high-level access for a transnational movement, but identification of a campaign with foreign intervention can decertify its proponents.

So much for a summary: what are the implications of this chapter's arguments? In the past decade, advocates of transnational activist networks have highlighted many successful instances of successful intervention on behalf of actors too weak to advance their own claims. In an internationalized world, we are likely to see more and more of such intervention, so it is important to look at it without illusions. Transnational intervention fails more often than it succeeds. First, heavy-handed or culturally insensitive transnational agents can delegitimize their partners and produce a backlash against foreign intervention (Bob 2002; Snyder and Vinjamuri 2004). Domestic failure is often an outcome of the very success of transnational intervention, when domestic activists come to depend upon it (Schmitz 2001). Third, domestic cultures of dissent may be resistant to even the most logical applications of international practice (Mendelson and Gerber 2004).

I have focused on domestic politics in this chapter because that is the framework in which most people live and where the changes in transnational activism will ultimately be felt. But this focus on domestic politics is rather one-sided; it leaves unexamined the broader international impact of the new transnational activism. It also leaves unexamined the major challenge to transnational activism of the early twenty-first century: how will the rise of muscular unilateralism on the part of the world's only superpower affect internationalism and thus the future of transnational activism? In the conclusion, I turn to the major changes in the international system as I see them and to the three big questions I pose in the Introduction to this book.

11

Transnational Activism and Internationalization

As summer ended in 2001, a range of Washington-based organizations were planning a demonstration against a meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Gillham and Edwards 2003: 91). Made up of a coalition of national and international advocacy groups, church and community organizations, and trade unions and environmental campaigners, they had organized themselves into a coalition, Mobilization for Global Justice (MGJ). Their goal was to mount "the latest in a series of high-profile, mass demonstrations since the Battle of Seattle had nearly brought the meetings of the World Trade Organization to a halt in 1999" (p. 92). These two institutions had been targeted by a protest a year earlier, but in the wake of the killing of a young demonstrator in Genoa in July (see Chapter 10), the Washington police were preparing for a much bigger confrontation.

The organizers were prepared as well, with the panoply of electronic communication, face-to-face "spokescouncils," and radical puppetry that had become familiar in international demonstrations since Seattle. But they were by no means all "global justice" activists, for they varied in character and degree of militancy from advocacy "insiders" to activist "outsiders." And although their claims ranged from the most global to the very local – remember the "global gardeners" in Chapter 4 – their plans were structured around the focal point of these international institutions. Everything seemed to conspire to promise the most vast, energetic, and potentially disruptive international protest of the year 2001.

But when four terrorist airplane-bombs crashed into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the Pennsylvania countryside on September 11, everything changed for the MGJ. In their careful reconstruction, Gillham and Edwards specify the various responses of the organizers. Of the roughly

eighteen events and protests that were planned for the week of the World Bank – IMF meeting, ten were canceled outright and four others were revised to respond to the new situation. The most disruptive protests and theatrical events, like radical puppetry, were canceled, and several new and more conventional activities were decided upon. A number of groups that had worked to plan MGJ events dropped out or scaled back their involvement. In particular, the AFL-CIO, which had always been queasy about working alongside radical peace groups, pulled its forces from the coalition to devote its energies to disaster relief. Strains quickly appeared in the coalition, in part echoing traditional ideological differences, but in part on the basis of different appreciations of the national tragedy. Some groups wanted to cancel the demonstration, others determined to maintain it as planned, while others turned swiftly to what they already saw as the growing threat of war.

The result was that many people who had been expected to travel to Washington didn't show up. Most of the media stayed away and the broad panoply of meetings, protests, trainings, and marches that had been meticulously planned around the theme of global justice collapsed in favor of a much smaller and more-conventional protest. The disaster on September 11 was a historic hinge, not only for the United States and its relations with the rest of the world, but for a movement that had found a surprisingly warm reception in the heart of global capitalism.

Would the movement collapse, go into hibernation, or survive in a different form (Mittelman 2004a)? Some of its components shifted permanently into antiwar activities; others – stunned by the attacks on September 11 – subsided into passivity as the country prepared for war; still others soldiered on in a campaign that attempted to reframe global injustice around the target of American militarism. Like many social movements, the global justice movement's fate depended heavily on forces outside its control.

What Is Happening Here?

