

Revolutionary Love and Alter-globalisation: Towards a New Development Ethic

Social Change
48(4) 601–615
© CSD 2018
SAGE Publications
sagepub.in/home.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0049085718801402
<http://journals.sagepub.com/home/sch>


Matt York¹

Neoliberal globalisation has increased inequalities, injustices, and violations of freedoms on an unprecedented scale, whilst creating a fertile environment for the rise of far-right xenophobic nationalism and authoritarianism. In parallel, the emergence of the alter-globalisation movement has responded with a growing popular resistance to neoliberal policy and practice. The experience of social movements over the last century confirms the pressing need for a framework of unity within this current movement wave which avoids the dominations and hierarchies of previous structures, maintains its constituent diversity and yet allows for the construction of a cohesive collective identity.

This article positions love as a key concept in political theory/philosophy and for performing a central role in the revolutionary transformation of contemporary global capitalism, exploring how new love-based political subjectivities, practices, and group formations might emerge via a more than human material-psychosocio-affective commons, with opportunities for a reimagining of the frame within which an alter-globalisation might occur.

Keywords

Love, neoliberalism, globalisation, social movements, the commons

Introduction: The Movement of Movements

Following the breakdown of the Cold War status quo, an unprecedented wave of globalisation has unsettled conventional political belief systems (Steger

¹ Department of Government and Politics, University College Cork, Ireland.

Corresponding author:

Matt York, CACSSS Excellence Scholar, Department of Government and Politics, Room 2.50, O'Rahilly Building, University College Cork, Ireland.
Email: matt.york@tuta.io

& Wilson, 2012). Across the spectrum of the political, social, economic and cultural realms, the forces of globalisation are creating new global challenges which exist beyond the control of individual nation states and their associated ideologies. These new global challenges include climate change and environmental degradation, food insecurity, deepening disparity in health and wellbeing including the increase of pandemics such as HIV/AIDS, increased migration, financial volatility, multiple cultural and religious conflicts and an upsurge in transnational terrorism.

This period of profound change has seen international development subverted and co-opted by the political right. Once grounded in the liberation politics of countries suppressed by empire, development has rapidly shifted away from this emancipatory context and has been shaped by the economics of unregulated markets. On 1 January 1994, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) came into effect while simultaneously, international financial organisations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), World Bank, International Monetary Fund and the G-8 worked together to create a new economic order, suppressing barriers against free trade at the global level. This market-driven globalisation has increased inequalities, injustices and violations of freedom, especially for workers and people in the Global South (Dearden, 2015). Today's dominant neoliberalism is above all a project to restore class dominance to sectors that saw their fortunes threatened by the ascent of social democracy following the Second World War (Harvey, 2007, p. 22). Whilst proving to be of limited effectiveness as a catalyst for economic growth, this latest, more aggressive stage of global capitalism has succeeded in rapidly channelling wealth from subordinate classes to dominant ones, and from poorer to richer countries. This process has entailed economic, political and social destabilisation through the dismantling of institutions and narratives that promoted more egalitarian distributive measures in the preceding era, while creating a fertile environment for the rise of far-right xenophobic nationalism and authoritarianism.

In parallel, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation began their resistance against the Mexican government on the same day NAFTA came into effect, leading to the emergence of a decentralised global web of solidarity groups in Mexico and around the world (Feixa, Pereira, & Juris, 2009). A growing movement led to the first 'Peoples Global Action' global days of action in the late 1990s, including the November 1999 protest against the WTO which saw 50,000 activists demonstrating on the streets of Seattle and helping to put a stop to the WTO negotiations aiming to establish new rules for the further liberalisation of world trade. During 2000, similar events occurred in cities on five continents, as each major summit became an occasion for an alternative summit and protest. Indigenous movements, anti-privatisation campaigns, the World March of Women, progressive intellectual networks, libertarian activists, youth activists and NGOs have further contributed to the rise of a lively and diverse movement (Pleyers, 2013).

