Dunkley 24-25). By managing inflation and economic recessions, Roosevelt put into place social liberalist practices and policies that were successful for years. Despite social liberalism’s numerous successes, some Americans, particularly the elite, were reluctant to abandon the ethos of individualism and laissez-faire economic practices, and the welfare state received considerable criticism (Richardson 41).
The post-war international economy experienced increased economic interconnectivity and cooperation among numerous Western and Asian nations along with a growing dominance of Western liberal economic order. United by the creation of several economic institutions in the 1940s, the IMF, World Bank, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) encouraged economic integration and common pursuits among member nations (Kenwood and Lougheed 237-41; O’Brien and Williams 118). Initially created to rebuild war-torn Europe after World War II, the World Bank was tasked with worldwide economic development while the IMF’s mission was to inhibit future economic depressions (Stiglitz 11; O’Brien and Williams 118; Kenwood and Lougheed 238-40). As the first multilateral trade agreement, GATT set the “rules and processes for trade liberalization” and the “mechanisms for implementing them” (Dunkley 28). U.S. funded reconstruction of both Europe and Japan also encouraged economic interconnectivity. American Secretary of State George Marshall’s European Recovery Program, more commonly known as the Marshall Plan, was largely administered by the newly formed Organization for European Economic Cooperation (the future European Union): a group of sixteen European nations joined together by the goal of European reconstruction (Kenwood and Lougheed 243-44; O’Brien and Williams 118). After the end of U.S. occupation, Japan used U.S. investments to rebuild its economy making incredible progress in education and in particular economic sectors (O’Brien and Williams 120-21). U.S. investments also sparked economic growth in South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore (O’Brien and Williams 115). The influence of Western liberal economic order grew steadily during this era.

By the mid-1970s, the pendulum began to swing in the direction of neoliberalism and free-market capitalism. Decreases in corporate profits, challenges to the welfare state system, and a growingly interconnected economy provided momentum for the shift away from social
liberalism towards the promotion of neoliberal theory and projects (N. Rose 140, 143; “Chronology”). The stagnant U.S. economy of the mid-1970s was troubled with rampant unemployment, inflation, and rocketing crude oil prices and one strategy of recovery was to attack the rationale of social government (“Chronology”). Corporate America, N. Rose suggests, put forth the dichotomy of a “productive” private sector verses an “unproductive” public welfare sector with the argument that a thriving economy and the welfare state are incompatible (140). Both the left and the right agreed that since the New Deal, the welfare state had failed to maximize equality and decrease social ills leaving few to advocate for continuing social programs and little opposition to a neoliberal agenda (N. Rose 140; Richardson 42). Pro-business forces argued that the state had grown too large and, as a result, inefficient and the private sector was more capable of handling social projects (N. Rose 139). As corporate voices strengthened and social liberalism slowly crumbled, a neoliberal ideology emerged with the promise to end poverty and spread democracy via worldwide business endeavors and unregulated markets (A. Starr 17; Kingsnorth 66).

Neoliberalism rose in status with the political-economic rationale of defending the market economy and the claim that the redistribution of wealth was a violation of rights and economic freedom (N. Rose 139). Liberty and freedom, under neoliberal standards, required a guarantee of private property rights and the promise that everyone reaped the fruits of their own labor (N. Rose 145). Individualist sentiment reemerged as the dominant leitmotif and the social ideal fell by the wayside as the government responded by encouraging the notion of individual responsibility for one’s welfare rather than communal support and responsibility (N. Rose 139). Keynesian economics, according to this new rationale, had become outdated causing inflation, increasing taxes, penalizing private industry, and decreasing incentives to work (N. Rose 139).
Social state activities were reconceptualized along economic lines embracing an ideal based on the economic needs of the market and the notion that individuals, private industry, and community organizations should be empowered through free enterprise and private property rights (N. Rose 142). Laissez-faire economic practices, the natural laws of free-market capitalism, and small, unobtrusive government became the neoliberal solution to engendering a more balanced and just economic system (Richardson 42; N. Rose 139).

As free-market capitalism spread and as the world became more socially and economically integrated, neoliberal policy prescriptions dominated the practices of governance institutions and businesses. International competition heightened and prompted neoliberal economic restructuring in the way of privatization, de-regulation, and decreased support of public institutions. The costs and benefits of these changes have not been shared equally among the world’s populous. As Manuel Castells states, “the ascent of informational, global capitalism is indeed characterized by simultaneous economic development and underdevelopment, social inclusion and social exclusion […]” (352). Neoliberal theory and practices have spread far and wide and have impacted the world socially, politically, economically, and ecologically.

Under neoliberalism’s hegemonic political-economic rationale, environmental and labor goals are marginalized by a pro-business agenda and the consequences of those changes are far reaching. Environmental degradation, Brecher, Costello and Smith claim, has taken place as the WTO has dismantled environmental protections claiming they impede free trade (9). The IMF and World Bank, Yearley argues, have contributed to environmental degradation by advising developing countries to increase their export earnings by attracting foreign investors and many third world governments have done so using the following methods: decreased government spending (particularly on environmental management), exploiting natural resources, and
attracting dirty industries (380). In a trade off for foreign investments, third world countries often experience “pollution, resource depletion and biodiversity loss” (Yearly 380). On the labor front, both rich and poor countries have adopted more flexible labor policies making it easier to dismiss workers or hire them only on a temporary basis (UNDP 344). Labor relations are uncertain globally as corporate restructuring has produced massive layoffs, union memberships have dropped, wages have stagnated, harsher working conditions have been implemented, and job insecurity has increased (F. Rose 93; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 5-7; A. Starr 16; UNDP 344; Castells 349; Rodrik 323). Even in the U.S., pervasive deunionization has taken place with declines in union membership and the percentage of the labor force belonging to unions (Baldwin 65). With labor in such a precarious position, the neoliberal agenda has overpowered the working class agenda and workers are left with few options but to adapt to pro-business conditions. Environmental and labor goals have been left in the margins as the free-market political agenda has dominated globalization.

Under neoliberal globalization and the guise of fragile economies, profits and the needs of the market have taken priority and, in the process, transformed the social imperative of government. Many countries have been forced to strip away or transform their welfare programs to gain or maintain a competitive edge in a global economy (F. Rose 93; A. Starr 16). Welfare, N. Rose suggests, has gradually been reshaped to reflect the pro-business ethos of “productivity” and “accountability” (151-53). Unemployment benefits, for example, once viewed as an individual right, have been transformed into an allowance that must be earned through performance of job searching duties (N. Rose 164). Under conditions of advanced capitalism, N. Rose suggests, individuals, not the collective community, are responsible for their own present and future well being (159). “[S]ocial insurance”, N. Rose states, “is no longer seen as a
socializing and responsibilizing principle of solidarity: not only does it not provide adequate security; not only does it represent a drain on individual incomes and on national finances; it also stifles responsibility, inhibits risk taking, induces dependency” (159). Responsible citizenship under advanced capitalism requires what N. Rose terms a new “prudentialism,” that individuals are socialized, through advertising and other means, to purchase risk-reducing products such as insurance to ensure a secure future and simultaneously producing new profitable markets (158-59). Thus, welfare has been transformed from the right of all citizens to a certain standard of living to benefits that must be earned by individual societal members.

Neoliberal economic-political logic has spread to other social spheres as well and has impacted such professions as education and health care (N. Rose 146). Providers of public or social services operating under neoliberalism are expected to compete with one another, to set new measurable targets, and for payment to be directly dependent on targets being met (N. Rose 147). Neoliberalism has shifted the work of providers and knowledge workers from an ethic of public service to private management (N. Rose 150). Professional concerns such as quality care or service have been marginalized with the new managerial focus on the value of money and controlling costs (N. Rose 151). Forms of accountability once based on professional norms have shifted to evaluation in financial terms with the primary goal of maximizing productivity (N. Rose 151-53). Many educational institutions, for example, have shifted their ethos from professional to managerial norms with a new focus on measurable results based on the needs of industry (Richardson 110). Universities, Richardson suggests, have remodeled their programs based on the needs of industry with shift away from “pure sciences, humanities, and social sciences to applied sciences and technology” (111). Neoliberalism has changed the core function and character of many social institutions.
Neoliberal economic rationalism has also impeded national sovereignty and created greater economic inequities. The IMF and World Bank have dismantled national restrictions on economic activities and replaced them with international policies of market liberalization and deregulation without the checks and balances of democratic controls or accountability (Stiglitz 216; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 8; Nash 96). Market liberalization and deregulation, globalization critics contend, generally produce greater economic inequities worldwide while corporate profits and power have grown (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 4-7; Dunkley 93). Regional agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the first free trade bloc between the U.S., Canada, and Mexico, was designed to promote business interests through freer movement of goods, services, and investments and has resulted in economic instability and inequality, a shift in power from the public to the corporate sector, and the weakening of welfare systems in all three countries (Dunkley 228; Leys 19). Fully comprehending all these changes requires a closer look at globalization’s history.

The Process of Globalization

Incipient globalization, many scholars suggest, places “the West” or European-Atlantic world, at the center of globalization’s history. With the beginning of colonialism and some of the first interactions of differing civilizations, the world’s inhabitants have gradually become increasingly interconnected economically, socially, and culturally (Modelski 49; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 1). Seeking the resources of the new lands they explored and inhabited, several European countries, such as Spain, Portugal, and England, expanded their state activities through war, violence, and slavery (Modelski 50; Smedley 60). Along with the trading of goods and sharing of knowledge, racist ideologies and a new division of labor spread and racism was used to legitimate this new division of labor, one that left people of color with little power or
privilege (Geyer and Bright 62). Westerners grew wealthy from the forced labor of indigenous populations in places such as Mexico, Peru, North American, Central America, and Australia and the utilization of the new land’s vast natural resources (Modelski 52). Confiscating the natural and human resources of these countries and transforming their inhabitants into dependents (A. Starr 23), many scholars point to colonialism as the beginning of globalization and the concentration of power in the West.

Between 1850 and 1950 the world experienced many global firsts: the first global communications technologies, the consolidation of the first global markets, the first elements of global finance, and the first model of global governance (Scholte 66). Inventions like the telegraph, telephone, radio, and intercontinental air transport made global communication possible (Scholte 66). When the gold standard was put in place in the late nineteenth-century, money was shipped across borders prompting the development of overseas commercial bank branches and giving certain national currencies transworld circulation (Scholte 68-69). Commercial interests spread as a range of brand name products became available in many parts of the world (Scholte 68). As the world gradually became a smaller place, worldwide regulatory agencies originated such as the International Telegraph Union (today’s Telecommunications Union) and the General Postal Union (today’s Universal Postal Union) (Scholte 71). During the 1940s, the United Nations (UN) System, the Bretton Woods institutions (the IMF and World Bank) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT, the future WTO) became the first institutions of global governance (Scholte 71; Dunkley 26; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2; Leys 8; Kenwood and Lougheed 237-41; O’Brien and Williams 118). Early forms of global governance, changing financial relations and advances in communication technologies laid further groundwork for modern globalization.
Civil societies also began taking on global features in the nineteenth-century with the transatlantic peace movement, women’s suffrage, the first international labor movement, the Red Crescent movement, and the development of the International Red Cross (Scholte 71). Early twentieth century witnessed the birth of an International Chamber of Commerce, the Save the Child Fund, and the first transborder initiative at wildlife conservation (Scholte 71). While the world was becoming increasingly interconnected, these international networks tended to be territorially based with a high degree of autonomy (Scholte 71-72). Put another way, the networking of this time period tended to occur between certain countries rather than the world as a single place. Modern globalization would take on the characteristic of an increasingly integrated world.

Rapid advances in technology helped open the door for the proliferation of neoliberal ideologies and practices and modern globalization. Technological advances of the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s have propelled much of the world into an information revolution (Hedley 10; Scholte 73; Held and McGrew 1; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2). Inventions such as the electronic microchip and fiber optics have altered our relationships with time and space enabling us to instantaneously move capital, share information, and communicate with others in distant places (Hedley 10). The Internet, wireless technologies, and satellite connectivity are all products of the information revolution and contribute to our sense that the world is a much smaller place (Hedley 10). These dramatic changes in technology helped reduce the barriers to a more integrated global economy (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2).

Along with these unprecedented advances in technology, the 1960s and 1970s were the beginning of an ideological shift in the world’s political economy towards neoliberalism. During the 1960s, U.S. and British economies experienced slow growth and politicians and economists
began to question the effectiveness of the state to manage the economy and provide welfare and social services (Leys 12). Neoliberal ideals dominated the debate and its pro-business philosophy suggested attacking socialistic projects as a way to improve the economy (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 3; Leys 12). Redistributing the wealth from the social to the corporate sphere in order to invest in American enterprise was viewed as the best solution to ease struggles with inflation, unemployment, and a declining economy (Brecher and Costello 327). Ideological campaigns were aimed at convincing the public that environmental protections, health and safety regulations, union protections, social services, and consumer protections are hindrances to individual freedom and economic growth (Brecher and Costello 327-28). Neoliberal campaigns in the U.S. and Britain were aimed at attacking the labor movement, lowering taxes, lessening trade barriers, eliminating controls on capital movements, promoting privatization, raising unemployment and creating global competition for the domestic workforce with lower-paid workers in other countries (Leys 12). Neoliberal trends soon spread to other parts of the world.

By the 1980s, neoliberalism had become the hegemonic political-economic ideology in the world of capitalism and led to numerous changes from deregulation to the dismantling of the social contract (A. Starr 16). Business sectors of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries organized to expand their interests in the global economy (Dunkley 34). Viewing the world as a single market and production site, business leaders began engaging in direct foreign investment and transnational mergers (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2; Leys 9). During the early 1980s, the U.S. deregulated domestic banking and other countries soon followed suit as national controls over capital flows disappeared creating a single global capital market (Leys 11). Deregulation and computerization eliminated any real barriers to financial integration and the world experienced tremendous growth in currency markets, securities, and
bond markets (Leys 14). Consolidation of capitalism worldwide became possible with the collapse of communist regimes creating an even greater sharing of social and economic space (Held and McGrew 1; Leys 11). Labor unions came under attack as numerous employers sponsored union de-certification drives and replacement workers were offered permanent positions (Mirola 445). With the rejection of social liberalism and the Keynesian view, U.S. and European business and political leaders enshrined neoliberalism and supranational institutions followed suit.

Beginning in the 1980s, the World Bank and IMF began prescribing neoliberal practices and policies with the goal of facilitating economic development and promoting healthy economies (Leys 19; Brecher, Costello, and Smith 2). Development programs encouraged by the IMF and World Bank focused on market liberalization to include: privatization, deregulation, balanced budgets, deflationary austerity, dismantling of the welfare state and minimal regulation of private capital flows (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 3; Held and McGrew 11-13). “[H]alf of the world’s population and two-thirds of its governments”, according to Held and McGrew, “are bound by the disciplines of the IMF or the World Bank” (30). Out of political and economic necessity, these countries were forced to adopt the World Bank and IMF’s policies even if they conflicted with public or environmental well being (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 3; Held and McGrew 13). Policies and practices of privatization and deregulation increased further with the establishment of another supranational governance institution, the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Visions of the WTO were prompted when GATT, the first multilateral trade organization, came under attack by free-traders for allowing protectionist measures and failing to promote trade liberalization and, after eight long years of negotiation, the WTO completely replaced
GATT in 1996 (Dunkley 44-46). Many debtor nations, including the U.S., embraced an export-oriented strategy as a means of lessening their deficits and stimulating the economy and the WTO supported this strategy (Dunkley 44). Under the WTO, a new model of free trade agreements was embraced with the primary goal of increasing “world-wide ‘market access’ through reductions in all forms of protection and through commitments by all participating countries to eliminating at least some access restrictions” (Dunkley 52). These change led to the advancement of more policies of privatization and deregulation (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 3).

Regional trade agreements also adopted the neoliberal philosophy of free market rule and the trade first rationale. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Permanent Normal Trade Relations agreement (PNTR), and the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) are all examples of recent trade agreements designed to promote market liberalization (Leys 19). Dominated by the interests of business, often the chief executives of transnational corporations write these trade agreements and are organized in groups such as “the European Round Table, the International Chamber of Commerce, and the Transatlantic Business Dialogue” (Leys 20-21). NAFTA, ratified by Congress in 1993, offered the promise of improving the economies of the U.S., Canada, and Mexico by eliminating tariffs and non-tariff barriers, increasing the privileges of foreign investors and the opening up of service sectors (Rothgeb 203-04). Using NAFTA as a model, trade ministers from thirty-four countries in North, Central and South America began negotiations to create the FTAA with the goal of implementing it by 2005 (Rothgeb 241). Under the 2000 permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) accord, the U.S agreed to normalize trade relations with China and support their “membership in the WTO in exchange for Chinese concessions on tariffs and quotas, expanded rights for American businesses in China, the opening of Chinese service sectors to U.S. firms, and agricultural trade” (Rothgeb 232). Regional
trade agreements have been used to gradually link together the world in global free trade (Leys 20) and all three agreements that were mentioned have faced intense opposition from labor unions, environmentalists, and human rights activists from many parts of the world (Rothgeb 205-06, 232-33).

In recent years, contentious politics has taken on an increasingly global dimension and many groups and movements have expressed concerns about neoliberal globalization. International and transnational civic bodies such as social movements and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have undergone tremendous growth (Held and McGrew 11) and many have put forth alternative visions to neoliberal policies and practices (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 11). Transworld solidarities are building as activists produce and develop global conferences and global news networks (Scholte 82). Environmental concerns have become more global in nature as scientists and activists raise concerns about global warming, depletion of the stratospheric ozone, and loss of biological diversity (Scholte 83). Labor unions opposed to economic liberalization have also advocated for the protection of workers and the environment worldwide (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 12). Anti-sweatshop and consumer movements have demanded trade agreements contain consumer protections and impose a degree of accountability on transnational corporations (Brecher, Costello, and Smith 13-14). Increasingly civic bodies are operating out of a global consciousness and recognize the need to extend their agendas to a global arena (Scholte 85). One of the most fascinating and exciting results of these changes has been the formation of coalitional movements like the anti-globalization movement.
IV. ANTI-GLOBALIZATION ACTIVISM AND ITS ANTECEDENT SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Anti-globalization activism is grounded in a long history of past relationships between diverse social movements and numerous antecedent events that prompted major anti-globalization demonstrations and conferences. In order to provide greater historical context, this chapter reviews these histories in two major sections. Section one covers the antecedent movements of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement including a brief history of environmental, peace, labor, farm workers, and anarchist movements and their experiences with alliance building. Section two focuses on the broader movement by including several characterizations of the anti-globalization movement and a synopsis of major events. To better comprehend the anti-globalization movement, one must understand the separate histories of its diverse movements, their past attempts at building alliances, and the unique history of anti-globalization activism.