The derailment of the September 2001 protests underscores many of the assumptions and findings of this book: about internationalism and globalization; about the wide variety and varied sources of "rooted cosmopolitanism," about the fragility of a global movement faced by the unimpaired power of states, and about the processes of transnational contention and their significance. It also affords a convenient foundation on which

to summarize the previous chapters and will help to respond to the broad questions raised at the end of Chapter 1:

- To what extent and how does the expansion of transnational activism change the actors, the connections among them, the forms of claims making, and the prevailing strategies in contentious politics?
- Does the expansion of transnational activism and the links it establishes between nonstate actors, their states, and international politics create a new political arena that fuses domestic and international contention?
- If so, how does this affect our inherited understanding of the autonomy of national politics from international politics?

Internationalism and Internationalization

The story of the failed September 2001 Washington protest allows us to summarize the main findings of this study and propose answers to some broader questions. First, the Washington event lends support to my contention that the new transnational activism recruits supporters around the focal points of international institutions, regimes, and events. Like the European Union that was the target of the "tuna war" in Chapter 4, the Davos meeting that led to the formation of the World Social Forum in Chapter 7, the work of the International Center for Transitional Justice that we encountered in Chapter 10, and much more, internationalism is a structure of threat and opportunity within which the new transnational activism has emerged.

Some observers have seen internationalism as no more than the public face of globalization; others have seen it as no more than intensified horizontal ties between states; still others only as international economic exchange. My view is that it is a triangular structure of opportunities, resources, and threats within which transnational contention is mobilized. Internationalism's horizontal axis is indeed found in a dense network of intergovernmental and transnational ties; its vertical axis consists of the extraordinary growth of international institutions, treaties, and regimes; and it provides the framework within which global economic exchange is organized. This structure provides the opportunity space within which efforts to control globalization, advance human rights, reverse environmental threats, dislodge dictatorships, and, most recently, oppose resurgent militarism are made.

For simplicity and to focus on contentious processes, I have treated internationalism as a static process, but there has been evidence of growing internationalization throughout this book. Internationalization is the broad process through which the density of both horizontal and vertical ties expands and opportunities and threats are externalized. We have seen evidence of it in the increasing number of international organizations, in the greater reach and influence of international institutions, in the growth of decision making and standards setting by transgovernmental committees and compacts, and in the extent to which nonstate actors are using international venues to advance their claims.

Processes of Transnational Contention

Within this broad process, nonstate actors are present in three sets of contentious processes. Two more "domestic" processes were described in Part Two – global framing and internalization. Two international processes that I called externalization and coalition building were described in Part Four. Linking the two are the two transitional processes I examined in Part Three – diffusion and scale shift.

In both the planning of the protest against the World Bank and IMF meeting and its derailment after September 11, many of the processes we have seen at work in this book were present. That event will help us to summarize the findings of these chapters; its disappointing outcome will guard us against excessive hope for the creation of a brave new world.

- *Global framing.* In Washington, even palpably domestic issues, like the plight of the homeless, were included under the global umbrella of a protest against these international institutions; but more important was the framing of domestic inequality as the result of global processes. Global justice protesters have helped even conservative Americans see the costs of rampant outsourcing of goods and services.
- *Internalization.* The Washington protesters were also using the event to challenge domestic opponents on domestic ground; as we saw in Chapter 5, internalization of international pressures has gone further in the European Union, where farmers, fisherman, pensioners, and anti-GM protesters target their national officials as proxies for hard-to-reach international institutions. But Americans, too, use international venues to challenge domestic opponents.

- *Diffusion.* Throughout this book we have seen the transnational brokerage and theorization of forms of contentious politics, which are then adopted and adapted in places very different than their place of origin. As in the spread of the Gandhian model of nonviolence in Chapter 6, a new form of protest organization – the so-called "Seattle model" – was planned for the streets of Washington until September 11 intervened.
- *Scale shift.* Scale shift is a vertical process that diffuses collective action – and often the response to it – to higher or lower levels. We saw it in its most lethal form in the creation of a global Islamist network and its most pacific in the groups that adapted the World Social Forum model to the local level in Western Europe. In Washington, activists from the American Northeast and the West came to Washington to join a national protest event.
- *Coalition formation.* Finally, "insiders" like the AFL-CIO and the Sierra Club joined uneasily in the Washington protest with outsiders like Anti-Capitalist Convergence and the Ruckus Society in an "event coalition" like the ones we saw in Chapter 9. Transnational campaign coalitions are the surest sign that enduring networks of activists and advocates can have an impact on global governance.
- Note the process that did *not* appear in the Washington protest – *externalization.* Only one group in the Washington protest even took it upon itself to maintain ties with foreign allies, and there were almost no foreigners present at the demonstration. This may be a function of the perceived centrality of the United States, of the isolation of that country from other centers of resistance to neoliberalism, or of the parochialism of American progressivism. In any case, it underscores the difficulty of creating truly global movements, even when the target of a campaign is a clearly global institution.