In 2001, in Porto Alegre (Brazil) representatives from two Brazilian NGOs and the Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions and for Citizens' Action (ATTAC) proposed the organisation of a World Social Forum (WSF) as an alternative to the World Economic Forum in Davos (Scerri, 2013). Building itself

around the banner 'Another World is Possible', the first WSF brought together 5,000 delegates from around the world, including trade unions, environmentalists, peasants, women, students, international solidarity activists and religious networks to develop, share and debate alternatives to neoliberal globalisation (Boaventura de Sousa, 2003). Since then, subsequent forums have drawn hundreds of thousands of participants. The forum process has also expanded transnationally as global forums have been held in India, Kenya, Mali, Venezuela, Pakistan, Senegal, Tunisia and Canada while local and regional forum events have been organised in nearly every continent. As the scale of resistance has grown, the cultural and ideological impacts of these movements have influenced and inspired new waves of action such as the Arab Spring and Occupy Movements of 2011 and beyond. The subsequent intensification of state repression and an increasing tendency towards authoritarianism means that internationally coordinated opposition (and proposition) is required now more than ever.

What is clear is that this alter-globalisation¹ movement offers significant potential in imagining, articulating, implementing and actualising an alternative model of development to that of neoliberal globalisation, which delivers environmental sustainability, equality of access to resources and opportunities, restorative and redistributive justice, and genuine participatory democracy.

The Challenge for the Alter-globalisation Movement

For most of the last century, efforts to create a world worthy of humanity were focussed on the state and the winning of state power. The main debates were about how to win state power, whether by parliamentary or by extra-parliamentary means. The history of the twentieth century confirms that in all cases, the winning of state power failed to bring about the changes that the militants hoped for. Neither reformist nor revolutionary governments succeeded in radically changing the world (Holloway, 2002). Davis (2011, p. 107) concludes that 'revolutions tend to go astray because of the inclination of some revolutionaries to make use of and eventually monopolise the very mechanisms of power that their masters formerly used to oppress them'.

The alter-globalisation movement and WSF are simultaneously examples of the finest expressions of emancipatory traditions and sites for their contradictions, hierarchies and exclusions (Conway, 2013). The movement will not be liberatory if it simply imposes new hegemonic discourses based upon old and familiar structures (Angelou, 2012; Chatterton & Pickerill, 2010). Forms of domination are embodied in languages, texts, knowledge, policies and human practices and thus, are naturalised to such an extent that they become unconscious and sometimes unrecognisable (Dillabough, 2004). As Bookchin (2005) argues in his work on *The Ecology of Freedom*, the state's capacity to absorb social functions allows it to physically and psychologically rearrange social life so that it seems indispensable as an organising principle for human consociation. Subsequently, there is a danger of the movement unconsciously reproducing the very systems of domination it aims to challenge. Thus, Manji described the situation as follows:

This event [WSF] had all the features of a trade fair—those with greater wealth had more events in the calendar, larger (and more comfortable) spaces, more propaganda—and therefore a larger voice. Thus the usual gaggle of quasi-donor/International NGOs claimed a greater presence than national organisations—not because what they had to say was more important or more relevant to the theme of the WSF, but because, essentially, they had greater budgets at their command. Thus the WSF was not immune from the laws of (neoliberal) market forces. (Manji, 2007)

Populated by interconnected organisations with a diverse array of ideologies, methodologies, identities and cultural norms, there is a pressing need for a ‘framework of unity’ (Wainwright, 2015, p. 12) within this movement of movements which avoids the dominations and hierarchies of previous structures, maintains its constituent diversity and yet allows for the construction of a cohesive collective identity.

Love and Revolution: Towards a Unifying Ethic

In this neoliberal age, unleashed from social constraints, there has been a ‘rollback’ of the social contracts which had led to the significant progress in the preceding era. Neoliberalism has driven a culture of competitive individualism framed within a resurrected social Darwinism in which the norms and values of collective survival have all but disappeared at governance levels (Robinson, 2001). In his writings on *Mutual Aid*, Kropotkin (2011) attacks the use of Darwinism as a social theory, arguing the primary importance of cooperation with regard to the higher achievements of the human race. Examining animals, indigenous societies, medieval cities and the modern (late 19th century) era, he demonstrated the importance of cooperation and collective enterprise to evolution and survival and as a means to social justice. From this perspective, humanity appears to be impelled to live in a highly associative world in solidarity.