Antecedent Movements of Northwest Ohio’s Anti-globalization Movement

Past alliances between environmental, peace, and union activists are the foundation of recent anti-globalization coalitions between these groups and Fred Rose’s book *Coalitions Across the Class Divide: Lessons from the Labor, Peace, and Environmental Movements* provides a history of these past relationships along with the challenges they faced in building alliances across movements. Labor, peace, and environmental movements, F. Rose assumes, are class-based movements: whereas the labor community directs their attention to the economic needs of the working class, peace and environmental groups attend to typical middle class social goals (1-3). Each of these movements has a history of maintaining a narrow focus making coalition building difficult because of the different experiences, needs, and values of each class-based movement (F. Rose 6). In the next several pages, I utilize *Coalitions Across the Class*
Divide to provide a history of those conflicts along with instances of cooperation and collaboration between labor, environmental, and peace movements. Activists from peace, environmental, and labor organizations, Fred Rose suggests, are learning to transcend these differences, to understand each group’s legitimate concerns, and to incorporate those concerns into their politics (6).

The Environmental Movement

Environmental concerns of the nineteenth century were quite diverse and often differed by class and race (F. Rose 102-03). Business executives envisioned moneymaking opportunities with the creation of parks while elite environmentalists were most concerned about preserving pristine wilderness areas (F. Rose 103). Recent settlers of the West sought protection against monopolies and overdevelopment and expressed concerns about the fair management of resources (F. Rose 103). Native American activists sought environmental protections as a way to preserve their culture while laborers were most concerned about protections from poison and hazards (F. Rose 103). Eventually, workplace, community, and nature-focused environmentalism developed into the dominant streams of activism (F. Rose 103). Emerging from these streams were organizations like Earth First! focusing on the protection of particular rivers or groups of trees, the Conservation Voters focusing on environmental protection legislation, Greenpeace focusing on global environmental concerns and various labor unions concentrating on protecting workers from occupational hazards (F. Rose 103; Shabecoff 146).

During the 1970s, environmental movements made tremendous strides in educating the larger public about environmental concerns and experienced major legislative victories. Earth Day, a day first envisioned as an environmental teach-in day in 1970, is now widely advertised and is even sponsored by major corporations (F. Rose 103; Gottlieb 124). The Environmental
Protection Agency began operations and the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Air Act, the Water Pollution Control Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Toxic Substances Control Act were all signed into law during this decade (Gottlieb 124-31; U.S. Fish). Public awareness about toxic waste disposal, protecting fragile ecosystems, and international issues like global warming and the depletion of the ozone has grown thanks to the educational practices of this movement (Rothenberg 57).

Fueled by the success of the environmental movement, the Green Party emerged and grew in the U.S. in the early to mid-1980s (Herrnson 23; Gottlieb198). Members of the Green Party identify as environmentalists and focus on a wide variety of environmental concerns plus social justice and international and political reform issues (Herrnson 23). Greens advocate for stricter laws protecting the environment and consumer conservation along with broader issues like living wage laws and health care reform (Francia and Herrnson 81). Ralph Nader’s run for the presidency as the Green Party nominee in 1996 and 2000 helped the party grow and brought Green party concerns to the attention of the nation (Herrnson 23). In recent years, the number of registered Greens has grown steadily as have the number of states where the Green Party candidates have qualified for the ballot (Collet and Hansen 143).

While the environmental movement experienced considerable success, corporate interests made significant gains in the political arena during the 1980s and 1990s. With his pro-development platform, Ronald Reagan attempted to weaken the Environmental Protection Agency and modify federal public land policies to favor mining, logging and grazing (Rothenberg 85). Declaring himself the “environmental” president, George H. Bush supported the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 but later allied with the same anti-environmentalists
Reagan associated with (Sussman, Daynes, and West 314). Bill Clinton preserved millions of acres of land using the Antiquities Act (Sussman, Daynes, and West 314) but also supported NAFTA, a trade agreement that environmentalists argued would cause the exportation of pollution and the lowering of pollution standards in Canada, Mexico and the United States (Rothenberg 86). Reagan, Bush, and Clinton all faced the challenge of balancing environmental protection and economic concerns during a time when corporate interest groups expanded their political operations and promoted a climate that favored business interests over environmental protections (Rothenberg 58).

Larger public support of the environmental movement fluctuated and environmentalists responded by rethinking their tactics and agenda (F. Rose 105). In their quest to understand why public support had waned, environmentalists began paying closer attention to their critics and examined the social and economic implications of their proposals. Business leaders, politicians, and workers criticized the movement for blocking access to needed resources and making the costs of waste disposal prohibitive feeding into the growing public perception that environmental laws harm the economy and the working class (F. Rose 105). Low-income communities and communities of color added their complaints suggesting that many environmental programs are implemented at the expense of the oppressed and ignore issues of social justice (F. Rose 106). These types of criticisms pushed environmentalists to shift their framework to include social and economic issues (F. Rose 107). During the 1992 Earth Summit, for example, scholars and environmentalists from wealthy countries began to examine the connections between poverty in Third World countries and environmental policies and engaged in cost-benefit analyses (F. Rose 106). By adopting these types of pragmatic strategies, environmentalists began a trend of
examining social and economic policy implications thus increasing the likelihood of coalitions across racial and class lines (F. Rose 106-07).

The Peace Movement

Following World War II, the peace movement contained two major strands: opposition to nuclear weapons and opposition of U.S. policies of foreign intervention (F. Rose 107). Focusing on the U.S./Soviet arms race, the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign challenged the legitimate use of nuclear weapons with the hope of preventing nuclear war (F. Rose 107). Concentrating on U.S. relations with less developed countries, peace activists opposed to foreign intervention questioned the United State’s agenda and argued for social justice and the right to self-determination (F. Rose 108). Both strands of the movement were fairly active up until the end of the Cold War.

Protests of the Vietnam War contained a plethora of social movements questioning the validity of U.S. foreign policy. While these diverse social movements shared the goal of ending the war, their relationships were tenuous at best (DeBeneditti and Chatfield 4; F. Rose 9). War protesters, DeBeneditti and Chatfield suggest, emerged from women’s liberation groups, movements challenging segregation practices and racism, Marxist and socialist political groups, labor unions, secular and religion-based peace movements, student groups, and multi-issue coalitional movements (389-90). Interfaith antiwar campaigns were quite diverse as well and included Catholics, Protestants, Jews and Quakers all acting in support of conscientious objectors (DeBeneditti and Chatfield 144-45). “Liberals and leftist, men and women, blacks and whites, students and intellectuals, clergy and laity: countless citizens passed in and out of the antiwar movement”, according to DeBeneditti and Chatfield (390). This heterogeneous group of activists held contradictory critiques of American society and foreign policy, disagreed on strategies and
tactics, and had bitter arguments among themselves (DeBeneditti and Chatfield 389). Events like the shootings at Kent State and Watergate combined with the draft, violent attacks on civil rights activists, and the emergence of the black power movement helped create an atmosphere of distrust and high tension (F. Rose 108; Levy 187). Although the divergent social movements contained within the peace movement disagreed on many issues, they joined together to make a relentless demand to the end of the Vietnam War. Once the Vietnam War ended, peace activism diminished until the next wave during the 1980s.

After Ronald Reagan spoke of a winnable nuclear war, peace activists returned to the streets. Expressing their desire for the end of the arms race, almost a million people participated in a June 12, 1982, peace rally in New York City expressing their desire for a peaceful co-existence with the Soviet Union (F. Rose 108). Reagan responded by toning down his rhetoric, and Gorbachev pursued policies of reconciliation with the West (F. Rose 108). As the first disarmament treaties of the nuclear age were signed, the Nuclear Weapons Freeze campaign faded into the background and the campaign against foreign intervention took center stage (F. Rose 108).

During the 1980s and 1990s, peace activists redefined their mission and strategies and shifted focus from the anti-nuclear movement to anti-interventionist work and coalitions (F. Rose 109). Turning their attention to foreign affairs, the peace movement successfully lobbied Congress to outlaw providing armaments to the Contras, a murderous right-wing regime trying to overthrow the democratically elected Sandinista government of Nicaragua (F. Rose 108). Displeased with Bush’s proposed foreign policy initiative, peace activists also organized in an effort to defeat Bush in 1992, and organizations such as Witness for Peace, the Pledge of
Resistance, Sanctuary, and the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador organized hundreds of thousands of voters (F. Rose 108).

With the end of the Cold War, much of the public began to focus on economic security rather than the threat of war and peace movement goals shifted to include both the economic needs of the working class and the conversion and reorientation of the military budget (F. Rose 110). Like the environmental movement, peace activists developed a greater awareness of their proposal’s social and economic impact and, in turn, created greater opportunities for coalition building with the working class (F. Rose 110).

**Labor and Peace Relations**

Prior to World War II, peace and labor movements often shared common ground and supported each other’s causes. The National Council for Prevention of War, founded in 1921, established a labor department to address the interests of working people as they worked towards their primary goal of resolving conflict via international law rather than war (F. Rose 79). Peace activists were actively involved in labor strikes and felt their destinies were tied to the well being of the working class (F. Rose 79). Fearing they would bear the brunt of the war, laborers typically opposed war and viewed the draft as a tool to destroy unions (F. Rose 79). When the Congress for Industrial Organizations (CIO) formed in the 1930s, it openly opposed fascism in Spain, Japan, and Germany and favored relations with the U.S.S.R. (F. Rose 78). Even World War II was opposed by labor until President Roosevelt began including labor leaders in war planning (F. Rose 78). In general, peace and labor movements were closely partnered until the beginning of the Cold War when labor and government forces allied.

Early alliances between labor and the government/military during the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II were tentative and intermittent but once the Cold War
occurred those alliances took on a more permanent form (F. Rose 80). In exchange for their support of the war effort, labor made significant economic gains through the awards of defense contracts and advanced in political power as labor officials became government appointed advisors (F. Rose 80). Labor’s prosperity became linked with the Cold War as the Soviet Union and the United States engaged in a massive arms race (F. Rose 80-81). As military spending rose, many members of the working class became convinced that war was good for the economy and a necessary part of their livelihood (F. Rose 81). Patriotism was used to rid the AFL-CIO of radical peace advocates who refused to adopt anticommunist policies and resulted in a growing division in peace and labor relations (F. Rose 82).

Appearing to have opposing goals, peace and labor movements developed ill will towards one another and, even when war was clearly rejected by the working class, the bridge of hostility between labor and peace was difficult to cross (F. Rose 83). During the Vietnam War, for instance, the vast majority of the working class opposed the war but also rejected the peace movement (F. Rose 83). Feeding this illusion of separate agendas, isolated but highly publicized confrontations between labor and peace activists gave the impression that labor was in support of military action and created an even greater distance between groups (F. Rose 83). When peace activists confronted workers at defense plants and encouraged them to leave their jobs for moral reasons, their action only served to further the divide between the peace and labor movements (F. Rose 83-84). Growing public disapproval of the Vietnam War would assist both movements to find common ground once again.

As the validity of the Vietnam War came more into question by Americans and a progressive segment of the labor force became disillusioned with governmental support of labor, new opportunities for coalition building occurred between peace and labor movements (F. Rose
In 1966, Walter and Victor Reuther, leaders of the United Auto Workers (UAW), charged the AFL-CIO with collaborating with CIA covert operations and attacked the board’s pro-war stance (F. Rose 86). By 1968, the UAW withdrew from the AFL-CIO, became active in the peace movement, and formed alliances with activists in Civil Rights and Peace organizations (F. Rose 86). Demonstrating labor’s large opposition to the AFL-CIO pro-war policy, Chicago’s 1967 National Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace meeting drew participants from thirty-eight states and fifty international unions (F. Rose 87). The invasion of Cambodia and killing of students at Kent State also prompted alliances between labor and student peace movements (F. Rose 87). In May of 1970, New York witnessed a joint antiwar protest organized by the Labor-Student Coalition for Peace (F. Rose 87). Student groups, realizing they could not stop the war alone, began supporting labor struggles and helped win strikes at General Electric and Standard Oil and antiwar gatherings experienced an even greater numbers of union activists (F. Rose 87). Once again, peace and labor understood each other’s legitimate concerns and incorporated their diverse perspectives into a common agenda.

During Reagan’s presidency, peace forces within labor pressed for change of the AFL-CIO policy supporting Reagan’s policies and actions in Central America and hundreds of unions issued statements of opposition (F. Rose 87). In 1983, the National Labor Committee in Support of Democracy and Human Rights in El Salvador forced the AFL-CIO national convention to support restrictions on military aid until human rights abuses in El Salvador ceased (F. Rose 87-88). A 1983 AFL-CIO survey revealed that sixty percent of their members "would not support higher military spending and 80 percent believed the federal government spent too much on the military” (F. Rose 88). At the 1985 AFL-CIO convention, critics of U.S. policy in Nicaragua forced “the first floor debate on foreign policy in the history of the AFL-CIO” (F. Rose 88).
Opposition to the Reagan administration provided additional opportunities for coalition building between diverse social movements.

United by the belief that Reagan’s administration has been the “most ideologically antilabor, militaristic, and antienvironmental administration since the Cold War began,” unions, peace activists, and environmental groups formed a campaign designed to keep Reagan from being reelected (F. Rose 88). The Reagan administration declared war on labor, peace, and environmental movements by “blaming overzealous environmentalists, overpaid union workers, and the ‘evil soviet empire’ for many of America’s problems” (F. Rose 95). While their campaign to keep Reagan out of office was unsuccessful, it did afford an opportunity to create a sense of solidarity between diverse movements and led to additional common political goals.

Realizing there was a lack of alternatives to defense employment, peace and labor activists began exploring alternatives to the military economy and hoped to create a program to facilitate a smooth economic transition from war to civilian production. In their effort to dismantle the war economy, both peace and labor activists began questioning the notion that economic prosperity depends on military spending (F. Rose 88). Walter Reuther of the UAW was an early supporter of a conversion plan and in 1969 put forth a proposal suggesting that defense contractor profits made during the Vietnam War should be used to convert industry to civilian production (F. Rose 89). The National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) also called for conversion and in 1964 led a campaign for reinvestment in “consumer industry, health care, education, scientific research, and housing” (F. Rose 89). Overlooking the need for conversion, the Johnson administration ignored labor and peace activists’ proposals and unemployment rose following the end of the Vietnam War (F. Rose 89). As economic conditions worsened, demands for conversion from peace and labor organizations gained
momentum (F. Rose 89). By 1977, the AFL-CIO passed a resolution drawing attention to the fast growing military budget and the need to reprioritize with a focus on human needs (F. Rose 89). Collaborating with SANE, the “UAW, the International Association of Machinists, the United Electrical Workers, and the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers” worked together in an effort “to develop Reuther’s 1969 conversion proposal into legislation” (F. Rose 90). After the proposal died in committee when Reagan came into office, labor and peace alliances shifted their focus to the transfer of military spending to social programs (F. Rose 90).

**Recent Trends in Labor Movement Activism**

In recent years, the broader labor movement has moved towards “pure and simple unionism,” a return to the fight for the right to bargain with employers and address larger political and social issues (F. Rose 97). Rather than business unionism, F. Rose argues, the working class has returned to the Marxist idea of worker and social control of production (98). Younger unionists, lacking the financial security of their predecessors, appear to be more attuned to environmental concerns and identify with the peace cause (F. Rose 100). Labor has made a shift from supporting politicians who don’t fully respect labor to using their money and resources on their own media and grassroots lobbying efforts (F. Rose 102). Given this trend, labor’s present orientation is more conducive to coalition building with other social movements (F. Rose 102).

**Farm Workers Movement**

Farm worker movements have a rich history of challenging the agribusiness industry, particularly in Northwest Ohio. Cultural anthropologist W. K. Barger and organizational psychologist Ernesto Reza were both involved in the development of the Northwest Ohio’s Farm
Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) and I utilize their book, *The Farm Labor Movement in the Midwest: Social Change and Adaptation Among Migrant Farmworkers*, to describe this history.

Coalitions are born out of necessity, evolve with the political landscape, are vital to most successful campaigns, and are especially important to social movements with few financial resources like the farm labor movement. Organizers of migrant and seasonal farm workers found their first allies within other labor organizations. During the 1960s, Cesar Chavez and Dolores Huerta organized the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA) in Delano, California, while the AFL-CIO established an Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee (AWOC) (Barger and Reza 45-46). When San Joaquin Valley grape harvesters decided to strike over wage reductions, the NFWA asked the AWOC for their help and support and ultimately merged to form the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC) (Barger and Reza 46). Many ranchers refused to negotiate with Cesar Chavez and workers responded with a call for boycotting all California growers and sought out popular and political support for their cause (Barger and Reza 47). Once Chavez became aware of pesticide hazards to farm workers and consumers, pesticide use was added to the boycott issue. The UFWOC met with their first major success with the signing of 1969 contracts that included terms to regulate pesticide use and new rights and benefits for workers (Barger and Reza 47). By 1972, the UFWOC was renamed the United Farm Workers (UFW) and became a fully chartered labor union of the AFL-CIO (Barger and Reza 47). This is but one example of the UFW’s many successes, accomplishments they could not have made without extensive internal and external support.

Their effective confrontation of the agribusiness industry included support from a large majority of farm workers and external support from millions of individual Americans, church groups, political organizations, civic groups, and other labor organizations (Barger and Reza 49).
External support was vital, according to Barger and Reza, “in counterbalancing the relative powerlessness of farmworkers” and necessary to challenge “the political and economic strength of agribusiness in California” (50).

Lacking independent financial resources, the farm movement depended largely on collective community power and would not have been successful without it.