If internationalization continues to expand, we can expect all of these contentious processes to become more prominent.

Rooted Cosmpolitanism

The new transnational activism is as multifaceted as the internationalism within which it has emerged. Although globalization and global neoliberalism are frames around which many activists mobilize, the protests and organizations we have seen in this study are not the product of a global imaginary but of domestically rooted activists who target dictatorship,

human rights abuse, HIV/AIDS, or militarism and its side products, or emerge from within religious denominations or their surrogates. Nor are the forms of their activism limited to the ones that appear in the press or on the internet. From sturdy port inspectors defending seamen's rights on shore to Greenpeace opposing oil platforms at sea; from well-dressed NGO insiders in New York and Geneva to activists on the ground in Sudan or Afghanistan; from quiet supporters of the "good" NGOs supporting peace, the environment, or human rights to the noisy protesters of Seattle or Genoa, transnational activism is a many-sided phenomenon. Its activists are the connective tissue of the global and the local, working as activators, brokers, and advocates for claims both domestic and international.

The events of September 11 revealed that transnational activism has a "dark side," one that we saw in Chapters 3 and 7. As the enthusiastic supporters of the Mobilization for Global Justice were planning to protest global neoliberalism peacefully, the "birds of passage" of political Islamism, disguised as "nested pigeons" in immigrant ghettos, were preparing to destroy the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. Although there is little in common between the liberal and progressive groups that planned the Washington demonstration and the militant adepts of political Islamism who attacked the World Trade Center, both reflect the tangled skein of transnational ties that weave our world together.

Resilient States, Fragile Movements

Notice that I did not claim that the processes I have examined are breaking down the walls of the state system. Internationalism takes a number of forms that impinge on but do not destroy the power of states: the "multilevel governance" that Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks (2002) uncovered in the European Union; the "complex multilateralism" described by O'Brien and his collaborators (2000); and the weaker mechanisms of NAFTA, the International Landmines Convention, and the Kyoto process. Internationalism is not an inexorable force working against the state but a loose framework of institutions, regimes, practices, and processes that include state actors and penetrate domestic politics. The lesson of the story that began this chapter and of many of the episodes described in this book is that internationalism is partial and many-faceted and intersects with the determined powers of states and the international institutions they have created. Later I turn to the question of whether it is reversible and reversing.

The 2001 Washington demonstration also underscores the fact that, in contrast to the hopes of many advocates, states are still robust in respect to transnational activism. From a sleeping giant that seemed unable to defend itself against the terrorist attacks of the 1990s, the United States responded to the September 11 outrages like a wounded tiger, transmuting itself into an aggressive military power abroad and a semipraetorian state at home. That dynamic profoundly affected the American global justice movement too, as the story of the Washington protest suggested. In response to September 11 and the war fever that it triggered, many American activists retreated from the broad terrain of global neoliberalism to the more immediate ground of electoral politics, where their lack of success in 2004 was palpable. Were they turning permanently inward? It is too soon to tell, but despite the thinly veiled attacks of the Bush administration against the UN, large majorities of Americans – even elites – still supported the organization after 9/11.

Both domestic and transnational movements depend on external threats and opportunities; but these are more volatile in international politics, where institutional routines are less established, allies and enemies change their strategies at will, and there is no single core of public authority. If we define internationalism as a triangular opportunity space made up of states, international institutions, and nonstate actors, we are bound to see states – especially powerful ones – asserting themselves periodically within this framework and movements struggling to reshape themselves around these changes, as we did in the failed Washington demonstration in September 2001.