Shortly after California farm workers began organizing, mid-western migrant workers also initiated their formal struggle for improved rights and living conditions (Barger and Reza 52). With its headquarters in Toledo, Ohio, the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC) was founded by Baldemar Velasquez and modeled their organization after the UFW (Barger and Reza 54). FLOC activities in the 1960s were directed towards the goal of addressing immediate problems such as poor living conditions, low wages, and harsh working conditions (Barger and Reza 57). A strike during the summer of 1968 prompted growers to quickly sign contracts and was FLOC’s first significant victory and an educational experience for both farmers and labor organizers (Barger and Reza 58). Farmers “claimed their own ability to provide wages, housing, and other benefits were governed by the prices set by the large food-processing corporations” (Barger and Reza 58). Empathizing with growers and understanding they had few resources and little bargaining power, Velasquez realized that to create real change they needed to push for reforms involving large agribusiness corporations and needed a strong public support base in order to do so (Barger and Reza 59). From 1970 to 1976, FLOC focused on community organizing and membership grew as they drew public attention to civil rights issues, developed food and gasoline cooperatives, and created legal aid programs for farm workers (Barger and Reza 59).
A spontaneous strike at a cannery in Warren, Indiana, provided FLOC with the ideal opportunity to confront a large agribusiness corporation (Barger and Reza 59). While workers picketed tomato fields and canneries, FLOC sent letters to growers and food-processing corporations requesting a meeting for the negotiation of three-way contracts between farm laborers, growers, and processing companies (Barger and Reza 61). During the spring of 1978, twenty-one of the five hundred fifty growers agreed to work with FLOC and zero corporations responded (Barger and Reza 61). FLOC responded with rallies, marches and ultimately organized a boycott against the largest agribusiness farm laborers and growers worked for, Campbell Soup (Barger and Reza 67).

After seven years of economic and social pressure, Campbell Soup finally came to the bargaining table in 1985 (Barger and Reza 67, 78). Campbell Soup, FLOC, and numerous growers signed an agreement to form a labor relations commission, a group to include representatives from all three parties that would negotiate rules and regulations for collective bargaining (Barger and Reza 78). All three parties became involved in negotiations and in 1986 history was made with the signing of the nation’s first multiparty collective bargaining agreements (Barger and Reza 80). Farm workers gained new benefits, union recognition, and, most importantly, the right to participate in the decision making process (Barger and Reza 80). Once Campbell Soup became willing to bargain, other food-processing companies followed suit and three-way contract negotiations flourished.

Public support was vital to FLOC’s successful negotiations. Religious organizations such as the Council of Churches in Indiana and Ohio, the archdioceses of Columbus, Cincinnati, and Detroit, the Disciples of Christ, the United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, and the American Friends Service Committee were vital supporters of the FLOC boycott. Without
the moral and financial support of the AFL-CIO, the UAW, the Communication Workers of America, the Justice and Peace Commission, the Democratic Party of Oregon, the Consumers League of Ohio, Indiana State Council of the National Organization for Women, and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Campbell Soup and other food processing corporations would not have felt compelled to negotiate or bargain (Barger and Reza 60, 70, 77). In addition to their financial and moral support, many individuals from these groups attended FLOC’s constitutional conventions, participated in marches and rallies, and directly pressured Campbell Soup to dialogue with farm workers and farmers (Barger and Reza 66, 70). Public concern for social justice and human dignity has been invaluable to this movement and FLOC brings this strong foundation of allies to its anti-globalization activism as well.

During recent years, FLOC has felt the impact of neoliberal globalization and during their 1988 Constitutional Convention attendees expanded their concerns to include agribusiness activities beyond U.S. boundaries (Barger and Reza 82). As free market capitalism has spread and crop exportation has become increasingly prevalent, local farmers and farm workers have expressed fear that they may lose their livelihood because they are unable to compete in a global economy (Barger and Reza 82). Through a collaboration between FLOC and growers, concerned parties have traveled to Mexico in an effort to understand and address these concerns (Barger and Reza 86). Consequently, Mexican agricultural workers became involved in the 1991 Convention and FLOC now has the goal of eliminating sharecropping and tenant farming practices outside national boundaries (Barger and Reza 94-95). By developing alliances with laborers and farmers around the world, FLOC hopes to facilitate the creation of fair farm labor
practices worldwide in an attempt to minimize the ability of multinational food-processing
corporations to cut costs by moving operations (Barger and Reza 95).

The Anarchist Movement

Three primary texts are used to create a historical narrative of the anarchist movement
and its connection to contemporary social movements: Paul Avrich’s *Anarchist Voices: An Oral
History of Anarchism in America*, Richard Sonn’s *Anarchism* and George Woodcock’s
“Anarchism.” By detailing the long history of anarchism, Avrich, Sonn, and Woodcock
demonstrate connections between early anarchist principles and the philosophies and practices of
contemporary movements like the anti-globalization movement.

The anarchist movement, unlike the other movements mentioned thus far, has no class
base, no unified theory, and no long-term organizations; yet, its strength lies in the power of its
critique of the dominant ethos of society (“Anarchism”; Sonn 102; Woodcock 463). All forms of
hierarchy, particularly the government and corporate entities, are viewed as autocratic,
authoritarian institutions from an anarchist perspective (Sonn 45-46). Drawing on Marxism,
anarchists envision the state as an apparatus for maintaining class privilege and power and judge
corporations as even worse for their absence of democratic practices (A. Starr 113-14). Authentic
freedom and liberty, from the anarchist perspective, requires decentralization, self-determination,
rejection of hierarchy in all its forms, and direct democracy (Sonn 46; A. Starr 113; Woodcock
463). Bringing its strong critique of capitalism to the anti-globalization movement, the anarchist
movement seeks revolution and imagines a future with a classless, harmonious society where
locally autonomous worker-collectives practice participatory democracy (A. Starr 113, 151;
Sonn 46).
Today’s anarchist movement has its early roots in the worker-led Paris Commune of 1871 and in the radicalism of factory workers and peasants during the Spanish Revolution (Avrich 3). Tensions ran high during the 1871 French civil war as the monarchist dominated assembly ordered several unpopular acts such as the end of the moratorium on debts and rents and the denial of wages to National Guard members (Wright 511). Adolphe Thiers, the chief of executive power, feared the heavily armed and predominantly working class National Guard would revolt and ordered their disarmament (Wright 511). What ensued was a worker-led uprising against the French government and the formation of the Paris Commune (Wright 511). While the Paris Commune fell to Thiers’ government in less than two weeks, it was significant in that its tenets were based on decentralization and the formation of self-governing communes throughout France (Wright 511). Spain’s anarchist insurrection, on the other hand, involved large numbers of factory workers and peasants and took place over several decades. Beginning in the 1880s and up to the Spanish Revolution, terrorism was the primary tactic used by anarchists to attack Spain’s monarchy (Woodcock 461). As the monarchy fell from power and the new republic was met with equal distrust and rejection, anarchists used this opportunity for social revolution and the chance to create the society they envisioned (Woodcock 461). Impoverished peasants seized land and formed libertarian communes and factory workers took over factories and created collective workspaces (Woodcock 461). As the Spanish revolution ended in 1939, Franco and his fascist troops retook the factories, destroyed the communes, and effectively crushed the mass movement (Woodcock 461; Sonn 99).

Anarchist movements in other countries met with similar fates. Mussolini and Hitler’s Fascist governments destroyed Italian and German movements respectively (Woodcock 461). After a Polish anarchist assassinated American President McKinley, the U.S. deported or
imprisoned the leaders of America’s anarchist movement (Woodcock 462). Russia’s anarchist movement fell to the pull of communism and the increased power of totalitarian regimes (Woodcock 461). Nevertheless, the anarchist critique of national and corporate gigantism perseveres.

Fragments of the movement were kept alive during the 1940s and 1950s through the dissemination of anarchist literature and cultural magazines until its next resurgence during the 1960s and 1970s (Avrich 221). Although a minority of 1960s activist identified directly as anarchists, the movements they participated in clearly embraced many anarchist ideals and theories (Sonn 102-05; Woodcock 463). Anarchist principles are evident in counter-culture communes and worker collectives and in their celebration of individuality and personal freedom (Sonn 102). Embracing the anarchist values of equality and direct democracy, campaigns such as the Civil Rights and Women’s movements rejected hierarchies based on race, class or gender oppression (Sonn 102; Woodcock 463). Many peace activists protesting the Vietnam War utilized the anarchist critique of a “warfare state” and the “military-industrial complex,” engaged in direct action tactics, and made an appeal for self-determination (Avrich 222; Sonn 101). New anarchist journals emerged and by the mid-late 1970s the punk rock scene exploded providing a new stage to articulate the anarchist critique of modern society (Avrich 222; Sonn 113-15).

Quite influential in the contemporary environmental movement are the works of two anarchist authors: Murray Bookchin and his books Post-scarcity Anarchism (1971) and Ecology of Freedom (1982) and Edward Abbey’s novel The Monkey Wrench Gang (1975) (Sonn 107, 124). In his books, Bookchin argues for an “economy based on values of variety, diversity, locality, and balance” and produces a strong critique of how production, whether it is capitalist or communist, causes harm to the environment (Sonn 107-08). Edward Abbey’s novel The
Monkey Wrench Gang suggests a tactic he calls “monkey wrenching,” a form of industrial sabotage designed to inhibit development projects that threaten the natural environments of the American West (Sonn 110). Inspired by Abbey’s novel, Dave Foreman founded the radical environmental group Earth First! (Sonn 110). The popularity of these two authors is more evidence that the anarchist tradition is still alive.

While today’s anarchist movement is not a large, vibrant movement, its enduring principles are evident in the mass demonstrations and discourse of the anti-globalization movement. Seattle’s 1999 WTO protest events, for example, were organized according to anarchist principles with no centralized control and no “official messages, or forms of the protest […]” (A. Starr 115). Affinity groups were formed to organize specific activities, such as lock-downs, hanging banners, or street theatre, and each group set its own priorities and actions with some collaboration across groups (A. Starr 115). Given the diversity of movements involved in the anti-globalization movement, the core anarchist values of freedom, decentralization, and direct democracy support a means to celebrate and honor the plurality of group goals and tactics.

Anti-globalization Activism

My exploration of the anti-globalization movement begins with how scholars characterize the movement then shifts to a brief history of the broader movement. Included are the goals, concerns, and visions of the plethora of movements involved, the common ground between them, and the dilemmas they face in coalition building. Anti-globalization activism’s history stretches from the early 1990s with events like the First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity Against Neoliberalism and protests over GATT’s removal of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, continues with the 1999 shut down of Seattle’s WTO Ministerial meetings, and gains momentum with mass protests in cities around the world during the year 2000 and beyond. By reviewing
research on the broader movement, this section highlights the origins of the movement and how opposition to neoliberal globalization sparked alliances between heterogeneous social movements.

**Characterizations of the Anti-globalization Movement**

Written in response to the 1999 WTO protests, Jeremy Brecher, Tim Costello and Brendan Smith’s *Globalization from Below: The Power of Solidarity* explains why a variety of social movements converged on the city of Seattle in late 1999 and puts forth the overall activist critiques of globalization that emerged from this event. In their characterization of the movement, Brecher, Costello and Smith suggest a rejection of the media-imposed label “anti-globalization” and refer to the movement as “globalization from below” or a loose coalition of social movements joined together for the purpose of countering the devastation of “globalization from above”. Supranational institutions such as the World Bank and IMF and multinational corporations are portrayed as institutions “from above” that have perpetuated a shift from socialist to neoliberal projects that promote increased foreign investment, transnational mergers, and other free market capitalist projects. Activists, Brecher, Costello and Brendan suggest, are not resisting globalization per se but rather globalization in its present form, a construct dominated by neoliberal economic practices and supranational governance institutions and multinational corporations that represent the interests of business, not public welfare. Anti-globalization activists, Brecher, Costello, and Smith argue, seek to make corporations and governance institutions accountable to the common people, not the elite. Other scholars suggest that globalization from below is just one form of anti-globalization activism and one way to envision the movement.
Concerns, visions, and strategies vary among anti-globalization activists and differing segments of the movement frame it in distinct ways. Amory Starr’s book, *Naming the Enemy: Anti-corporate Movements Confront Globalization*, provides an analysis of the various movements involved in the Seattle protests and identifies three major forms of anti-globalization activism: globalization from below, contestation/reform, and relocalization/delinking. First, the globalization from below mode puts forth a vision of democracy and criticizes corporations and governance institutions for their lack of accountability to the people (A. Starr 83). Environmental, labor, socialist, and movements opposed to free trade agreements, A. Starr suggests, typically embrace this form of anti-corporate activism (84-102). Compared to the other two modes, this group is the least anti-corporate and its vision for liberation and an alternative economy is weak (A. Starr 108-09). Labor unions, for example, struggle to look beyond decent-paying corporate jobs and socialists have difficulty addressing problems related to bureaucracy and democratic participation (A. Starr 108). Second, movements that embrace the contestation/reform mode, A. Starr suggests, oppose neoliberal reforms and the state’s subordination of social priorities in favor of economic practices and policies that benefit big business (45). Holding the belief that corporate rule is wrong, their strategic approach is to force regulatory limitations on corporations (A. Starr 45-46). Peace, human rights, land reform, and groups opposed to biological patenting, for example, often embrace this form of anti-corporate activism (A. Starr 45). Compared to globalization from below, the contestation and reform mode has a clearer vision for an alternative political economy but fails to fully challenge the state’s support of corporate hegemony (A. Starr 78). Finally, movements embracing the relocalization/delinking mode, A. Starr argues, envision local initiatives as the solution to corporate-led globalization (111). Their emphasis is on the rights of localities and proposes that
local communities detach from corporate-controlled economies and re-localize via grassroots projects (111). Anarchist collectives, sustainable development groups, and sovereignty movements, for example, typically embrace this form of anti-corporate activism (A. Starr 112-34). They seek “local political authority founded on economic independence and local mutuality” (A. Starr 112). Opposition to corporate hegemony and neoliberalism unite the diverse movements involved in anti-globalization activism, A. Starr argues, however, they are separated by varied concerns, visions, and strategies.

Frederick Buttel’s journal article entitled “Some Observations on the Anti-Globalization Movement” and José Seoane and Emilio Taddei’s piece “From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement” also provide useful characterizations of the movement. According to Seoane and Taddei, the 2001 World Social Forum was both “a point of arrival and a point of departure”: an event that facilitated both a convergence of goals and a clearer recognition of existing differences (114). Participants agreed on two primary issues: one, that neoliberal globalization has led to inequities of all kinds and to the increased destruction of the environment and two, that supranational institutions, like the IMF, WTO, and World Bank, are part of a power structure that represents transnational financial and corporate interests (Seoane and Taddei 116). Opposition to free market capitalism, trade liberalization, and the increased ability of corporations and nation-states to dismantle social and environmental legislation that inhibit free trade, Buttel suggests, are common concerns among the diverse activists involved in the anti-globalization movement (96). While common ground exists, Seoane, Taddei, and Buttel agree that differences among movement participants do create dilemmas within the movement. Differences among participants include disagreements over tactics (violent or non-violent), strategies (to reform or destroy capitalist institutions), and visions
(how to resolve inequities involving property and wealth) (Seoane and Taddei 119; Buttel 105-07).

Seattle and Beyond

Anti-globalization activists emerged from numerous social movements from many parts of the world. Both European and United States anti-globalization activists typically come from global trade watch organizations, organized labor, NGOs, and a variety of other social movements such as environmental, farmer, consumer protection, student, and women’s organizations (Seoane and Taddei 102-03, 106; Buttel 99, 102). Among the North’s most active groups have been Europe’s movement of the unemployed, organized labor groups like United Parcel Service (UPS), the AFL-CIO, and the Teamsters in the United States, trade watch groups like France’s Association for the Tax on the Transactions for Aide to the Citizens (better know as ATTAC) (Seoane and Taddei 103-04), and transnational anti-WTO collectives (Buttel 102). In the global South, applications of neoliberal polices have prompted major actions from indigenous and peasant movements, debt relief movements, and labor movements in countries like Bolivia, Argentina, Thailand, India, Brazil, and Indonesia (Buttel 99). Peasant and indigenous movements in Mexico, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Paraguay, for example, responded with protests to neoliberal agrarian restructuring and campaigned for reasonable access to land and water and against poverty (Seoane and Taddei 111-12). Among the South’s most active anti-globalization groups are Mexico’s Zapatista movement, India’s Peasant Way, Latin America’s Shout of the Excluded and Institute of Agrarian Reform, South Africa’s South-South Summit Meeting on Debt and Brazil’s Southern Cone National Labor Union (Seoane and Taddei 102, 105, 109-10; Buttel 102). Labor organizations play a predominant role in anti-globalization actions in both hemispheres while debt relief and peasant and indigenous movements appear to
be unique to the South and the North’s actions contain a plethora of distinct social movements. Anti-globalization activists of both the global North and South suggest that neoliberal practices and policies undermine democracy and social justice and Southern activists add the complaint of Northern hegemony, particularly the dominance of the United States (Seoane and Taddei 114). During the 1990s, these diverse activists coalesced to oppose neoliberal globalization and anti-globalization activism exploded.

Numerous historical antecedents may have contributed to the 1999 Seattle WTO Ministerial meeting protests, the symbolic beginning of anti-globalization activism. Mexico’s 1990s complaints against GATT over the removal of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, Buttel argues, followed by the WTO’s dismantling of rules designed to preserve air quality and protect endangered sea turtles were primary motivators for anti-globalization activism (102-03). Seoane and Taddei suggest that Mexico’s Zapatista Army of National Liberation took the initial step in creating an international movement by organizing the First Intercontinental Encounter for Humanity Against Neoliberalism in 1996 (102). Having already experienced the negative consequences of the NAFTA, three thousand people from over forty countries gathered to share their knowledge and concerns about global, corporate-led capitalism and named neoliberalism the enemy (Seoane and Taddei 102; A. Starr 104). Just a few months after the Zapatista conference, drafts of the Multilateral Investment Agreement (MIA)--a treaty the OECD had secretly been negotiating--were circulated via the Internet (Seoane and Taddei 102). Designed to protect foreign investment, the MIA proposed a shift in power from the nation-state and its inhabitants to foreign investors and transnational corporations. Campaigning against the MIA, Global Trade Watch organizations in the United States began circulating the MIA draft to NGOs, intellectuals, activists, and representatives from numerous social movements all over the world.
Additionally, 1996’s media attention on Nike, Reebok, and Kathie Lee Gifford’s sweatshops sparked a lively and aggressive student and labor anti-sweatshop movement (Buttel 103).

Seattle’s demonstrations may have been prompted by many other events as well. Many activists responded with criticism to the IMF’s response to the 1997 Asian financial crisis, a response that many viewed as favoring foreign investors over the well-being of billions in the global South (Buttel 103; Seoane and Taddei 103). In the U.S., UPS workers held a two-week strike in mid-1997 challenging the company’s “flexibilization of labor” policy, raising concerns about job security, and attracting the support of the AFL-CIO (Seoane and Taddei 103). Also occurring in 1997, unemployed activists from countries throughout Europe protested the Maastricht Treaty blaming its neoliberal policies for promoting unemployment and precarious employment conditions (Seoane and Taddei 102-03). Anti-globalization activists experienced their first significant victory in 1998 when the OECD suspended their secret negotiations on the MIA in response to massive protests in Paris (Seoane and Taddei 104). On May 16, 1998, the first global street party occurred when thousands of people in twenty different countries blocked traffic, occupied bridges, and danced in the streets to protest the meetings of G8 leaders in Birmingham and the WTO in Geneva (Seoane and Taddei 104-05). In June 1999, massive protests took place in London, Cologne, and numerous other financial centers in Europe as thousands took to the streets to protest the annual G7 meeting (Seoane and Taddei 105). Shortly before the Seattle demonstrations, social movements in India, Latin America and South Africa also voiced their concerns about neoliberal globalization in the Second World Conference of People’s Global Action in Bangalore, India, the Latin American Shout of the Excluded campaign in numerous Latin American countries, and the South-South Summit Meeting on Debt in Johannesburg, South Africa (Seoane and Taddei 105). Regardless of which events motivated
activists to take action, international networking certainly led to a massive convergence of a variety of social movements on the city of Seattle.

By late-1999, the stage had been set for what has commonly been called the “Battle in Seattle.” Concerns about trade liberalization and the dominance of transnational corporations in the creation of a global market brought diverse activists from many parts of the world to Seattle (Seoane and Taddei 105). Peace, labor, environmental, farm worker, and anarchist activists were among the seventy thousand protesters that took to the streets and shut down the WTO Ministerial meetings (A. Starr 99-100). Internet communications helped to connect the various movements and groups like Public Citizen and Direct Action Network trained protesters and organized conferences (Seoane and Taddei 106). On November 30, thousands of activists marched, rallied, and staged sit-ins on the streets of Seattle (Seoane and Taddei 106). Police responded with pepper gas, rubber bullets, and mass arrests but the conflict did not end until December 3 when the WTO talks collapsed (Seoane and Taddei 106).

After the Seattle demonstrations, anti-globalization activism gained momentum and subsequent demonstrations took place all over the world. Mass protests took place in Washington, Windsor, Detroit, Calgary, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Melbourne, New York, Prague, and Toronto during the year 2000 (Ponniiah and Fisher 8). In the year 2001, protests occurred in Quebec City at the Summit of the Americas, the G8 Summit at Genoa, the World Food Summit in Rome and at the Free Trade Area of the Americas meeting in Buenos Aries (Buttel 104-05; Ponniiah and Fisher 8). Porto Alegre, Brazil hosted the first annual World Social Forum (WSF) during 2001, a counter-summit to the neoliberal project of the World Economic Forum with the alternative focus of social progress (Ponniiah and Fisher 4; Schonleitner 128). More than ten thousand anti-globalization activists from one hundred seventeen countries
attended the first WSF and the second WSF had more than fifty thousand participants from one hundred twenty-three countries (Ponniah and Fisher 5; Schonleitner 129). Anti-globalization activism continues today and shows little sign of slowing down.

This study builds upon the research on coalition building and anti-globalization activism and its antecedent movements by highlighting the anti-globalization movement’s history from a local perspective and demonstrating the challenges experienced with cross-movement alliance building. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement emerged from peace, labor, environmental, farm worker, and anarchist movements and differences in vision, preferred tactics, and group structure along with conflicts involving issues of race, class, religion, and gender have produced dilemmas in coalition building between movements. Motivated to join forces by the political, economic, and social changes associated with neoliberal globalization, these activists work to overcome these dilemmas in order to address their common concerns regarding trade liberalization, the increased power of multi-national corporations, and the neoliberal practices and policies of governance institutions. While mass mobilizations like Seattle and Genoa tend to foster the greatest media coverage, the groundwork of the anti-globalization movement consists of alliances built at grassroots levels. In the next chapter, I offer anti-globalization activism in Northwest Ohio as an example of how and why one community’s activists developed concerns about neoliberal globalization and struggle to build cross-movement alliances.
V. BATTLLING NEOLIBERALISM: ANTI-GLOBALIZATION ACTIVISM AND
COALITION BUILDING BETWEEN THE DIVERSE ACTIVISTS OF NORTHWEST OHIO,
1970-2003

Local coalitions such as those found in Northwest Ohio are the building blocks of national and transnational movements, and the anti-globalization movement cannot succeed without them. In research on the determinants of successful U.S. protest groups, Steedly and Foley conclude that groups with considerable numbers of allies are more likely to succeed (12-14). Cross-movement alliances provide opportunities to learn about the needs and desires of diverse populations, to identify commonalities, to jointly develop visions and plans, and to increase political leverage. Once solid cross-movement alliances are built on a local level, the knowledge and trust gained from those experiences are likely to translate and transfer to national and international cross-movement alliances. At the foundation of the broader anti-globalization movement are local coalitions of separate movements joined together by the common goal of resisting neoliberal globalization. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement represents one branch of a mass of intertwined and changing alliances.

Anti-globalization activists of Northwest Ohio are a loose and shifting coalition of peace, labor, environmental, farm worker, and anarchist movements with a wide range of motivations and concerns. Organizations like the Toledo Area Committee on Central America (TACCA), Jobs With Justice (JWJ), the Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC), the Local 20 Teamsters, the Green Party, the Toledo Metropolitan Ministries (TMM), the Interfaith Justice and Peace Center (IJPC), Witness for Peace, the Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition (NWOPC), and the Program on Corporations, Law and Democracy (POCLAD) all contain activists who identify with anti-corporate, anti-neoliberal, or anti-capitalism themes. Northwest Ohio’s environmental
activists oppose the recent dismantling of environmental protections along with the importation of pollution and manufacturing jobs. Peace and social justice organizations focus on human rights abuses, worker exploitation occurring in sweatshops in third world countries, and job losses experienced by the American workforce. Union activists are naturally concerned about lost job security and employment opportunities in the U.S. and demand fair labor practices both here and abroad. Connecting these diverse movements is their common dissatisfaction with the institutions of global capitalism and the neoliberal policies and practices they impose. Their common enemies are the WTO, the IMF, the World Bank, multinational corporations, and U.S. economic policies regarding free trade—all of which have, in their opinion, a negative impact on the environment, labor rights and social justice both in the U.S. and internationally.

Some alliances within Northwest Ohio’s activist community have been substantial and long lasting while most have been temporary and based on short-term events or projects. Northwest Ohio’s peace and environmental activists have in most cases merged into one community embracing each other’s struggles and often referring to themselves as the social justice or progressive community. Most of Toledo’s labor organizations have allied with each other but remain predominantly isolated from the social justice community. Northwest Ohio’s anarchist community is quite small and has some connections to both the social justice and labor community but their participation remains on the fringe of any major social movement.

Like many U.S. cities of the Upper Midwest, Toledo has a long history of strong union activism and the labor community plays a major role in local anti-globalization activism. Toledo has been a hotbed of union activism since the early 1930s and Northwest Ohio’s autoworkers were major players in the foundation of the UAW (Chavez). Auto related manufacturers are still among the top employers in Ohio and several large plants are located in Northwest Ohio
including General Motors, Daimler Chrysler, and Ford employing close to fifteen thousand workers collectively (Ohio Department 2, 9-10). Toledo’s 2004 Yellow Book contains listings for approximately seventy labor organizations including the AFL-CIO, FLOC, AFSCME, and the Teamsters to name a few. While the Upper Midwest is the most unionized region of the U.S., the proportion of unionized workers has decreased significantly from fifty-two percent in 1977 to twenty-six percent in 1997 (Baldwin 10-11). Naturally, Toledo’s labor unions are quite concerned about decreases in union membership, loss of job security and labor rights, and other changes associated with neoliberal globalization and are key opponents of free trade agreements and corporate hegemony.

The information in this chapter is based on interviews with thirteen activists and concentrates on the history of anti-globalization activism and the nature of coalition building within Northwest Ohio. It is an attempt to document part of an international movement and does not purport to be all-inclusive. As defined for this study, anti-globalization activists are individuals who express a concern about the nature of globalization, identify with such themes as anti-corporatism, anti-neoliberalism, or anti-capitalism, and believe that their concerns reflect changes not limited to local, regional, or national boundaries. Interviewees consist of nine men and four women for a total of thirteen, two of whom are persons of color. Informants range in age from approximately thirty to eighty years old. Most come from organizations in the social justice community, three are union activists, and one is an anarchist on the fringe of both the social justice and labor community. Most of the activists interviewed are not major leaders of any social movement but rather out-of-the-spotlight activists who challenge the corporate elite and/or institutions of global governance. Some of the activists are participants in mass anti-globalization demonstrations while others seek change via community education. Some focus
their activism within the political system while others concentrate their efforts on a grassroots level.

During November and December of 2003, I interviewed all activists and I simultaneously researched their organizations and groups. Interviews ranged in duration from twenty minutes to two hours and covered such topics as activist history, experiences with cross-movement alliances, anti-globalization activism, and the development of concerns about the nature of globalization. All interviews were tape-recorded and most were also videotaped. To select interviewees, I started by interviewing Steve Miller, a long-time activist from Toledo who has an extensive phone list of local activists. Miller referred other “anti-globalization” activists to me and they suggested others and so on, creating a snowball effect.

My initial focus was to gather personal recollections of the emergence of concerns about the nature of globalization, anti-globalization activism, and local alliances across movements, contextual biographical information, and historical material during interviews. Second, I organized the data gathered around themes to indicate pivotal events. Third, I explored the meaning of the stories relying on individuals to provide explanations. Finally, I looked for larger structures such as ideologies, cultural trends, and socio-economic and political context to offer further explanations, which collectively led to my interpretation of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activism and experiences of coalition building. This study shows that Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement arose in response to neoliberal changes to the local, national, and global economy and that the diverse activists involved have a growing recognition of common concerns and are increasingly interested in cross-movement alliances. It also illustrates the dilemmas of alliance building across movements including differences in group
structure, tactics, and vision along with conflicts related to issues of race, class, religion, and
gender.

Theoretical Framework

This study is framed by the political and economic theories of neoliberalism, a
framework that naturally emerged from my research. As I gathered data on globalization and
anti-globalization, I discovered that much of the surrounding discourse suggests that neoliberal
thought and practices dominate the current process of globalization and uses conceptions and
criticisms of neoliberalism to construct its arguments.

Three major works on neoliberalism will be used: Colin Leys’ Market-driven Politics:
Neoliberal Democracy and the Public Interest, Lisa Duggan’s The Twilight of Equality?
Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy, and Nikolas Rose’s “Advanced
Liberalism.” Each of these works describes the ideological stance of neoliberalism, its history
and consequences, and puts forth an analysis of the crisis tendencies in advanced capitalism.
They share the basic assumption that economic powers work arm-in-arm with political order and
that power is derived from knowledge claims, and, in this case, an ideology that justifies certain
political, economic, or social conditions. According to Colin Leys, Lisa Duggan, and Nikolas
Rose, neoliberalism was embraced as the dominant ideology by the major economic forces in the
world beginning in the 1970s and has since spread throughout the world. Rejecting Keynesian
economics, the notion of the welfare state, and social democracy, neoliberalists envision the
government’s primary responsibility as maintaining an infrastructure of law and order while
organizing national policy to promote maximum corporate profits, a political project anti-
globalization activists oppose. Colin Leys, Nikolas Rose, and Lisa Duggan all help to explain
why activists become concerned about neoliberal globalization by describing the political and economic changes it creates.

Colin Leys emphasizes the power of neoliberal ideology as it drives political practices and policies, the very conditions anti-globalization activists object to. Beginning with the globalization of capitalism, Leys argues, market forces and neoliberal thought have driven political practices and policies. Modern globalization is more than “autonomous technological changes and ‘impersonal’ market forces,” Leys contends, it contains a neoliberal political project aimed at defeating socialism and promoting a free market economy (11). Leys provides a historical analysis of how neoliberalism developed beginning with attacks on state managed social projects, followed by the collapse of communism and strengthening of capitalistic forces, and culminating in a neoliberal project of lower taxes, privatization, the end to controls over the movement of capital, the elimination of trade barriers, and anti-union measures (12). Anti-globalization activists object to such market-driven politics and I utilize Leys’ work to provide explanations for their motivations.

Nikolas Rose sheds light on the motivations of anti-globalization activists with his suggestion that neoliberalism has spread into the social sphere. Neoliberalism, he argues, aims not only to privatize industry but also to reconceptualize the relationship between the economic and the social by rethinking aspects of social behavior along economic lines (N. Rose 142). Nikolas Rose compares and contrasts social liberalism with neoliberal ideology and provides examples of the rhetoric put forth to justify the shift from an ethic of public service to private management and the increased focus on the value of money and controlling costs (150-51). Social liberalism and its prescriptions for handling social problems lost credibility and were replaced by policies organized to support the market and to reconceptualize the social along
economic lines (N. Rose 139-42). Reshaped to generate profit, projects in social spheres, including education and healthcare, were restructured in the image of the economic or the market (N. Rose 146-51). Neoliberalism is more than just a new political philosophy, it is a new orientation containing a power shifting rationale with new techniques of control and far reaching consequences that extend into the social realm. The neoliberalization of social spaces such as education and health care have motivated multiple activists to act in opposition of this ideology.

In addition to describing the construction of neoliberal hegemony, Lisa Duggan focuses on the fight against neoliberal hegemony and the division between progressive activists focused on economic issues and those involved in identity and cultural politics, an important division among anti-globalization activists. Identity and cultural politics, she argues, are central to the entire neoliberal project (Duggan 3). Neoliberalism makes the claim of value neutrality by purporting to separate the “natural” processes of capitalism from such issues as class, gender, sexuality, and race, while, in fact, it promotes the inherently racist and classist structure of global capitalism (Duggan 5). The neoliberal rhetoric of value neutrality disguises oppressive goals of upward redistribution of wealth, power, and resources. Progressive movements responding to the neoliberal project are hindered by a split between movements that focus on economics, wealth distribution, and corporate hegemony and others that focused on political and cultural equality surrounding such issues as gender, race, or sexuality (Duggan xv-xvi, 71). Social movements focusing on economics and corporate hegemony, she contends, often overlooked connections with social and cultural inequality. Economic issues, Duggan argues, should not be separated from the political and cultural arenas and “as long as the progressive-left represents and reproduces itself as divided into economic vs. cultural, universal vs. identity-based, distribution vs. recognition-oriented, local or national vs. global branches, it will defeat itself” (xx). Anti-
globalization activism, Duggan suggests, has the potential to connect political, economic, cultural, and social issues but has yet to fully adopt the notion that cultural and identity politics are material to the neoliberal project (xx). Duggan’s analysis of the split between progressive movements contains important implications for coalition building across movements and highlights the challenges social hierarchies pose in forming alliances.

By framing anti-globalization activism as a reactive response to neoliberal hegemony, explanations of the political, economic, and social changes that motivated such a diverse group of activists to take part in this movement become apparent. Whether activists have a conscious awareness of the political economy’s shift towards neoliberalism or not, they appear to be responding to the political, economic, and social transformations that the invention of this modern liberalism has prompted.

**Activists Respond to Neoliberalism’s Early Years**

Several Northwest Ohio activists point to the 1970s as a time when U.S. economic and political forces began facilitating a pro-business agenda that inhibited labor and environmental campaigns. Various social movements struggled to adjust to the changes brought about by the early years of globalization.

Bill Lichtenwald, President of the Local 20 Teamsters and long-time labor activist, targets the economic changes of the 1970s as being the time when he first became concerned about issues of globalization (although “globalization” was not a term used at that time). Responding to U.S. support of Israel in the Yom Kippur War, the oil pricing policies of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) led to increases in gas prices, an energy shortage, and a slump in the U.S. economy (“Chronology”). Inflation and unemployment were
high, productivity was low, and the U.S. experienced a recession during the mid-1970s (Kenwood and Lougheed 249). Lichtenwald remembers those difficult times for labor:

 […] all of a sudden fuel prices went up. It didn’t only just affect the automobiles and the trucking industry, but it affected the people who were heating their homes. And, that’s when I saw […] people saving money were starting to buy these foreign cars. Our economy was based on the automotive industry […]. Employers were starting to flee south where they had a cheaper labor force […], a cheaper labor force and a more anti-union labor force.

Given the desire of corporations to cut costs and increase profits, Lichtenwald reasons, corporations quickly learned they could “ship these things [business operations] overseas, make our product cheaper where we don’t have environmental laws.” Attacks on labor and environmental campaigns, Lichtenwald suggests, are inherently linked in a global economy.

Environmental activists also struggled during the 1970s to promote their agendas and found common interests with numerous labor unions. Struggling to promote the anti-nuclear power agenda, environmental and peace activist Mike Ferner sought the support of organized labor as he promoted the Ohio Safe Energy campaign. Challenged to take on the lucrative and powerful utility industry, Ferner’s strategy was to move the Safe Energy campaign forward by building alliances between environmental and labor movements:

The utility industry here in Ohio and outside of Ohio dumped in literally millions of dollars to fight us in 1976 and they had done that all around the country. It became pretty clear that if we were going to try to go up against that kind of power and money that we needed a lot more in the way of allies than just environmentalists scattered about here and there. What that mandated, as far as I
was concerned, was that we learn about the issues that were important to the people that we were asking to support us. And, that got me learning about labor and about the issues that they deal with locally and globally […].

Ferner’s commitment to building strong relationships with Ohio’s labor community yielded a strong alliance between environmentalists and the UAW. Together they worked to restrict the building of nuclear power plants and to restructure utility rates. These successful coalitions between labor groups and the anti-nuclear power movement motivated Ferner to organize a statewide labor/environmental conference in Toledo and a national conference in Pittsburgh. As he became more connected to the labor community, Ferner was asked to speak at numerous labor rallies where he tied together what he knew about electric rates and nuclear power plants to workers’ costs of living concerns.