Moreover, the world of the early twenty-first century is not neatly divided into a camp of statists and globalizers on one side opposed by a composite movement for "global justice" on the other. Such condensation makes for exciting politics and popular journalism, but it is reductionist on both counts. On the one hand, the post–Iraq war world is a lot more multilateral than it seemed when American forces stormed into Baghdad in March 2003; on the other, the "global justice" movement is a lot more fragile than its advocates hoped. Through its energy and diversity, the movement helped to dignify and generalize a wide variety of claims that might otherwise have remained local. But its geographic and sectoral dispersion and the different targets of its components made it difficult to sustain as a unified movement. To be sure, the movement put new issues on the global agenda; but states and institutions have inherited and are processing them.

Processes and Mechanisms

Some readers may have wondered why I have focused so much attention in this book on political processes and their constituent mechanisms. In response to earlier efforts of this kind (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001), some complained at what they regarded as a description of processes in place of the crisper correlational analyses that some regard as the only true social science. I have argued that specifying the mechanisms of contentious politics, and trying to understand how these mechanisms combine in political processes, can tell us how robust those processes are likely to be and will help us to understand their outcomes.

Consider diffusion, the most widespread and easily observed transnational process we examined. Were we to adapt only the dominant "relational" model of diffusion from domestic practice, we could produce high levels of significance connecting diffusers and adopters of particular forms of contentious politics. But would we be able to understand how, say, the Zapatista solidarity network was diffused from Chiapas to North American and Western Europe partly through *non*relational means? Or the key role of international brokers in the mediated spread of nonviolent strategy from India to the United States and from there to Serbia and Georgia?

Moreover, better specification of the mechanisms of diffusion not only traces its pathways but helps to understand its reach and outcomes. Diffusion through established networks of trust is the surer and more durable pathway, but its reach is limited by its dependence on the preexisting ties of those who pass on the message. Nonrelational diffusion – for example, through the internet – has greater reach, but its impersonal nature makes its impact thinner than that of relational diffusion. Mediated diffusion depends on brokers who connect otherwise unconnected actors, and thereby gain leverage over the content of the message. Trying to understand transnational contention by observing its processes and specifying their mechanisms is not a lesser form of analysis than correlational work; it is a different kind of causal analysis.

But identifying the processes of contentious politics that form within internationalism is only the first task in understanding that complex phenomenon. Eventually, we will need to turn seriously to the methodological questions that have been ignored in this book and attempt to put together different processes with one another and with different contexts. That is a task for another time, and, probably, for other researchers. Instead, I want to try to respond to the three big questions posed at the outset: What is

new in the new transnational activism? Does it involve a fusion of domestic and transnational contention? What does it say about the inherited divide between national and international politics?

What's New?

The disappointment to activists of protests like the September 2001 event in Washington, D.C., undermine hopes that a global movement of resistance will triumph in a state-centered world. But seen in the light of the changes in contentious politics over the past few decades, even this failed demonstration offers evidence that something new is happening. We can summarize these changes in three ways: in new "global" attitudes, in new forms of organization, and in the shifting campaigns and composite forms of transnational activism.

New Attitudes

We saw in Chapter 4 that while the vast majority of citizens identify primarily with their localities and their national states, younger citizens are more likely to feel attachments to the continental or global levels than their elders Moreover, even in the wake of 9/11, large numbers of people interviewed in the World Values Study believed that key policy areas – like the environment, immigration, and development – are best dealt with by international institutions (Jung 2005). While there is little evidence of either mass or elite globalism, there is growing evidence that young people communicate more easily across borders, and that activists participate around common themes across the world, as we saw in both the movement against the Iraq war in 2003 and in the rapid diffusion of the model of the World Social Forum.

This does not mean (and it is worth repeating) that transnational activism is displacing activists' domestic involvements or escaping national constraints. Consider the massive number of Italians who marched past the Coliseum in February 2003: some had their attention turned from domestic to transnational activism by the Zapatista rebellion of 1994; others by the Genoa G-8 protests of 2001; still others by the "social forums" that emerged in Europe and in Italy after Porto Alegre. When della Porta and her collaborators interviewed many of them on their way to Genoa or in Florence, they identified strongly with the struggle against globalization (della Porta et al. 2006). But the majority were deeply embedded in

domestic forms of activism. Outraged by their government's abuse of peaceful protesters in Genoa, their turn to transnational activism filled a gap that had opened in Italian politics with the collapse of the the Communist Party (see Figure 7.2). The new activists represent less a migration from domestic to international arenas than a transmutation of domestic activism.