New Waves of Activism in the 1980s

Neoliberal attacks on labor and education combined with the Reagan administration’s anti-communist campaigns and talk of a winnable nuclear war sparked new waves of activism during the 1980s in Northwest Ohio. Some educators took exception to the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report suggesting that the nation’s public schools are mediocre and started campaigns to oppose the commission’s proposed reforms such as proficiency testing. Peace activists were propelled into action by Reagan’s anti-communist sentiments and launched the nuclear freeze campaign and opposition to U.S. foreign policies in Central America. “Trickle down” economics, deregulation, and Reagan’s attacks on unions sparked massive resistance from labor activists and an abundance of labor rallies and strikes. Educators, peace activists, and union members all worked to create their own waves of change.
Union activists grew increasingly concerned as neoliberalism gathered momentum with Reagan’s promotion of free enterprise, opposition to governmental support of the welfare state, and assaults on labor. Many experts contend that business growth prompted by Reagan’s “trickle down” economics and deregulation policies was accomplished at the expense of the middle class and poor (“Reaganomics”) and the working class naturally opposed these changes. Early in his presidency, Ronald Reagan fired thirteen thousand air traffic controllers and ordered the Professional Traffic Controllers Association be decertified (Brecher and Costello 11; F. Rose 88). He began his presidency with a reputation as a hostile anti-labor president whose goal was to shift power from organized labor to large corporations (Leys 41). Toledo’s labor community took decisive action to oppose such changes.

Northwest Ohio’s union activists fought back as an increasingly neoliberal work-climate hit laborers hard. Labor rallies and strikes became commonplace as unions responded to assaults on labor and the impact of Reaganomics. Well connected to the labor movement by this time, Mike Ferner was often asked to help organize labor rallies in the early 1980s:

In the early 80s, it seemed like there was just a string of strikes. The Greyhound workers went out, the mineworkers. There were auto parts plant strikes here in Toledo. Somehow or another I got into helping organize rallies [...]. I was working with a group of labor activists and we were just determined to have as many of them as necessary and possible to have. We began to be quite a common event around town to have these events in support of strikers.

In November of 1983, negotiations between the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) and Greyhound broke down marking the beginning of a seven-week long strike nationwide strike (“Great Greyhound”). Over two hundred UAW members went on strike at a Toledo auto parts
company in May of 1984 (Green). United Mine Workers also went on strike against Pittston Coal Group and New Beckley Mine in 1989 (“Coal Mine”). Failed contract negotiations combined with the actions of union busting, pro-business politicians prompted many union activists to take to the picket lines.

As a representative of large numbers of professional truck drivers, Lichtenwald was naturally concerned about neoliberal changes of the 1980s in the trucking industry. Deregulating and privatizing the trucking industry, according to Lichtenwald, had a negative impact on working conditions, compensation, and union membership. At its peak, the Local 20 Teamsters had four thousand members but by 2003 membership had dropped to seven hundred. Deregulation, Lichtenwald argues, harmed professional truck drivers in numerous ways:

It [trucking regulations] kept the trucking industry safe and it kept only so many carriers and we thought it worked well. When we deregulated it, […] all of a sudden they created this competition. All of a sudden people could start trucking companies over night without paying insurance, without paying pensions […] by telling the guys I got operating authority, you buy the truck, and I’ll find the loads for you […]. This person’s a slave. They have no choice. It has lowered the standards and the wages of the industry.

While federal deregulation allowed the trucking industry to grow, it did so at the expense of unionized workers.

Coinciding with Lichtenwald’s concerns about the decline of U.S. labor, retired history professor, peace, labor, anti-racist and political activist Michael Kay argues for the absolute necessity of strong labor unions in order to constrain capitalist interests:
If we’re going to develop an effective countervailing force in these United States, we have to increase the power of labor unions [...]. This meager amount of organization has enabled the corporations to operate in an uninhibited, unlimited fashion. So we have a capitalism operating today in the United States that has gone wild.

Activists who are not part of the labor movement, Kay suggests, need to develop a greater understanding of the needs of the working class and an appreciation for the importance of strong labor unions. Many middle class, intellectual liberals, he implies, fail to fully understand the state of the working class because they have never experienced it. Without a strong coalition of the nation’s workers, Kay reasons, corporate interests would override the needs of humanity. An effective strategy to strengthen labor, Kay contends, is to create “laws that enable the growth of labor unions again.” From the perspective of a political activist within the Democratic Party, Kay believes in the power of representative democracy and that strong coalitions of workers will effectively influence state actors who in turn will take workers’ needs and concerns into consideration when dealing with capitalism’s imperatives. Without strong labor unions, Kay believes, U.S. government officials will facilitate corporate agendas rather than the interests of the working class.

On the peace front, activists worked to criticize and confront Reagan’s foreign policy objectives. Drawn into activism when the nuclear freeze campaign was at its height of activity in the 1980s, peace activist Steve Miller utilized a variety of tactics in his attempt to gain political leverage. Groups he was involved with focused on lobbying Congress to pass a nuclear freeze resolution, planned a variety of events and meetings, and engaged in acts of civil disobedience at nuclear testing sites. Miller feels it is imperative to form coalitions with other social movements
in order to increase their political leverage. One successful alliance Miller was able to facilitate is a strong relationship with the FLOC:

I’ve done a number of things with FLOC, the Farm Labor Organizing Committee, going on retreats with them, going to some marches to deal with the boycott against Campbell’s soup and their boycott against Mt. Olive pickles […] that engendered some reciprocity. We had a march I remember and some people from FLOC were there with their flags […]. A few of us went to their things and AFL-CIO celebrations and a few of them went to our things.

As the Cold War thawed and the nuclear freeze campaign lost its momentum, peace activists focused on campaigns against U.S. foreign intervention.

Numerous peace activists in Northwest Ohio were motivated to organize in response to the Reagan administration’s foreign policies in Central America. Because the Sandinista government of Nicaragua engaged in relations with Cuba and other Communist-bloc nations, the Reagan administration believed they were a threat to democracy in the Western Hemisphere. Local resistance to the Sandinista regime was led by the Contras, a group of guerrilla warriors who set up bases in the neighboring countries of Honduras and Costa Rica. Reagan’s support of this guerilla army motivated the formation of Witness for Peace and the TACCA. Acting as human shields and delivering humanitarian aid, many activists from these organizations made trips to the countries of Central America.

Initially, motivation to learn Spanish prompted Reverend Chet Chambers’ activism concerning Central America. While working on developing the Hispanic congregation in a Toledo Methodist church, Reverend Chet Chambers found himself in numerous meetings where
most of the participants were Spanish speaking. At the suggestion of one of his peers, he attended language schools in Mexico and Nicaragua.

During the four-week language camp in Cuernavaca, Mexico, Chambers learned more than just Spanish. He learned that many Mexicans have valid reasons for feeling contempt for the U.S.:

One of the kind of shocking things […] was to hear these people generally refer to the United States as the North American Empire. The more I’ve reflected on that during the years […] the clearer it seems to be in accuracy in terms of its effect on Latin America as a whole and not just Mexico.

During the Contra War, Chambers also attended a Spanish language school in Nicaragua. For five weeks he received Spanish language instruction and received exposure to the cultural, political and economic situation in Nicaragua. Welcomed with open arms, Chambers was touched by the generosity of Nicaraguans in spite of U.S. government actions and policies. Chambers explains, “that was a dramatic experience in my life to be there in the midst of the Contra War where people, especially in Northern Nicaragua, were really feeling the effects of that.” Moved by these eye-opening experiences, Chambers became involved with TACCA and assisted in organizing caravans to Mexico, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Cuba as well as other countries. TACCA’s goals are to provide humanitarian aid to those in need and to educate Americans about the impact of U.S. foreign policy on Central and Latin American countries.

In the midst of the unrest in Central America, Indiana’s University of Notre Dame invited Salvadorian President José Napoleon Duarte to be their commencement speaker, an action that prompted not only protests against his appearance but also protests against the IMF. Envisioning Duarte as a “puppet of the U.S. government” and the organizer of death squads, Steve Miller was clear about his own reasons for attending the demonstration but was confused when he saw signs
about the unjust and undemocratic practices of the IMF. Miller remembers reading a large sign that read, “The real enemy is the IMF” and none of the peace activists surrounding him understood the meaning behind the sign. Apparently, some activists were beginning to connect the neoliberal policies of the IMF to the militarization and exploitation of Central American countries, an awareness that would grow in years to come.

Part of the construction of neoliberal hegemony includes an attack on public institutions including schools (Duggan xii) and Mitch Balonek, teacher, Green Party co-chair and self-described political activist, has grown acutely aware of this connection. Neoliberalism’s economic ideals, according to N. Rose, spread into social practices like education and are found in the shift in focus from professionalism and ethics to a new accounting discourse (146-47). Education is being restructured in the image of financial institutions where professional expertise takes a subordinate position to obtaining certain test results, controlling costs, and assessing student learning based on standardized tests. Teachers are no longer self-governed in assessing their students learning but are mandated to teach to a standardized test. Proficiency testing, for example, is one example of neoliberal economic ideals spreading to social practices and being used as new techniques of control. When asked about how he became concerned about issues of globalization, Balonek connected mandated proficiency testing to globalization and a neoliberal agenda. Responding to a loss of corporate profits particularly within the U.S. auto industry, the Reagan administration, Balonek suggests, blamed and attacked public education:

The Japanese were kicking our butts in car sales […]. Well, the Reagan administration and their neo-conservative policies began that movement of, first of all, they attacked public education with a report called The Nation at Risk and
that report basically said that the United States was falling way behind other industrial nations in education. The report though, today everybody knows has no merit whatsoever. They don’t cite any resource, any scholarly information or, you know, theoretical information that proves what they were saying. It was just one of these scathing reports of education that started this progression towards testing and by the time the first Bush got into office, he took it the next step and instituted testing.

Neoliberalism had extended into the social sphere, into education.

Resistance to NAFTA and other Neoliberal Practices

Northwest Ohio activists’ opposition to trade liberalization, multinational corporate power, and the ethos of neoliberalism heightened with the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement. NAFTA negotiations began in 1991 to establish the world’s largest free trade zone to include a “15-year gradual phase-in of the elimination of tariffs and traditional non-tariff barriers on trade for all goods and services” in the United States, Canada, and Mexico (“North American Free Trade Agreement”). When Democratic President Bill Clinton took office he continued governmental support of NAFTA, the same neoliberal economic policies of former Republican presidents. Concerned that NAFTA would lead to losses in U.S. manufacturing jobs, drops in wages, and human rights abuses and environmental devastation in Mexico (“North American Free Trade Agreement”), activists from a variety of movements mobilized and after NAFTA took effect, anti-globalization activism blossomed in Northwest Ohio.

Many labor activists mistrusted the promise of NAFTA, felt betrayed by Democrats who sponsored it, and responded by increasing their political activism. Before NAFTA was
implemented, Lichtenwald was suspicious of the rhetoric surrounding NAFTA and viewed it as a ploy to increase the wealth of capitalists at the expense of organized labor. “The idea behind NAFTA,” Lichtenwald states, “was it was suppose to create more jobs in the United States and create more jobs overseas. And, the idea sounded good, although they didn’t fool any of us in organized labor.” Many working class individuals, Lichtenwald suggests, lost their jobs due to corporate access to cheaper Mexican labor and those who have not remain under the constant threat of job loss due to possible business relocation. “Investors and financiers,” Lichtenwald argues, benefited from NAFTA while organized labor lost ground in contract negotiations often having little choice but to accept concessions or lose their jobs.

As Democratic politicians supported free trade initiatives, union activists felt betrayed and Teamsters responded with increased voter education and political activism.

As Lichtenwald put it:

If you look at the biggest hits that the unions have taken […]. Clinton signed PNTR. Clinton signed NAFTA, not that the Republicans wouldn’t have. Generally the Republicans are the ones who, I guess, take the discredit for trying to break unions and lower the working standards of the local people but our biggest hits have been by the Democrats […]. You have to keep both sides honest and that’s why we are very active politically and try to keep our members active politically.

Hoping to reclaim the Democratic Party from, as he referred to them, “the elite” and “the aristocrats,” Lichtenwald has focused his energies and resources towards voter registration, promoting the elections of union members as precinct captains, and educating Teamster members on the voting records of various politicians. Envisioning state managers as having the
power to regulate capitalism to favor the working class, his strategy involves influencing and, in some cases, actually having labor officials become state actors.

Michael Kay had this to say about NAFTA:

> With the passage of laws of NAFTA and the demand for fast track and so on, we recognize the highly destructive impact that this has upon American workers and we weren’t nearly as understanding of the impact or the destructive impact upon workers in other lands or farmers in other lands but we certainly understood what was happening to American workers. We opposed it from the get go.

Reverend Larry Clark, Executive Director of the Toledo Metropolitan Ministries and long-time anti-racist and peace activist, opposed NAFTA from its inception. Clark and others at TMM believed “manufacturing jobs would be lost from the United States and that Mexico would receive those manufacturing jobs but what it would lead to more misery in Mexico […]”

NAFTA, as described by Mike Ferner, privileges the propertied-class and is yet another example of preferential treatment for the wealthy that goes back to the birth of the United States:

> […] the economic forces that we wind up finding so much here at home—in other words, powerful corporations, private interests—that those same forces were responsible in the early days of our country for putting, for example, the Commerce Clause [Article I, Section 8] and the Contracts Clause into our own Constitution. Some of us have taken to calling the Commerce Clause the first free trade zone agreement because what it did was combine the colonies into the states […] primarily for ease of commerce. People that were in the property-class in that day could conduct commerce with as little interference as possible. And, what we’re seeing with NAFTA and the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas these
days is an extension of that same philosophy, that property rights are more important than human rights.

During the same year NAFTA went into effect, Ferner and twelve other activists and scholars from around the U.S. formed the Program on Corporations, Law and Democracy (POCLAD). POCLAD’s members research “corporate, labor and legal histories” with the goal of rethinking history and sharing their analysis with democracy movements (POCLAD). Their focus is three-fold: to produce a historical analysis of the fundamental relationships that govern people’s lives, particularly relationships between corporations, the government, and its citizens; to explore how and why resistance movements have failed to stop corporate abuse and to create a power shift to people and communities; and to develop and share strategies for effectively addressing these issues (POCLAD). Ferner summarizes his work with POCLAD by saying, “[We] take these historical themes and educate the movement organizations of a variety of kinds about these historical themes that are common to so many different movements.” As the present Communication Coordinator of POCLAD, Ferner suggests that their work is “the analysis part of coalition building so that groups can see more of the common thread in the work that they are doing that’s coming out of history.” Strategically, POCLAD encourages activists to explore ways to change the constitutional rules that privilege the propertied class and corporations and deny self-governance to the majority (After Seattle). Effective strategies, Ferner contends, will focus on:

the fundamental powers that corporations are wielding in such a way that it reduces their ability to define their own existence and run the government […] If we can find ways of limiting the power and reducing the rights that corporations
have stolen as they’ve operated in this country, it will certainly impact their operations and their ability to wield such a free hand internationally.

In a U.S.-dominated political economy, Ferner argues, the best way to confront the capitalist institutions of neoliberal globalization is to democratize power, allowing the people, not corporations, to manufacture the rules that govern the lives of citizens in the U.S. and elsewhere. For a perfect example of privileging propertied interests and corporate hegemony, both Ferner and Miller pointed to Owens Corning Fiberglass and the demands it made of the city of Toledo in 1994.

Toledo City government panicked when in 1994 Owens Corning Fiberglass threatened to move its headquarters out of the city of Toledo unless public funds were used for building their new headquarters. Fearing that good paying jobs would leave Toledo, Miller rationalizes, the Mayor and the rest of City Council designed a package of tax incentives and assisted Owens Corning in building an entirely new complex. Miller uses the words “robber barons” to describe Owens Corning and suggests their actions were “holding up the city for a lot of money.” Ferner explains it in this way:

We had a fortune five hundred company with its headquarters in Toledo that did what so many companies do and threatened to move out of the city--move its headquarters out of the city unless there was a huge public subsidy involved with building their new world headquarters […]. At the time the company was busy buying other companies around the world, buying operatives all over the globe, opening plants in a variety of countries and clearly they had the wherewithal to lead a global operation. But, for reasons of their bottom-line, when it came time to invest in their headquarter building, they said they weren’t going to do it unless
it involved public money put into it. It’s another example of a company defining its own rules and its own methods of operations.

Ferner went before Toledo City Council to voice his opposition then organized “an effort to put the tax abatements on the ballot” to “give the public a chance to vote.”

Miller, Ferner, and a small group of activists collected ten thousand signatures in thirty days, one thousand short of the needed eleven thousand. Had they successfully collected enough signatures, Ferner assumes, “Owens Corning and probably all of their buddies in various corporations and towns would have put unlimited money into that campaign to make sure that the referendum was defeated and they maintained their subsidies.” As Miller points out, “In the context of capitalism, they’re doing what they’re suppose to do […], making a good deal.”

Owens Corning received tax abatement worth about twenty-five million (Blade, “The Price”) and their successful campaign to gain access to public funds for their own private interests serves as an excellent example of the strength of the pro-business, neoliberal philosophies and policies of the 1990s.

Still motivated to help the working class and confront corporate greed, Steve Miller began a 1996 campaign to pass a Living Wage Law in Toledo. After reading articles about Living Wage ordinances in The Progressive and The Nation, Miller contacted Toledo City Councilman Pete Gerkin who agreed to help draft an ordinance and support the legislation if Miller could build a constituency. Living Wage laws are intended to establish a quid pro quo; if companies received a certain level of tax abatemnets or other economic incentives from the city, they are required to provide benefits and pay all employees a living wage at ten percent above the poverty level (Blade, “Council OK’s”). Initially, Miller reports, the proposal met with considerable resistance from local businesses and the Chamber of Commerce. Contacting
Toledo’s labor leaders, Miller and a small group of social justice activists were able to build alliances with the majority of the city’s labor community. After the AFL-CIO assigned a person to work part-time on the issue, union support grew. Miller, primarily a peace activist, was able to form alliances with the AFL-CIO, the United Labor Council, the UAW, the United Food and Commercial Union and others. Two public hearings were held and union activists attended in force. In spite of overwhelming public support, the battle over the Living Wage ordinance went on for the next four years and was finally passed in June 2000 (Blade, “Council OK’s”).

In addition to NAFTA going into effect, the mid-1990s was a time of tremendous economic changes. Miami hosted the first Summit of the Americas, a meeting promoting the FTAA (an expansion of NAFTA to the entire Western hemisphere) and involved trade ministers from thirty-four countries. Mexico experienced a serious financial crisis. Investors favored the dollar over the peso, Mexico’s buying power plummeted, and President Ernesto Zedillo gave partial blame to the implementation of NAFTA as he struggled to deal with wealthy Western creditors (“Mexican Bail-out”; Duggan 2). Asian and Russian economic crises soon followed as they struggled to adjust to expanding global capitalism and neoliberalism. By the mid-1990s, the Internet had become a strong economic and social force with the number of users growing rapidly and online businesses flourishing (“Internet”). Under the continued neoliberal economic and social policies of the U.S. government and supranational governance institutions, the gap between the rich and the poor continued to widen across the globe.