New Forms of Organization

New forms of organization are being created that bring people together in transnational campaigns and coalitions. Spokescouncils and working groups have replaced the bureaucratic organizations of the past and mediate between the need for coordination and group autonomy. Between these events, most participants melt back into their own societies, but organizers remain in touch with one another through friendship networks, e-mail contacts, and, increasingly, through on-line internet connections.

There is no doubt that the internet speeds the organization of event coalitions and eases the maintenance of between-event coalitions. It is at the core of a new type of movement organization, one that is no longer dependent on fixed, place-based activities (W. L. Bennett 2005). It has produced forms of activism indigenous to its technology – "hactivism" – which range in form from on-line comedy to entering and corrupting official websites for political purposes (Samuels 2004). It is also a tool in "cyber terrorism" and has helped to build and maintain the "dark side" of transnational activism (Sageman 2004). But it is less clear that, in the absence of trust-producing face-to-face contacts, the internet can create a social movement.

Like every other new form of communication, the internet both increases the speed of communication and creates inequalities of access. Moreover, when it comes to building a unified movement, ease of access to communication is a mixed blessing, because every activist who is capable of building a website can challenge established organizers and disperse a unified movement into a number of separate campaigns. Finally, states and countermovements have proved adept at using the internet too, responding in real time to on-line activist campaigns and using their information channels to infiltrate and oppose them.

At the other extreme of organization are the campaign coalitions we examined in Chapter 9. These are unglamorous, require constant negotiation, engage in education and lobbying and seldom protest, and usually focus on concrete and often technical objectives. Many collaborate with institutional and governmental elites, requiring compromises that can

disappoint the hopes of their more ardent supporters. But some, including the landmines coalition, the European anti-GM movement, and the coalition that derailed the Cancun summit, have proved remarkably successful. Moreover, in Seattle, at Cancun, and at the World Social Forum, we see increasing cooperation between social activist "outsiders" and "insider" NGO advocates producing hybrid forms of activism and organization.

Shifting Campaigns and Composite Organizations

In other ways as well, the panoply of forms of transnational activism and activities is changing. Two kinds of connections are especially striking: the ease with which activists who enter politics in one campaign can shift smoothly to cognate campaigns, and the rise of composite movement organizations.

In the months and years after September 11, 2001, many activists from the global justice campaign moved rapidly into antiwar activities, often framing their new target as an extension of their opposition to global social injustice (Fisher 2004). Whether opposition to American militarism is part of the movement against neoliberalism or is a case of transnational "movement spillover" (D. Meyer and Whittier 1994) may be a matter of definition. What is certainly true is that there was a rapid "spillover" of activists from the global justice protests of the late 1990s to the antiwar movement at the beginning of the Iraq war.

There are costs to every movement "spillover." While "global justice" is a collective action frame so broad that it could proceed for years without evident failure, opposing a war about to be launched by a determined government can fail – as the antiwar movement failed when President Bush decided to go to war against Iraq (D. Meyer and Corrigall-Brown 2004). Moreover, gaps soon appeared between the American branch of the movement, which was forced to operate in an atmosphere of outraged patriotism, and its transnational allies, whose movement could depend on the instinctive anti-Americanism that is present – and growing – in many parts of the world (Maney, Woehrle, and Coy 2003).

Just as impressive as the flexibility of the new activists is the composite nature of their organizations. A robust trend that began in the 1990s was a shift from single-issue to multi-issue organizing by transnational movement organizations. Although most such organizations still focus on a single set of goals, Jackie Smith (2004b) found a doubling in the number of groups adopting multi-issue organizing frames. This trend is especially striking in the global South, because of the different mobilizing opportunities and

constraints they face. As in Eastern Europe before 1989, dictatorship and corruption provide opportunities and threats that encourage the formation of broad-based opposition groups instead of the focused campaign coalitions more typically found in pluralistic systems. Both flexible campaigning and multifocused organizations suggest that we are seeing a change in the actors, the connections among them, their forms of claimsmaking, and the prevailing strategies of contentious politics.

But both these trends have potential costs. Just as many American activists shifted from campaigning against the World Bank and the IMF to the antiwar movement in 2003, many more moved back into domestic politics in the election campaign of 2004. No doubt they did so for reasons related to their antiwar convictions – the outgoing president was, after all, the chief war maker. But their move also reflected the complex nature of the new internationalism: it is neither a flatly horizontal system of states, nor a suprastate structure, but a triangular opportunity space that reaches into domestic politics. We still do not know if the transposition of American activists from the international to the domestic sphere after the Iraq war will turn them permanently away from transnational activity or reflect a fusion of domestic and international contention.