**Neoliberalism Invades the Social Sphere**

Part of the construction of neoliberal hegemony involved a 1990s attack on public health care institutions (Duggan xii) and two activists, Anita Rios and Karen Krause, identify those changes as their initial reasons for becoming involved in the anti-globalization movement. With
the implementation of managed care, health care workers were pressured to shift their focus from professional ethics and quality of care to controlling costs and maximum productivity (N. Rose 150-53). Rios and Krause suggest this shift in focus is connected to larger changes in the global economy.

While working at the Zeph Center, mental health care worker Anita Rios became frustrated with management’s push for productivity (billable hours worked) and accountability (increased paperwork) and their lack of consideration for providing quality service to clients. As she explored the problem, Rios found her concerns went beyond issues with upper management or the head of mental health services for the state. She concluded that there were larger forces at work and that the entire system was faulty:

[…] somebody was making a lot of money on one end and on the other end people were literally dying. People were struggling for healthcare. People were struggling to get their medications. People were struggling to provide services […]. That situation existed so that somebody could make a lot of money. So finding the bad guy to me was finding […] the reality that the system had to change.

In her attempt to address and confront neoliberalism, corporate greed, and free-market capitalism, Rios responded with increased political activism by joining the Green Party, a political party known for its anti-corporate rhetoric.

As a public health nurse, Karen Krause encountered similar frustrations and concerns. Individuals and families most in need, Krause witnessed, were unable to get health insurance and quality health care:
I’ve been very involved, I mean at the national level, with folks in healthcare reform movement. We recognized that the countries of the world that have good national health programs that give access to all of their residents, not necessarily citizens but all their residents, to high quality healthcare are being invaded by […] the medical-industrial complex. And so healthcare systems are being destroyed […] Managed care clearly is managed costs--has nothing at all to do with the imperative to deliver a high quality of healthcare to the folks who need it. Whether we’re talking about physical health, mental health and any combination thereof […], when the profit motives gets involved in healthcare it messes it up and it denies access to those who have the greatest needs.

Like Rios, Krause responded to neoliberalism’s impact on managed care by becoming increasingly politically active within the Democratic Party. As a member of both the central and executive committee of the local Democratic Party, Krause believes state actors have the power to create change and regulate capitalism. In 1996, Krause engaged in an unsuccessful run for state representative but was elected to serve on a local school board (Blade, “Toledo and Suburban”). To her dismay, Krause found the same neoliberal trends in education that she had discovered in the healthcare field. The concept of managed care, she asserts, has simply transferred to the educational sphere:

The same thing is happening. Pretty soon we’re gonna see a lot of folks not having access to high quality education. One of the important things that this country has always been based on. Takes one more step to say, and wait a minute, those kids dads aren’t gonna be employed either, or their moms, because good jobs are moving offshore. You run into the folks who are involved with the
women in Bangladesh. They’re working in the sweatshops. All of this begins to make sense.

Perceiving their professional struggles as connected to larger political and economic changes; both Krause and Rios use political activism to address their concerns over neoliberalism.

By the late 1990s, teacher and political activist, Mitch Balonek, began researching the business community’s connection with proficiency testing and theorized that their motivation was shaped by the neoliberal political economy under global capitalism.

Business leaders in particular pushed for education reform arguing that U.S. students were not being adequately prepared for global competition and rapid technological advances (I. Friedman 28). Unconvinced that the business community had altruistic intentions, Balonek views their support of proficiency testing as a method to produce two distinct classes of workers:

I became involved in a movement to oppose proficiency tests because I thought I saw how they were part of the global economy and how they served the politician. Business people were pushing these tests on states, like the Business Round Table was very interested for some reason in state mandated testing. And, when I started following that I started learning that there was something a little deeper going on that was affecting us in a variety of different ways. [I] mainly thought that they were trying to create a two-tiered system of education, a sorting system so to speak. Because of our new globalized economy, we have the need for a large segment of service industry workers, low paying jobs, low paying workers, and then we have this higher skilled technical side of our economy. And, of course, there are only a few people in the technical end needed whereas there is a large number of people needed in the service industry. So the testing system serves as a
sorting system to decide who is deserving of a diploma to move on maybe to higher education […]. I saw the effects this was having on our students and I teach in a predominantly African-American, it’s almost all African American school--poor, working class people for the most part […]. Over the last seven/eight years, […] even while our enrollment is going up, our graduation rates were dropping rapidly.

Balonek connects the neoliberal trend of increased accountability via proficiency testing to a further broadening of the gap between social classes. However, social class is not his only issue of concern.

Issues of social class, race, and gender, Balonek remarks, are intertwined but often oppression based on race or gender is ignored within anti-globalization discourse. Many progressive movements, including the anti-globalization movement, highlight social class oppression while issues of race and gender often become overlooked. Bridge building across race and gender differences, Balonek suggests, becomes very difficult when activists fail to include race and gender in their analysis:

We have many white males who attack social class oppression but they won’t look at oppression of people of color, so, or women. They just think […] [solving] the class problems will solve all the problems. Well, that’s not what’s going to happen. Like I said, I still don’t know how exactly to build those bridges completely except to teach people to understand […] that there are lots of different oppressions and that they all contribute to our segregation in a progressive movement.
Disturbed by the competitive nature of neoliberal globalization, Balonek argues that capitalists and politicians are responsible for creating a world of “winners and losers” and growing economic inequities both in the U.S. and abroad:

We have a small minority of people who pretty much own and run everything in this country. They have politicians in their hands, you know, in their pockets […]. We went from a country where corporations were given a charter for fifteen to twenty years and they had to serve a purpose [of common good], otherwise their charter would be revoked; to today where corporations are considered to have the same rights as any person […] and they have advantages that normal people don’t have […]. They can amass enormous amounts of wealth and concentrate it in the hands of a few and use that wealth to, you know, manipulate the economy, to gain more wealth and that’s what globalization is. It affects every one of us. We have corporations, large corporations that are now multinational; they can amass wealth around the world. They’re exploiting labor in poor third world countries. They’re exploiting labor here in our country.

From Balonek’s perspective, common citizens have little power under neoliberal globalization because the system is dominated by corporate-political alliances.

Precursors and Repercussions of the Battle in Seattle

During the 1990s, Witness for Peace and TACCA activists became involved with the School of Americas Watch (better known as SOA Watch), continued making trips to Central and South American countries, and saw first hand the impact of NAFTA and globalization in those countries. By the late 1990s, Chambers, Baldoni, Kay and others began attending the annual November SOA Watch demonstrations in Columbus, Georgia outside the Fort Benning army
post and received further education on the effects of globalization in Latin America. “In solidarity with the suffering poor of Latin America,” SOA Watch’s primary goal “is to close the SOA [now renamed the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation] and to change U.S. foreign policy in Latin America” (School of the Americas). SOA Watch national meetings and Ft. Benning demonstrations educated attending activists on NAFTA and FTAA and offered additional reasons for opposing free trade agreements. Chambers describes their experience in this way, “Some of us went for the first time to the School of Americas Watch in Fort Benning in November of 1998 and I’ve gone back in each year since. And, of course, that’s a major effect in understanding the effects of globalization in Latin America.” Kathy Baldoni’s experience with TACCA and the SOA Watch demonstrations in Ft. Benning led her to become a regional organizer for Witness for Peace and to take numerous philanthropic trips to Managua during the 1990s. Witness for Peace delegate, Michael Kay, made two trips to Colombia and one to Guatemala. Witnessing the tremendous poverty, exploitation of labor by multinational corporations, and environmental degradation, Kay has this to say about neoliberal globalization: “[…] the full impact of globalization policy upon these people was made summarily evident [during those visits].”

By 1999, the Battle in Seattle was ripe to occur. While at the 1999 SOA Watch demonstrations, Chambers met many activists from all over the world who planned to protest against the WTO in Seattle after the Ft. Benning protests ended. POCLAD had just published an analysis of the Commerce and Contract Clause calling it the “first free trade zone” in America (Ferner). Financial crises in Mexico, Asia, Russia, and Brazil along with the plummeting of dot.com stocks (Duggan 2; Seoane and Taddei 103) gave further evidence that not everyone could emerge as a winner under neoliberal capitalism.

While none of the thirteen activists interviewed attended the 1999 Seattle anti-WTO demonstrations, almost all of them referred to it as a very significant event in the anti-globalization movement and mentioned the importance of the broad-based coalitions and their success in disabling the ministerial meetings. The Seattle coalition included Green Party members, groups specifically focused on issues of globalization, environmental organizations, agricultural groups, organized labor, consumer groups, development/world hunger groups, anarchists, animal rights groups, and NGOs and activists from many countries of the South (Buttel 104; Kingsnorth 61). More than fifty thousand protestors paralyzed the downtown area sending a clear message to globalization’s proponents that not only opposition to neoliberal globalization existed but it also existed in very large numbers (Rhoads 237-38).

After the Battle in Seattle, anti-globalization activism blossomed and many Northwest Ohio activists increasingly embraced anti-neoliberalism discourse and allowed it to influence their groups’ goals and activities. Ralph Nader, known for his anti-corporate political stance, ran for president as a Green Party nominee in 2000, prompting the growth of Toledo’s Green Party. Large demonstrations occurred in Washington D.C., Windsor, Detroit, Calgary, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Melbourne, and Prague (Seoane and Taddei 109; Buttel 104-05). Especially after
missing the battle in Seattle, some Northwest Ohio activists felt compelled to participate in several of these events.

Toledo anarchist, Bruce Smith, attended numerous anti-globalization demonstrations during 2000 including the IMF and World Bank demonstrations in Washington D.C. and Cincinnati’s Trans Atlantic Business Dialogue. In April, thousands of union members, students, human rights activists, and environmentalists gathered in Washington D.C. to participate in demonstrations against the policies and practices of the IMF and World Bank (McFeatters). Later that same year in November, Cincinnati hosted the Trans Atlantic Business Dialogue and hundreds of activists showed up to protest what they viewed as corporate elitism, an exclusive meeting of international corporate and government leaders (Byczkowski). Smith attended these events with the goal of disrupting business as usual and the hope that direct action will eventually lead to revolution and a collapse of governance institutions. Critical of marches and rallies, Smith suggests that direct action (ranging from civil disobedience to militant acts) is the only truly effective means of protest. Asked why he attends such demonstrations, Smith remarked:

I think, you know, they [governance institutions] should not be happening at all and I think they shouldn’t exist […]. I’ll keep doing it until they don’t exist. I consider myself a revolutionary. I think the movement [the anti-globalization movement] should be a revolutionary, anti-capitalist one.

Reforming capitalist institutions, Smith contends, would be the equivalent of placing a band-aid on a corrupt, inhumane system. Opposed to representative democracy, Smith embraces the concept of direct democracy and envisions a future where “people in a collective would sit down and decide things themselves based on some consensus.”
Unlike most of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activists, Smith does not hope to democratize supranational governance institutions or regulate capitalism; his strategy is to eliminate both.

When questioned about collaborating with other activist groups, Smith notes that many progressive groups do not want to work with anarchists. Other activist groups, Smith suggests, reject radical tactics or change because they fear losing their own positions of power and privilege. Having allied with some groups in the past, Smith has found, “If things got too radical, they would abandon the anarchists.” His goal to destroy capitalism and governance institutions along with his willingness to engage in militant tactics are indeed rejected by many more moderate anti-globalization activists.

Some pacifists reject anarchist political philosophy and militant tactics and both Krause and Miller’s beliefs validate Smith’s experience of anarchist rejection. Expressing a disinterest in working with Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition anarchist members, Krause states she was uncomfortable with individuals who are, as she put it, “clearly uninterested in fixing this government.” Miller also expressed a discomfort with militant rhetoric and tactics and states, “The people I know and felt most comfort with were […] the people that were progressive in their politics but not necessarily revolutionary.” While anti-globalization activists seemingly agree on the goal of social justice, there is little agreement on which strategies and tactics will take them in that direction. Anarchist philosophy embraces direct action and, at times, militant tactics and suggests more traditional tactics are predominantly ineffective. Pacifists, on the other hand, seek nonviolent social change and believe positive social change can only originate through nonviolent means. Differing value systems make these alliances difficult to build and maintain.
In response to the Toledo visit of Mexican President Vicente Fox and U.S. President George W. Bush, Sept. 2, 2001 was the beginning of a weeklong series of anti-NAFTA events. While Bush and Fox celebrated the “success” of NAFTA, Baldemar Velasquez of the Farm Labor Organizing Committee, Lloyd Mahaffey of the United Auto Workers, U.S. Rep. Marcy Kaptur, and state Rep. Teresa Fedor held a news conference to raise awareness on NAFTA’s impact on labor rights and the environment (Blade, “Anti-NAFTA”). NAFTA, Mahaffey reasons, has caused a loss of U.S. jobs, and worker exploitation and environmental degradation in Mexico (Blade, “Anti-NAFTA”). Kaptur invited both Bush and Fox to join her on a tour of U.S. and Mexican factories to hear firsthand from the workers themselves about the impact of NAFTA (Blade, “Anti-NAFTA”). During his personal interview, Velasquez suggested that labor must organize internationally to effectively challenge the present conditions of globalization. Sharing stories of workers dying in the fields, denied medical attention, being cheated out of their rightful wages, and denied any avenue to redress their grievance, Velasquez proclaims, “We’ve got to do something regionally, nationally and globally to get an equal playing field for workers not to compete against each other.” During the anti-NAFTA events, Velasquez challenged Bush to legally recognize undocumented workers and provide them with labor rights (Blade, “Anti-NAFTA”).

Sharing his personal observations of anti-globalization activists, Velasquez indicated a preference for alliances with members of particular ethnic, social class, or religious groups. He characterized anti-globalization activists as fitting into one of three categories: those who are suffering and fighting for mere survival; progressive, intellectual idealists who join the movement for philosophical reasons; and members of the Christian community who participate
for moral reasons. The “premium” activists, Velasquez states, come from the religious community:

I think they take seriously the Jesus mandates that loving your neighbor as yourself, watching over the orphans, the widows and the aliens—the people that God guards jealously in the Old Testament and the New Testament—and they take that seriously. They think that ought to be reflected in our economic, political and social life. To me, those are probably the premium people because they’ll never give up […]. They are not going to let winning and losing be the measure of whether they do something like this or not.

Sharing a common ethnic identity with those he represents, Velasquez feels a strong sense of responsibility to fight for poor and undocumented laborers who are most vulnerable to worker exploitation. His words indicate that non-religious progressives who come out of academia, primarily members of the middle or upper class, have been a source of disappointment for him and, from his perspective, lack the conviction needed to remain in the movement for the long haul. On the other hand, Velasquez praises those committed to the tenets of Christianity, a religious perspective he obviously shares and values. Clearly, social hierarchies of race, class, and religion influence the quality of relationships, the negotiation of difference, and the ability to support long-lasting coalitions in this instance.

Not long after Toledo’s anti-NAFTA events ended, tragedy struck the U.S on September 11, 2001. Americans searched for reasons why such a tragedy occurred while the Bush administration promoted war and attempted to silence dissent. Many progressives connected the attacks of September 11 to U.S. economic, political, and military abuses (Duggan 69). Several progressive critiques suggested that the terrorists carefully chose their targets, that the World
Trade Center symbolized corporate power and economic coercion while the Pentagon and White House reflected military force and political power (Duggan 69). While the Bush administration promoted the so-called War on Terrorism, these analyses and anti-war protestors were discredited as “unpatriotic” (Duggan 69-70).

Refusing to be silenced, activists Anita Rios, Kathy Baldoni, and Amjad Doumani organized a peace march through the city of Toledo less than a week after September 11. Approximately one hundred fifty people marched from International Park to St. Francis de Sales Catholic Church carrying signs of peace (Zinn). The primary organizer of the event was the Northwest Ohio Green Party and it was endorsed by FLOC, the Interfaith Justice and Peace Center, Witness for Peace, St. Rose Peace and Justice Committee and the Greater Toledo Arab-American Association (Zinn). Encouraged by the strong turnout, Rios, Baldoni, and Doumani planted the seeds for a new peace organization, the Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition.

Rios, Baldoni, Doumani, Miller, Balonek, Ferner and many others came together to form the Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition (NWOPC) and included statements opposing corporate hegemony and economic inequities as part of their peace message. NWOPC’s vision statement includes not only a call for peace but embraces much of the anti-globalization discourse by focusing on social justice, human rights, environmentalism, issues of national sovereignty, democracy, and economic justice (Northwest Ohio). NWOPC’s “Points of Unity” reads, “Violence comes in many forms: from individuals as well as from nation-states and corporations […]. We will work to understand the root causes of violence and we will work for global peace by assuring that all human beings on this earth attain social, economic and political equality” (Northwest Ohio). Vowing to “monitor the actions and policies of our local and national communities, sovereign nations, and corporations,” the NWOPC vision statement rejects “war in
all its manifestations” (Northwest Ohio). Northwest Ohio’s peace organizations have increasingly embraced the anti-neoliberal rhetoric of the anti-globalization movement, have allied with other movements, and taken part in joint demonstrations but not without internal conflict.

Although she helped start the NWOPC, Rios has slowly decreased her activities with the group and expressed a frustration with the internal dynamics of progressive social movements in general. As a Latina, Rios has struggled to have her voice heard within the predominantly white, male leadership of a variety of progressive movements, including the anti-globalization movements. Rios put it this way:

I sometimes just want to say look I am tired of dealing with your white privilege and I am tired of dealing with your paternalistic attitudes and I’m not gonna do that anymore […]. But, on another level you come back to it and […] you realize […] there are good intentions behind what are conditioned ways of interacting with one another.

Noting that there are few people of color in many of the social justice campaigns she is involved with, Rios argued that one reason for this may be how people of color are treated within those movements. Suggesting that the anti-globalization movement cannot succeed without people of color and women, Rios proposed that activists must find ways to create organizational and structural changes that facilitate greater equity. As Rios indicates, conflicts around issues of race, gender, and group structure clearly exist within Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization community.