The Fusion of Domestic and International Contention

Is internationalization a cumulative process, or are we seeing only outcroppings of internationalism in a sea of states? To put this question more generally, "Is there evidence from the new transnational activism that the traditional divide between domestic and transnational contention is breaking down? As in all big questions for which there is scattered and inconclusive evidence, the answer is still "maybe" and "in part." If such a fusion is occurring, it will be seen through three main channels: a breakdown in the resilience of domestic structures; changes in the repertoires of domestic contention; and a growing connection between internal contention and international conflict.

Resilience and Change in Local Contention

In trying to gain domestic purchase for international issues, grass-roots activists must embed them in domestic cleavages and frame them in ways that matter to their compatriots. In doing so, the connection to "global"

movements is stretched, sometimes to the breaking point, by the very "weight" of the local in peoples' consciousness. This is what happened to the September 2001 Washington demonstration, after which many activists tried to frame their antiwar message in domestic terms (Maney, Woehrle, and Coy 2003).

But national security is the area in which state interests are most likely to trump transnational commitments (Keohane and Nye 1971). A better test of the question of whether the traditional divide between domestic and international contention is breaking down is the environment. Even here, however, the evidence is mixed. Focusing on Western Europe, Christopher Rootes (2005: 22) sees a limited transnationalization of environmental protest. Although three of the five environmental groups he studied in Britain (Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and the World Wildlife Federation), always transnational in inspiration and aspiration, have, in recent years, become more so, Rootes failed to discern "the development of a substantial *non-elite* audience/constituency for such views" (pp. 39–41).

In contrast, the campaign against climate change shows clear local-global connections. As Harriet Bulkeley and Michele Betsill point out in *Cities and Climate Change* (2003), local governments have a great deal of expertise in the fields of energy management, transportation, and planning that can be turned to fighting climate change. International efforts to enlist localities in the fight against global climate change began in 1991, with the creation of an International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI). Its mission was to build and serve a worldwide movement of local governments to achieve and monitor tangible improvements in global environmental conditions through cumulative local actions. Cities for Climate Portection (CCP) was established as the vehicle to spread this message (ICLEI 1997; Vasi 2004). Bogdan Vasi's (2004) research shows a wide diffusion of environmental activism to cities in Australia, Canada, and the United States during the 1990s.

The anti-GM campaign in Western Europe shows the clearest fusion between domestic and transnational activism. Vera Kettnaker's (2001) research shows that, as local activists were attacking experimental fields and picketing outside supermarkets at the local level, their attention shifted to the EU when the European Parliament was considering labeling requirements for GM products. In the anti-GM campaign, Europeans fused local and transnational activism.

Persistence and Change in the Classical Repertoire

Another way of specifying the question of whether transnational and domestic activism are fusing builds on Charles Tilly's concept of the "repertoire of contention" (1978, 1995b). Many American and Canadian activists who took part in the anti-WTO protest in Seattle tried to bring that model home. In her analysis of New York and Toronto activists who went to Seattle, Lesley Wood sketches six attributes of the model, consisting of "black bloc" street tactics, radical puppetry, blockade tactics, legal collectives, affinity groups, and a spokescouncil mode of organization. In the year following Seattle, local social movement organizations working on immigration, police brutality, housing, and student issues experimented with these tactics in both cities (2004b: 1). Wood found that only in New York City was the transfer successful.

What can explain these differences? Domestic structures seemed to do the lion's share of the work of diffusion. In New York, Wood argues, the city's larger size permitted a greater number of activist organizations and fragmented them around a large number of issues. In Toronto, the Ontario provincial government served as a magnet for public claims making, and the use of commissions served to co-opt activists. The Torontonian structure of activism resisted innovation, whereas New York's was more open to innovation.

The adoption of the social forum model of local organization in both Western Europe and Latin America represents the most remarkable fusion of transnational and domestic repertoires. Of course, "downward scale shift" also involves a shift in objects and claims of contention, as we saw in Chapter 7. It is possible that these "new" forms of organization are simply producing old local wine in new global bottles; but it is also possible that new political identities and new forms of democratic practice will emerge from this fusion of the local and the global (della Porta 2005a).

Internal Contention and International War

The strongest evidence for the fusion of domestic and international contention comes from the connections between international and domestic conflict. It is well known that since the end of World War II, domestic violence has displaced international war as the major source of armed conflict (Gurr et al. 1993), although the level of civil violence peaked in the early 1990s. More important for the "fusion" hypothesis is the growing interface

between domestic and international conflict. Three trends appear to be at the heart of this interface:

- The end of the Cold War removed the major constraint on states interfering in other states' internal affairs.
- The effective end of classical colonialism – from both East and West – left in its wake a large number of weak states.
- These two trends combine to open opportunities for internal minorities to assert themselves and ally with external state and nonstate sponsors.

In Chapter 7, we saw evidence of the peaceful externalization of domestic claims making. But the interface between domestic and international conflict has been extending into violence. It includes secessionist movements that ally with external lobby states or actors against their own governments (Jenne 2001, 2004); it extends to domestic violence that is coordinated with international terrorist organizations, making domestic actors subjects of the international "War on Terror" (Sageman 2004); and it is often met by coalitions of foreign states that intervene as "peacemakers" in a process that has been called, with only some exaggeration, "postmodern imperialism" (Fearon and Laitin 2003).

The collapse of the Soviet empire in East Central Europe and Central Asia produced lethal combinations of all three trends: secessionist movements assisted by external lobbies, internal terrorism linked willy-nilly to the "War on Terror," and multilateral intervention by coalitions of "peacemaking states." "During those years," writes Charles Tilly (2003: 77),

> major powers (including the United States and the United Nations) responded to the weakening of central authority in the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia by signaling increased support for claims of leaders to represent distinct nations currently under alien control. That signaling encouraged leaders to emphasize ethnic boundaries, compete for recognition as valid interlocutors for oppressed nations, attack their ostensible enemies, suppress their competitors for leadership, and make alliances with others who would supply them with resources to support their mobilization.

Once they had triggered ethnopolitical violence, many of these external "lobbies" drew back from the chaos that their interventions had encouraged. But as Erin Jenne (2004) shows, even weak domestic actors were determined on domestic violence to bring their external sponsors to intervene on their side in domestic disputes. And by that time, "international arms merchants, drug runners, diamond merchants, oil brokers, and others who benefited from weak central political control had moved in" (Tilly 2003: 77). In an

internationalized world, one kind of local-global interface produces a chain of consequences.

Unlike classical territory-acquiring imperialism, in the context of the new internationalism interventions are mainly multilateral, humanitarian, and – at least in their intentions – short-term. This produces massive problems of coordination, responsibility, and, especially, problems of exit. As Fearon and Laitin (2003: 2–3) conclude, "the problem of *exit* from postmodern imperialist ventures is nearly intractable" and, we might add, can trigger still more violent fusions between international and domestic contention, as the United States has learned to its dismay in Iraq.

Combining these insights, it would be fair to say that the new transnational contention has its greatest impact where foreign states become involved in domestic conflicts. But we still lack the serious investment in panel studies or in time-series analyses that can tell us whether and how the new transnationalism is fusing with domestic contention. Is internationalization a cumulative process, or in these examples are we seeing only exceptional cases of internationalism in a state-centered world? We are left with the third "big" question: how does the fusion of domestic and transnational activism affect our inherited understanding of the autonomy of national politics from international politics? This question is particularly important in the light of the retreat from internationalism in the United States after September 11, 2001.

After Internationalism?

When I began to collect the materials for this study, optimists were seeing a global civil society growing out of the changes that had emerged following the fall of the Soviet empire. From the increasing density of international nongovernmental organizations; the growing global consciousness among ecological, human rights, indigenous, labor, peace, and women's organizations; and ever-more-dense intergovernmental compacts and negotiations and a treaty signings, many saw the power of states declining and global governance developing apace (Ikenberry 2003: 537; Slaughter 2004).

Not all assessments of these trends were positive. Pessimists warned of the power of these organizations and institutions and worried about the lack of representativeness of the advocacy groups that surrounded them. From the right, there was skepticism about the force for good of nongovernmental organizations and of international intervention; from the left, there was worry about the power of the IMF or the WTO, which had wrested

power over domestic economies from national polities and voters. Realists resisted both optimism and pessimism, insisting, as they always had, that powerful states would continue to dominate the international arena and that – with the death of the Soviet Union – the United States would govern the world through the panoply of international institutions it had created in its image.