Anti-globalization coalitional protests continued and in April 2002 Washington D.C. was the site of three different but interlinked demonstrations: a pro-Palestinian/end the occupation rally, an anti-war demonstration, and another rally critiquing the policies of the IMF and World
Bank (McFeatters). Toledo anarchist, Bruce Smith, and Green Party leader, Anita Rios, were among the many who traveled by bus, plane, or automobile to this national “Stop the War” march and rally. During the morning and early afternoon, three separate rallies were held that ultimately converged into one massive march down Pennsylvania Avenue. Each group had its own specific goals yet expressed support for each other’s causes. Pro-Palestinian demonstrators, IMF-World Bank protesters, and anti-war protesters rallied together for human rights, social justice, and changes in U.S. and international government policies.

Around the same time period, Marge Reas, Steve Miller, and others began lobbying Toledo City Council to pass an anti-sweatshop resolution or actual guidelines for the city to follow when purchasing clothing, footwear, textile, and other related products. Reas, known as “the” anti-sweatshop activist in the area, has traveled numerous times to El Salvador and Nicaragua and feels compelled to object to the conditions of poverty and labor exploitation she has witnessed. “Seeing how the poor in Central America live,” Reas states, “and knowing about the whole sweatshop thing and how these people, especially the women, are taken advantage of and working for nothing to try and support themselves and their families really is difficult for me to take without objecting.” Those objections were heard and by November 2002 the City of Toledo passed an ordinance pledging not to buy goods made in sweatshops.

By the end of 2002, Northwest Ohio was ripe for its first concentrated effort to form an anti-globalization coalition. Attacks on labor unions, education, and health care combined with many activists’ exposure to exploited workers in Central and Latin America had local activists more determined than ever to confront the problems associated with globalization. Multiple years of battling neoliberal economic policies, like NAFTA, had local activists searching for ways to increase their political leverage through coalition building. Although there had been past
coalitional relationships among Northwest Ohio’s labor, peace and environmental movements, none of those alliances produced a formal group with a long-term, anti-globalization focus or agenda. Jobs With Justice (JWJ) was the first.

**Jobs With Justice Attempts to Bridge the Gaps between Movements**

Toledo’s Jobs With Justice coalition is part of a national movement to create strategic coalitions between college students, labor unions, and social justice organizations in an effort to support workers’ rights. According to the Jobs With Justice web page, more than forty U.S. cities have JWJ chapters and their grassroots movement hopes to recreate “the infrastructure that gives communities a sense of their own power” (About JWJ). Strategically, JWJ strives to challenge corporate power with a focus on four primary areas: 1) the right of workers to organize and collectively bargain; 2) access to healthcare; 3) “global justice” with a focus on the impact of globalization on the people of the world; and 4) issues concerning immigrant workers (About JWJ).

Toledo’s labor community was the initial driving force behind the formation of the local chapter however, many of the labor leaders lacked connections with community and faith-based organizations. Karen Krause, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) member and JWJ Co-Chair, puts it this way:

> When the labor community began to talk about forming a Jobs With Justice chapter here in the last year, they had no clue how to reach out [...] to other segments of the community [...]. And, I indicated that was not a problem. They bring the labor people. I could bring the other folks [...]. I was on the board of Toledo Metropolitan Ministries, which is the social action arm of the Council of Churches.
Krause, other union activists, and members of the social justice community searched their communities for groups and organizations interested in coalitional building and shared common ground with JWJ’s mission. Excited about the opportunity to collaborate with the labor community, peace activist Rev. Chet Chambers states, “The Jobs With Justice organization is really the first time we’ve really gotten linked with labor organizations.” By December 2002, JWJ held its first monthly meeting with dues paid by twenty-eight member organizations, approximately half social justice and half labor organizations. Farm Labor Organizing Committee, Teamsters Local 20, Witness for Peace-Great Lakes, Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition, Toledo Area Committee on Central America, Toledo Metropolitan Ministries, and twenty-two other charter members gave JWJ its start.

Toledo’s JWJ Co-Chair, Larry Clark, agreed to take on the responsibility of a leadership position because he likes JWJ’s goals and shares their notion of power in modern society. Over powered by the economic leverage of large corporations and the neoliberal economic agenda imposed by supranational governance institutions, many countries, Clark argues, have been forced to surrender their national sovereignty.

Capitalism, he contends, can and must be regulated by governing bodies that place human interests, not corporate interests, first. Clark puts it this way:

If multinational corporations have the ability to do whatever they want to anywhere in the world and they have more economic strength than the countries in which they operate, they’re really in charge […] And, even in this country the free trade agreements sometimes mean local laws are invalid. It supersedes local laws […] People have to gain control of their lives and have to create some kind of governmental system that gives them power to make decisions. And if they
don’t, the decisions will be made for them somewhere else and […] they will be based upon what creates the greatest economic wealth for some large corporation. It won’t be based upon what’s best for people.

Strategizing to address neoliberal globalization, Clark works for the democratization of power including the restructuring of capitalist institutions and a governmental system that provides opportunities for average citizens to influence state actors.

Aware of the fragility of coalitional relationships during the early stage of trust building, both JWJ leaders Krause and Clark expressed the need to cautiously avoid controversial topics and to limit JWJ’s focus to worker-related issues. Restricting their focus to issues likely to promote commonalities, JWJ members participated in campaigns to lower the price of prescription drugs in Ohio, acted as the primary sponsor of the City of Toledo’s anti-FTAA resolution, and led campaigns against the corporate giant Wal-Mart.

Wal-Mart, according to many anti-globalization activists, provides a perfect anti-corporate target and is ideal for building alliances across different social movements. When Wal-Mart opens up a new store, Clark argues, it not only offers low paying jobs but drives down the wages of competitors in the surrounding community and is able to undercut other retailers due to its immense purchasing capacity. Members of the social justice community dislike Wal-Mart for selling products produced in sweatshops, while Wal-Mart’s reputation for unfair labor practices and the elimination of its competitors has the labor community very concerned about the quality and quantity of jobs available to the working class. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activists said the following about Wal-Mart:

They [Wal-Mart] are […] the richest corporation now. They are paying their workers meager wages, lousy benefits. They have many court cases against
them now for the mistreatment of workers both in promoting female workers and minority workers as well as making workers work overtime without pay (Balonek).

I think, for example, Wal-Mart, I mean if I had to cite the incarnation of the devil in the corporate world […]. It has an impact everywhere. Its involved in a race to the bottom for so many different groups […]. Here you have this giant Wal-Mart effecting wages here in the United States in a race to the bottom, effecting wages in the maquila factories down in Latin America, ultimately affecting them in China and then effecting, of course, other businesses in this country in a snowball effect right across the line so that you have a lowering of wages all across the line (Kay).

We have a war going on here in Toledo with the Wal-Marts […]. [They] keep them [employees] under twenty-eight hours so they can’t get the insurance […]. What they are doing is competing against the grocery chains that have the good jobs and the good benefits and the good insurance […]. Those are the things [… ] that keep me going when I get up in the morning (Lichtenwald).

Certainly the labor community has a pretty good idea how Wal-Mart might harm them with their jobs […]. The social justice community, particularly the folks that have been involved in Central American issues and third world issues, are real aware of what’s going on in those plants that are producing the goods that then come in here for the low dollar (Krause).

Clearly, concerns about the practices and policies of Wal-Mart cuts across labor and a variety of social justice movements.
Free trade agreements also provide fertile ground for coalition building across movements. Chambers and others involved with TACCA developed an anti-FTAA resolution, requested that JWJ be the primary sponsor, and then took it to Toledo’s City Council. JWJ member Kathy Baldoni strongly objects to the FTAA for numerous reasons:

  This trade agreement is so connected to militarization of the Western hemisphere.
  We need in this country to maintain the status quo. We need to continue to be users of the world’s resources. We need to be this consuming machine. So in order to be this consuming machine, we have to keep down others, we cannot allow progress in other countries. We say that we do, we--I mean the government and corporations--are encouraging democracy but we’re really not […]. Right now, it’s not going to be an even playing field. And, that’s the thing with FTAA. It isn’t even. It is all about what the U.S. can glean from other countries.

Free trade agreements, Clark argues, “don’t protect the rights or workers and don’t protect the environment and really are only good for multinational corporations who have the ability to move any place they want to and exploit workers and exploit the environment.” Both labor and social justice JWJ activists enthusiastically supported the anti-FTAA resolution and the City of Toledo unanimously passed it in June of 2003. The diverse members of JWJ successfully rallied together and made some progress towards their goals.

When these interviews were conducted in November and December of 2003, Toledo’s chapter of JWJ was in the early stage of coalition building when members learn if they truly have shared goals and interests. During their interviews, much of the social justice community spoke of the importance of strong unions and clearly embraced labor’s causes. Labor activists, on the other hand, communicated a much more limited focus and spoke little, if at all, about peace,
environmental, human rights, or any other issue outside of meeting the immediate needs of union members. Toledo’s social justice and labor community arrived at the JWJ table with sometimes differing goals and agendas, not all of which were welcomed by all members.

Peace activism, from Lichtenwald’s perspective, caused problems in relation to his work with the Teamsters and his participation in JWJ:

[…] there were a lot of our people [JWJ labor members] mad because they [JWJ peace activists] came out so strongly against the war and our issue is suppose to be jobs […]. Whose kids are in the service? It’s the working class kids […]. They were joining the service to get an education and needed the benefits through the military. So they are offended by that […]. They really don’t represent all of our interests […]. My interests are for working people […]. Can I tell the members I’m spending their dues money on other issues other than their issues? So I have to be careful and we have to watch what we do because you can get labeled […]. What does Lichtenwald care about […] this, you know, what about my job? What about bringing jobs back to the United States? What about my healthcare? That’s what I elected him to do. So we have to be real careful to stick with the issues.

Peace campaigns, along with animal rights, environmental movements, and gay liberation, are examples of what Lichtenwald refers to as “luxury” social causes. Lichtenwald grew up during the Vietnam era and was angered by abusive antiwar protestors. “When a kid comes back from the service,” Lichtenwald states, “they’d [rich and spoiled kids] tease him and call him a baby killer.” Memories of young peace activists who avoided the draft through college deferments and disrespected soldiers returning home left Lichtenwald unsympathetic to the peace cause.
Lichtenwald’s attitudes and words illustrate how issues of group structure may cause coaltional dilemmas. Naturally, being a member of the working class and employed as an elected labor official has influenced Lichtenwald’s approach to social change. As a paid union representative, Lichtenwald suggests that issues outside of labor concerns are off limits to him. Consequently, his participation in JWJ has been minimal and several members from the labor community have followed suit.

Learning about and negotiating differences in goals and interests is an important early task in coalition building and JWJ obviously has a challenging task ahead of them. Comparing the participation levels of the labor and social justice community, JWJ Co-Chair Karen Krause expressed an awareness that much of the labor community has not fully committed to this project but is unaware of the reasons why. Some union activists had simply stopped attending JWJ meetings without first providing an explanation as to their reasons for withdrawing. Without open, honest communication, negotiating differences becomes impossible and coalitions simply fall apart. Krause and Clark face the difficult challenge of bridge building. If the diverse members of JWJ are successful in negotiating their differences in goals and interests, there will no doubt be additional differences to surmount as they grow and become an even more heterogeneous group.

While JWJ is unique in that it is Toledo’s first concentrated effort to unite social justice and labor communities with a common agenda, other Northwest Ohio anti-globalization activists are faced with the difficult challenge of bridge building as well. In order for Ferner and other POCLAD members to effectively coalesce with various social movements, their analysis of corporate, labor and legal histories, and development of strategies need to take into account a variety of standpoints. Rios is also faced with similar challenges: to recruit and organize Green
Party members using methods that are inclusive, encourage open and honest debate, and the negotiation of difference. Intending to run for Toledo City Council, Balonek faces the challenge of building alliances with Toledo’s labor unions while also considering the values and concerns of the social justice community and others. In fact, any Northwest Ohio activist interested in building alliances across movement, class, racial, ethnic, gender or religious lines must identify ways to effectively negotiate difference.

Retrospect

As neoliberal philosophy and economic logic spread, Northwest Ohio’s activists responded with increased anti-globalization activism. Lichtenwald, Krause, Rios, and Balonek’s early concerns about globalization were sparked by neoliberal changes in their professions. Trucking deregulation, decreased union membership, and a corresponding loss in power to negotiate fruitful labor contracts created considerable distress for Lichtenwald and the Teamsters. As members of the healthcare profession, both Krause and Rios experienced the negative impact of managed care on the mental health and nursing professions. Even teaching, as Balonek suggests, endured the stress of neoliberal changes with the publication of A Nation at Risk and the implementation of proficiency testing. Peace and migrant labor activism connected Chambers, Reas, Baldoni, Velasquez, and Kay to the harsh living and working conditions of Central America under NAFTA and other free trade agreements. For many of these activists, like Miller, Ferner, Smith, and Clark, concerns about the nature of globalization were simply part of a natural evolution in their activism. Neoliberal globalization, from the perspective of Northwest Ohio’s activists, takes power from the people and puts it in the hands of large corporations who are more than willing to exploit workers and the environment to increase profits.
Northwest Ohio’s activists have battled neoliberal globalization in a variety of ways. They have actively confronted and disrupted the business dealings of multinational corporations, like Wal-Mart and Owens Corning Fiberglass, and supranational governance institutions, like the World Bank, IMF, and the WTO. Working with members of Toledo City Council, lobbying by activists has led to the successful passage of the anti-sweatshop, anti-FTAA, and Living Wage resolutions. By 2002, Toledo activists formed Jobs With Justice, the first long-term coalition focused on worker’s rights and issues of globalization. As part of a movement still in its infancy, Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement still has much work ahead and faces the formidable challenges of building coalitions across difference and defying the institutions of global capitalism.
VI. CONCLUSIONS

Theories on neoliberalism help shed light on many of the political and economic changes that motivated Northwest Ohio’s activists to participate in the anti-globalization movement and Nikolas Rose’s essay especially stands out for lengthening his supposition to include aspects of the social. While Leys, Duggan, and N. Rose all describe the neoliberal stance and its history and consequences, N. Rose goes beyond the notion of neoliberalism as merely a new political philosophy and suggests this new orientation contains a power shifting rationale with new techniques of control that reach deep into the social sphere. Neoliberalism, N. Rose argues, aims to both privatize industry and to reconceptualize the relationship between the economic and the social by rethinking aspects of social behavior along economic lines (142). Three activists, Rios, Krause, and Balonek, indicate that pro-business rationales within the social spheres of education and health care played a large part in motivating them to question neoliberal principles and to develop concerns about issues of globalization. In the health care field, Rios and Krause’s place of employment, managed care is a rationalized program that equates service with productivity and places profit above professional concerns. In education, proficiency tests, Balonek argues, are supported by the business community with the proposed goal of improving education and teacher accountability but have functioned to broaden the gap between the social classes by tracking students into one of two types of work: jobs in the unskilled service industry for those who don’t pass the test or skilled/professional positions for those who do. These kinds of rationales within the social sphere are part of the neoliberal project and significant motivators for socially conscious activists.

Evidence of opposition to neoliberal globalization is apparent among Northwest Ohio’s activists as labor, peace, environmental, farm labor, and anarchist activists expand their
particular local and national concerns to include global interests. Prompting tremendous opposition, the implementation of NAFTA and the threat of its expansion incited action from numerous activists pushing them to look beyond local or national boundaries to include concerns about the power of transnational forces. Northwest Ohio’s activists took numerous actions in opposition to corporate hegemony and the ethos of neoliberalism including: the formation of POCLAD, the campaign opposing tax abatements for Owens Corning in Toledo, the Living Wage Campaign, local growth of the Green Party, Toledo’s anti-sweatshop resolution, the formation of JWJ, and increased participation in mass anti-globalization demonstrations. As neoliberalism spread into the social sphere and activists in the education and health care fields struggled with the shift from a focus on professional ethics and quality of service to a business rationale of controlling costs and maximizing production, they searched beyond the boundaries of their professions connecting their professional difficulties to larger political and economic changes occurring not only on a national level but globally. Concerns about labor rights, environmental degradation, and issues of social justice expanded beyond national boundaries and took on a global face. While local concerns have not disappeared, Northwest Ohio’s social movements have lengthened and reshaped their goals to include concerns about trade liberalization, the increased power of multinational corporations, and the ethos of neoliberalism.

Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement is a small sampling of the movement and its characteristics are reflective of Buttel, Seoane and Taddei’s portrayals of the movement in the global north. Typical of the movement in the north, Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activists come from a variety of social movements with considerable mobilization of organized labor groups. Labor, environmental, farm worker, social justice, and peace activists are the Toledo’s area’s most active anti-globalization activists. Congruent with Buttel, Seoane and Taddei’s
findings on the common ground found between activists, the diverse anti-globalization activists of Northwest Ohio jointly oppose the perceived threat of neoliberal globalization and share common enemies like the IMF, World Bank, WTO, and multi-national corporations.

While they embrace the anti-globalization discourse and clearly engage in activism that is often labeled anti-globalization, Northwest Ohio’s movement is not a cohesive movement based on a collective anti-globalization identity. Supporting J. Starr’s finding that even a successful alliance across movements can fail to produce a collective identity, all the interviewees in this study expressed concerns about the nature of globalization and directed much of their activism to address those concerns, but none of them claimed the label “anti-globalization activist” as their primary form of activism. Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement has two major factions: progressive or social justice community activists and traditional union activists. Members of TACCA, the Green Party, NWOPC, POCLAD, Witness for Peace, the Toledo Metropolitan Ministries, and the Interfaith, Justice and Peace Center identify with their own individual organizations as well as being part of Toledo’s progressive or social justice community. Most of these individuals know each other and support each other’s campaigns whether they address peace, environmental, or social justice issues. The bulk of Toledo’s labor organizations, on the other hand, view their activism as simply part of their employment and do not identify as members of the social justice community. Labor organizations tend to join forces with other labor groups and rarely coalesce with Toledo’s progressive community. Like Ferree and Roth’s study on coalition building concludes, this study finds that exclusive framing and campaign visions like those often found within labor organizations fail to promote a collective identity and encourage social isolation between groups.
Two notable organizations are exceptions to this pattern of social segregation in Northwest Ohio, FLOC and JWJ. Working from a position of weakness, FLOC relies heavily on the support of those outside of the farm labor movement, knows the value of having a broad base of allies, and has strong connections to both the labor and social justice community. Religious organizations and labor unions, Velasquez indicates, are the two groups FLOC has strong alliances with, yet FLOC has not engaged in a concerted effort to build bridges between these two communities. On the other hand, JWJ’s vision is to become a coalition of local community organizations and labor unions. Whether or not JWJ facilitates the successful coalescence of Toledo’s labor and social justice community or the formation of some type of collective identity has yet to be determined. JWJ has reached out to the majority of labor unions and community organizations in the Toledo area but is still in the early stages of coalition building and those relationships have not been firmly established. More than any other activist organizations, FLOC and JWJ have the potential to act as bridge builders between labor and community organizations.