The world after September 11, 2001, looks very different. As Robert O. Keohane (2002a: 29) would write soon afterward, "The attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001 have incalculable consequences for domestic politics and world affairs." Advocates of global civil society were appalled by the fact that a transnational network – the Al Qaeda organization – was responsible for attacking the heart of Western society and refused to recognize it as part of the new transnationalism. Students of international institutions, who postulate that "multilateral institutions should play significant roles whenever interstate cooperation is extensive in world politics" (p. 35), were proved overly optimistic when 9/11 produced a failure of either the United Nations or the European Union to take effective action. And those who saw the United States exercising "soft power" and using multilateral negotiation had to face the fact that military aggression was emerging as that country's chosen instrument of power.

Do these policy turns and policy failures tell us, as Stanley Hoffmann (2003), among others, warned, that internationalism may be over? Or that it is, at best, no more than a thin cloak that can be whipped off to expose a hard core of naked power when national interests are threatened? Or will there be an inevitable return to internationalism as the costs of unilateralism become more clear, in both Iraq and elsewhere? Theory, as Keohane (2002a: 36) pointed out soon after, "is not tested by the immediate reactions of policymakers, much less by those of the press"; in the months following 9/11, he bravely saw international institutions regaining their authority.

As this book was completed and American-led "coalition" forces and their Iraqi puppets were reeling from insurgency from within and international revulsion from without, the verdict was still out on whether September 11 and the Iraqi adventure that it justified have put the seal on five decades of internationalization. But those who believe in internationalism and shrink from the orgy of national chauvinism that followed September 11 must take a longer view. And this for several reasons.

First, there are general gains to be made from internationalism. G. John Ikenberry (2003: 534) argues that while the circumstances of the first few years of the new century gave the American government both the

opportunity and the incentive to act unilaterally, "the circumstances that led the United States to engage in multilateral cooperation in the past are still present." In fact, even in the current situation of world politics, Ikenberry sees incentives for a return to multilateralism (pp. 534–44).

One of these incentives was predicted by Ernst Haas (1958) four decades ago – the need for cooperation spawned by the functional needs of a globalizing economy. Another is the tissue of transgovernmental arrangements and international institutions that already cover the globe, producing concrete interests in collaboration (Slaughter 2004). A third is the presence of norms of collaboration that have grown up around these contacts and interests. For example, the now-hegemonic American legal-institutional political tradition has diffused a rule-of-law orientation that produces international order. These potential sources of multilateralism, Ikenberry (2003: 534, 544) concludes, "still exist and continue to shape and restrain the Bush administration, unilateral inclinations notwithstanding."

As we reflect in 2005 on the lies and half truths that led to the Iraq adventure, on the systematic abuse of prisoners by American agents in Saddam Hussein's torture chambers, and on the doctrine of preemptive strike that lies behind both of these, Ikenberry's speculations may seem optimistic. But as long as we are in the realm of speculation, why not go one step further? If the world of today is as interdependent as Keohane (2002b) has argued, and if, as I have argued, the structure of internationalism is triangular, there may be processes both within and outside America's borders that could tame the unilateralism that followed September 11.

We have seen some of these processes at work in the outpouring of dissent against the Iraq war and in the global rejection of American aggression in public opinion polls around the world. We have also seen them in the refusal of many states – under pressure of their citizens – to fall in line with the Bushite designs for a *pax Americana* across the Middle East. Like this author, Ikenberry (2003: 544) sees a new internationalism that involves "like-minded coalitions of governments and civil society . . ., the inclusion of NGOs in the governance structures of UN agencies, and various forms of multi-stakeholder, public-private, public policy networks."

Will the transnational movement against the Iraq war with which I began this book be remembered as the end of a period of internationalism that reached its apogee in the late 1990s? Or will it be seen as the beginning of a move toward a more sustained integration between international and domestic politics? If this book's findings are sustained, I would offer three speculations.

First, as we have seen throughout, transnational activism will be episodic and contradictory, and it will have its most visible impact on domestic politics.

Second, international institutions, regimes, and treaties will continue to reflect state relations and state power, but transnational activists will increasingly find in them a "coral reef" where they both lobby and protest, encounter others like themselves, identify friendly states, and, from time to time, put together successful global-national coalitions.

Finally, as the story that introduced this chapter illustrates, transnational activism does not resemble a swelling tide of history but is more like a series of waves that lap on an international beach, retreating repeatedly into domestic seas but leaving incremental changes on the shore.