Dilemmas of Coalition Building

Anti-globalization coalitions are fraught with numerous dilemmas as well as opportunities. A long legacy of conflict and cooperation exists between many of the movements involved in anti-globalization activism. Diverse social movements have multiple and sometimes conflicting interests that are magnified by each group’s social segregation. While coalitions increase political leverage, they typically are shifting and unstable limiting their ability to promote change. Northwest Ohio’s activists generously shared their challenges faced in coalition building and many of the lessons learned from them are applicable to other communities as well. Perhaps the most important contribution of this study is its implications for activist practice in building coalitions.
First, resembling the findings of Buttel, Seoane and Taddei on the broader anti-globalization movement, Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activists have differing visions for the movement and debate whether to reform or disable the institutions of capitalism. Smith clearly and boldly calls for the end of capitalism and views the anti-globalization movement as the reemergence of an anti-capitalism movement. Both Balonek and Miller make a strong critique of capitalism proclaiming it to be an unfair and unjust economic system but fall short of calling for its elimination. The realists in the group, Chambers, Clark, Kay, Krause, Velasquez, Reas, Lichtenwald, and Rios, oppose unfettered capitalism and seek regulations that will limit the power of corporations, increase the power of the public, and promote democracy.

Researchers suggest that among participants in the broader movement, differing views on capitalism splits the anti-globalization movement into two primary groups: one group that wishes to end capitalism and disable its institutions and another that hopes to reform or restructure capitalist institutions and create a more humane form of capitalism (Seoane and Taddei 119; Buttel 105). As these two camps engage in this debate on a local, national, and international level, the potential exists for the development of greater understanding and appreciation of opposing viewpoints, but reaching consensus on whether to destroy or alter capitalism’s institutions seems unlikely. As the studies of J. Starr and Altemose, and McCarty indicate, successful coalitions limit their focus to issues the broader community can support and avoid controversial goals. Anti-globalization activists hoping to build alliances across movements are more likely to succeed if they set aside the capitalism debate and choose to focus on confronting their common enemies.

Second, differences in group structure including notions of leadership and methods of decision-making influence the ability of Northwest Ohio’s activists to create alliances across
diverse social movements. Leadership accountability, for example, varies greatly between
groups. Labor leaders are elected making them accountable to their constituency while
leadership within social justice organizations tends to arise from some pressing need for change
and activism. Labor unions are structured and organized with dues withdrawn from members’
paychecks while most social justice groups lack any formal organization, dues are rare, and
membership fluctuates greatly. Bill Lichtenwald, President of the Local 20 Teamsters, feels
limited in the types of progressive issues he can support as a union representative but has
tremendous financial and human resources as part of organized labor. Members of Northwest
Ohio’s social justice community, on the other hand, freely support many progressive issues
without fear of alienating a constituency or losing their jobs but typically have little in the way of
financial and human resources. Decision-making differs as well with most labor decisions being
made by elected leaders versus consensus or majority vote within social justice organizations.
Differing notions of leadership are also a source of conflict in cross-movement alliances. When
asked about leadership in the anti-globalization movement, Lichtenwald named politicians who
support labor causes demonstrating preference for representative democracy and a clear chain-
of-command. Krause and Clark also purport a vertical model of organization in the operation of
JWJ with a few decisions made by the three primary leaders and major decisions being put to a
vote in a representative fashion with member organizations expected to act as agents for their
organizations. Reas, Smith and Baldoni, on the other hand, express preferences for participatory
democracy and the consensus model for making decisions. Participating in the decision making
process, they argue, allows for increased commitment to projects and ownership of decisions.
The Green Party, Rios suggests, is in the process of inventing leadership. Expressing frustration
with what she calls, “white, patriarchal forms of leadership,” Rios states, “I can not follow
accepted models of leadership, […] I am inventing the leadership that I’m comfortable with and it doesn’t always fit, is not always consistent with what is expected of me.” One structural change the Green Party made is to practice gender equity, placing women in leadership positions, and encouraging men to support them in that role. Leadership models vary from organization to organization and movement to movement.

Separate studies conducted by Banks, Mirola, and Fine share similar results, particularly in relation to the structural challenges of building alliances with labor organizations. Alliances between labor unions and Detroit’s religious community, Mirola suggests, failed in large part because of conflicting organizational structures (452, 457). In his study of JWJ coalitions, Banks argues that in regions where labor unions are strong, coalitions across movements tend to fail because labor leaders feel threatened with a loss of power by approaches to social change that contain inclusive practices (33). Fines’ interview with Mel King, leader of Boston’s Rainbow Coalition, reveals that King experienced the practices and polices of labor organizations to be oppressive and non-conducive to coalition building (“Rainbow” 148-49). A commitment to work through points of contention and an understanding of different group structures may provide insight into the various needs and interests of each group and decrease the number of conflicts encountered between groups. As Bystydzienski and Schacht’s research suggestions, participatory, nonhierarchical structural practices are most conducive to building cross-movement alliances (12).

A third dilemma within Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement is the common disagreement over what tactics are appropriate to deploy. Tactics may range from more militant, violent direct action (e.g., corporate property destruction and seizing control of a business site) to non-violent direct action (e.g., strikes and demonstrations that interfere with business) to
traditional/indirect forms of mobilization (e.g., petition drives and community education).
Activists from the anarchist community and other more radical groups typically prefer some type of direct action, are often open to militant tactics, and consider traditional forms of mobilization to be ineffective. Most of the social justice and labor community prefer non-violent direct and indirect action with most of their energies placed in traditional forms of mobilization. Within the broader movement, the issue of violent versus non-violent tactics is covered by Buttel (107) and Seoane and Taddei (119) and yields similar results. Disagreement regarding tactics is commonplace in Northwest Ohio and in the broader anti-globalization movement and whether or not to engage in violent tactics is a major source of contention. Which of these tactics is appropriate or effective is a continual source of debate and a difficult dilemma to overcome.

Finally, complicating all these dilemmas are social hierarchies based on race, class, gender, and religion and their influence on each group’s political viewpoint, motivations, goals, and approaches to social change. Five out of the thirteen interviewees mentioned conflicts and concerns involving one or more of these social hierarchies. Class-related conflicts were most frequently mentioned and the two activists of color both brought up race-related issues. White men dominate Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movement and, although they are well meaning, they cannot fully represent the needs and concerns of marginalized groups. Buttel suggests, and I strongly agree, that the anti-globalization movement needs to broaden its critique of neoliberal globalization to include marginalized perspectives and to build coalitions with identity-based minority groups as well as labor, environmental, peace, and other groups (109). Duggan makes this point as well and adds that when progressive movements fail to understand the cultural politics of neoliberalism, they reproduce the neoliberal project’s separation of economic/class issues and identity/cultural politics (xx-5). In order to generate long-term public
support, activists need to examine such issues as class, race, gender, and religion and their related power dynamics within the movement and as part of the neoliberal project.

Anti-globalization activists have much to gain from coalition building and engaging in open, honest conversations that reveal commonalities as well as differences. Stable alliances are needed to generate greater public support and political success. While differences between groups can be a source of tension and disagreements, heterogeneity may also be a source of strength. Fred Rose contends, and I agree, that coalition building provides opportunities for learning about difference, developing empathy for other perspectives, broadening viewpoints, building community, and strengthening democracy (160-62). Activists with a willingness to learn from others and a respect for differences are likely to build successful coalitions and in doing so increase their political leverage. Even if some differences cannot be resolved, agreeing to disagree on some issues while working together on others is a positive step towards building community and understanding among diverse groups.

Attention to the complexities of anti-globalization activism and coalition building are important to the scholarship on social movements. Future studies on this topic may take on a number of important directions. Anti-globalization activist as a collective identity needs to be explored in greater depth by comparing individuals in the anti-globalization movement who embrace anti-globalization as an identity with those involved who do not. Comparing activists’ notions of globalization and their conceptions of power along with their thoughts on whether to reform or disable the institutions of capitalism is also important. More comparative studies on anti-globalization activism in the global south and north are needed along with empirical studies on transnational coalition building. Identifying and describing how and why some local coalitions grow into national or transnational movements is also an important direction of study.
Also needed are studies on anti-globalization activists who exist on the margins of the movement and with whom few groups attempt to ally. Above all, this case study provides a history of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization movements, information on the motivations of its diverse activists, and their experiences with coalition building. Anti-globalization activism in Northwest Ohio arose in response to the political, economic, and social transformations brought about by neoliberal globalization and this study provides a nuanced picture of that history along with an analysis of both the constraints and possibilities of coalition building across involved movements.
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APPENDICES

Appendix One: Survey Instrument

Northwest’s Ohio’s anti-globalization activists were asked the following general questions:

1. Tell me your story as an activist. When, how, where, and why did you become an activist and what led you to become concerned about issues of globalization?

2. What is our local history of anti-globalization activism? What do you see as the important events locally, nationally, and internationally?

3. What has your experience been in communicating and collaborating with other social movements? How has this been accomplished and with whom?

4. What are the shared issues concerning globalization that have brought together diverse social movements and how have those issues become more important than differences? How have activists from separate social movements connected with one another and how have those connections been maintained?

5. How have differences been negotiated and who are the key players who have helped to build bridges?

6. How does the decision making process occur?

7. What does leadership look like within the anti-globalization movement?

8. What is the quality of relationship within these coalitions? (Relationships of tolerance and acceptance of differences or empathy and respect of differences)

9. How have collective actions occurred? (Spontaneous or planned)

10. How have new technologies played a role in your communications with activists in other social movements?
11. From your own subjective point-of-view, has the anti-globalization movement reclaimed or created accessible community space that is used as a forum for public debate? If so, is this space accessible on a local, regional, national, and/or global level?

Appendix Two: Interviewee Background Information

My discussion in chapter five on the history of Northwest Ohio’s anti-globalization activism mentions thirteen activists from a variety of social movements. Listed in alphabetical order, this appendix provides greater information on their very interesting lives and histories as activists.

*Kathy Baldoni* was first exposed to issues of social justice at an early age. She learned her sense of social responsibility from her mother who taught migrant workers to read and helped with housing and resettlement issues. During high school, Baldoni learned about grassroots organizing as she worked on McGovern’s presidential campaign. After graduating from college, she became a Jesuit community organizer in Fresno, California working in low-income neighborhoods and later worked for the National Land for People whose primary goal was to protect small landowners for the all-too-frequent land grabs of multinational agribusiness corporations in California. Later, Baldoni became involved with SOA Watch, TACCA, and eventually became the regional director of Great Lakes Witness for Peace. Her major causes are peace, social justice, and labor rights for sweatshop workers with a particular focus on Latin America.

*J. Mitch Balonek* grew up in a working class family and began his work life by selling motorcycles and working in an auto manufacturing plant. He worked his way through college and became an English teacher at Scott High School. Known for his strong stance against mandatory proficiency tests, Balonek’s activism within school systems has expanded to include
active memberships in the Green Party and the Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition. He continues to teach at Scott High School and is presently running for Toledo City Council.

Rev. Chet Chambers is a retired Methodist minister active in TACCA, JWJ, SOA Watch, and TMM. Beginning in his college years, he became concerned about issues of world peace and became part of the United Methodist student movement. As part of that movement, Chambers protested the Korean War and McCarthyism and was exposed to various activists in the civil rights movement. His goal of developing the Hispanic congregation in Toledo took him to Spanish language schools in Mexico and Nicaragua where he learned not only about those two countries but also heard speakers from Guatemala and El Salvador and learned about the Contra War. Chambers has considerable expertise on free trade agreements and opposes trade agreements that do not include protections for labor and the environment.

Rev. Larry Clark became interested in social issues while attending high school in the 1960s. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the civil rights and antiwar movements had a profound impact on Clark and he linked the scriptures calls for justice to what was happening in the world. He felt not only called to serve as a minister but to minister in the city. He has served as a pastor in low-income neighborhoods that have either had multiracial or African American congregations. Presently, Clark serves as the executive director of Toledo Metropolitan Ministries, the co-chair of Erase the Hate, and the co-chair of the Toledo Area Jobs With Justice Coalition.

Mike Ferner began his work as an activist in his youth. As a young teenager, Ferner worked in the sugar beet fields side by side with migrant workers and sometimes visited them in what he called “deplorable” housing facilities. Horrified by what he saw, he wrote a letter to his Congressmen, asked for help, and minor improvements took place as a result. From that point
on, he felt committed to social justice and activism. During the Vietnam War, he served almost four years in the Navy Hospital Corp, obtained conscientious objector status, and then became active in the peace movement. After the war, Ferner’s focus turned to labor and environmental issues. He co-founded the Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy and acted as a union organizer for the AFSCME and communications director for FLOC, AFL-CIO. He served two terms as an independent member of the Toledo City Council from 1989 to 1993 and made a failed run for mayor in 1993. Ferner has traveled to Iraq with Voices in the Wilderness and has memberships to Veteran for Peace, the Labor Party, and the ACLU. Presently, Ferner is the Communications Coordinator for POCLAD.

*Michael Kay* has a long history of activism. He began as a labor activist at his first job as a longshoreman on Lackawanna Railroad where he tried to organize a union unsuccessfully. Later, he attended the University of Minnesota where he met his future wife Betty Ruth and became involved in a variety of radical activities on campus including campaigns opposed to McCarthyism, war, and racism. Kay’s first position out of graduate school was an Instructor’s position at Tuskegee Institute where he became even more involved in the civil rights movement. Even as a professor, Kay organized students around a variety of social justice issues. Kay has worked with FLOC, traveled to various parts of Central America as a Witness for Peace delegate, participated in SOA Watch demonstrations, was a leader in the Kucinich for President campaign, and is a retired University of Toledo history professor.

*Karen Krause* is a life-long activist involved in numerous causes. As a teenager, Krause was active in the civil rights movement. As a young wife with a husband in the military, she rallied against the Vietnam War. Krause has been a public health nurse most of her life and has been involved in campaigns involving universal health care and AIDS and has made human and
worker rights her major issues of concern. Her work in the health care field brought her to union activism and increased participation in the Democratic Party. Krause remains involved in numerous professional, labor, political, and church related organizations. To name a few, Krause is President of the AFSCME Retirees Chapter 1184, Co-Chair of the Toledo Area Jobs With Justice Coalition, an acting board member of Toledo Metropolitan Mission, President for the governing board of the Lucas County Educational Services Center, and Chair of the Ohio Public Health Association.

_Bill Lichtenwald_ grew up in rural Dell, Ohio and got his first union job at age eighteen with a trucking company. He worked the loading docks and observed the harsh and unreasonable treatment of laborers by bosses. Motivated to gain some control over his livelihood, Lichtenwald developed an interest in unionization and began participating in union meetings. He was eventually hired as a business agent for UPS and elected president of their union. Today, Lichtenwald is a union representative for the Teamsters Local 20 and his major concerns involve free trade and the protection of American labor.

_Steve Miller_ was first attracted to political activism during the 1960s by the socially conscious messages contained in the music of Peter, Paul, and Mary, Bob Dylan and others and felt moved by the message of Martin Luther King, Jr. and other civil rights leaders yet he remained on the periphery of any movement. Fearing he would be drafted during the Vietnam War, Miller enlisted in the army for four years and served in Japan. After his time in the service, he worked selling life insurance and shoes but did not find the personal fulfillment he desired. During the early 1980s, Miller listened to a speaker involved in the nuclear weapons freeze campaign and felt compelled to take action. He called the Interfaith Justice and Peace Center in search of organizations to become involved with and has not slowed down since. Miller has been
involved in various peace and environmental campaigns, the anti-apartheid movement, the fight for a living wage ordinance in Toledo, and is presently a leader in the Northwest Ohio Peace Coalition. Much of his work has a legislative focus as he has lobbied local, state, and federal politicians to support or oppose legislation.

_Marge Reas_ began her life of activism after graduating from nursing school. Working for two years in the mountains of New Guinea as a nurse opened her eyes to third world conditions and U.S. imperialism. Having worked as both a nurse and counselor, most of her professional life has been in service to the poor and/or mentally ill. During the Vietnam era, she was active in the peace movement and later in the nuclear freeze movement. Reas traveled to El Salvador and Nicaragua during the Contra war and has since been to other parts of Central America witnessing the impact of NAFTA and the horrific labor conditions of sweatshops. Reas’ recent activities include participation in JWJ, protests against the so-called war on terrorism, involvement with Toledo City Council’s anti-sweatshop ordinance, and contributions to _Linkages_, the Interfaith Justice and Peace Center newsletter. Reas is best known in the Toledo community for activism regarding labor rights and sweatshops.

_Anita Rios_ began her activism as a youth in the Latino community working with FLOC. She spent several years working as a mental health case manager at Zeph Community Mental Health Center where she became head of their union and involved with the universal healthcare movement. After running in to numerous barriers to creating change, Rios concluded that political activism is the best mechanism for creating systemic change and is presently the national co-chair of the Green Party of the United States. Rios is quite active in peace, environmental and antiracist movements.
Bruce Smith (pseudonym) received his first exposure to feminism and peace activism as a teenager when his sister began taking him to large demonstrations in Washington D.C. and elsewhere. Involved heavily in the punk scene, much of his early political education came from the messages of political punk bands. Being an avid reader, Smith is a heavy user of the library and enjoys reading anarchist books, zines, and pamphlets. He believes that some sort of direct action is necessary to create change and has been involved in a wide range of demonstrations including gay rights, pro-choice, antiwar, anti-globalization, and antiracist rallies and has been involved with Marxist/Leninist organizations, Food Not Bombs and numerous anarchist collectives. He has traveled and lived in many parts of the U.S. and has been involved in the squatting scene in several major cities. Smith asked to remain anonymous for this study and asked only to be identified by a pseudonym.

Baldemar Velasquez is the son of migrant workers and became involved in the farm labor movement out of necessity and his belief in social justice. His family was recruited from South Texas to work on Ohio farms during the sugar beet and tomato harvest. He and his family remained in Ohio during the winter months borrowing money to survive and working all summer and spring to pay off their debts. Velasquez learned to speak English and later attended college where he learned about discrimination and racism. With an increased awareness of migrant worker oppression, Velasquez directed his anger towards the fight against injustice and demanded decent treatment, pay, and housing for all migrants. He is the founder of FLOC and has been working to empower migrant workers ever since.