Horvat (2016) claims that every act of solidarity contains love but that love cannot be reduced to solidarity. He describes how revolutionary events such as the Arab Spring, Occupy Movement or New Left share inherent characteristics within their forms of organisation and many of their goals but further argues that attempting to reduce them to a single global movement, to reductively define them, brings the danger of limiting them. However, Horvat describes how these events are connected in a far deeper sense most beautifully:

What connects them, more than anything, is something that can’t be reduced to pure facts. What can’t be reduced is this feeling of presence beyond classification or definitions; a presence of submergence; the feeling that you are completely alone but not abandoned, that you are more alone and unique than ever before, but more connected with a multitude than ever as well, in the very same moment. And this feeling can be described as love. Revolution is love if it wants to be worthy of its name. (Horvat, 2016, p. 6)

In attempting to explain why so few revolutions have succeeded while so many have failed, Foran (2005, p. 274) speculates about the future of revolutions in an age of globalisation, making clear the connections between love and revolution:

Love is arguably the emotion that most strongly underlies the vital force that impels many ordinary people into extraordinary acts, across time and place. Expressing hope and optimism, it provides a constructive counterpoint to those other powerful animating emotions, hatred and anger. Love of life, love of people, love of justice all play a role across revolutionary political cultures.

Foran suggests that this is something that the revolutionaries of the future will need to learn to nurture and build upon.

Love, as a subject of enquiry, has caused a significant amount of ‘academic anxiety’ to date (Morrison, Johnston, & Longhurst, 2012, p. 507). Within contemporary theory generally the subject of love has usually evoked an embarrassed response with the topic suggesting a conservatism, a denial of politics and ‘an aura of naïveté and sentimentality’ (Toye, 2010, p. 40). Since the early 1990s, however, and especially since the millennium, a growing interest in the subject of love across many disciplines and fields of academic scholarship has been evident. What is distinctive about this latest emergence of interest in the subject of love is how it is now increasingly accepted as a legitimate subject of enquiry with far less academic anxiety or the need to disguise it by translating it into other terms. This noticeable shift in attitude has led Jónasdóttir and Ferguson (2014, p. 2) to name this new field of academic interest ‘Love Studies’. What is especially significant for this article is that love within this new field is being considered as an important ethical, social and/or political force (Ferguson & Toye, 2017, p. 5). In recent years, a (albeit small) number of anarchist political philosophers and social movement theorists have explored whether love can be utilised as a useful key concept for a new political theory of global revolution.

In the final instalment of their *Empire Trilogy: Commonwealth*, Hardt and Negri (2011, pp. 179–199) theorise a political concept of love as a process of the production of the common *and* the production of subjectivity. In this way, they formulate a concept of love as not only a means of production of the common but also as an end in itself. They further theorise love as an economic power through the production of affective networks, schemes of cooperation and social subjectivities. In this way, love is not necessarily spontaneous or passive but can be an action, a biopolitical event, planned and realised in common. Hardt and Negri take a Spinozan perspective of love as an ontological event which marks a rupture with existing being and creates new being, ‘from poverty through love to being’ (Hardt & Negri, p. 181). Hennessy (2014, p. 269) further contends that ‘if unmet need is the seedbed of organised struggle against exploitation and oppression, surplus common fertilises it’—proposing that we might call a passionate politics that transforms unmet need into the possibility of reclaiming this common *love*. The utility of such a love concept through the affective attachments of organising remains one of the under-theorised features of social movements and one worthy of significant attention.

Hardt and Negri (2011, p. 182) also warn of the ‘corruption’ of love through its shift from the common to the repetition of the same or a process of unification, distinguishing the beneficial forms of love as the constant interplay between the common and singularities. From this perspective, Hardt and Negri argue that populisms, nationalisms, fascisms and religious fundamentalisms are not so much

based on hatred as would commonly be understood, but on a 'horribly corrupted form of identitarian love'. It has now become common for right wing fascist 'hate groups' to rebrand themselves as organisations of love, claiming to act out of love for their own kind and for the nation, rather than out of hatred for strangers and others (Ahmed, 2004, p. 122). We can see in contemporary global politics how such an appropriation of love as a justification for hate can (and increasingly does) frame those who oppose such groups (such as anti-fascist, anti-racist and anti-war activists) as working against the nation, and subsequently against love.

The Private is (Still) Political

Hardt and Negri's theoretical ideas on love have come under significant criticism from contemporary feminist scholars. Wilkinson (2014, p. 238) critiques their particular concept of 'love of the same' as overly simplistic and claims that by depicting the nuclear family as a 'claustrophobic confine' they help to uphold dominant scripts of masculine mobility and freedom, where the home and intimate sphere 'confine' men and hold them back from 'real' political action. Ferguson (2014, p. 260) reflects that the multitude that Hardt and Negri imagine as the new global revolutionary subjects will tend not to be women with young children, sick relatives or elders to care for, except in very special circumstances, and argues that social movements must reorganise their internal social relations so that men are expected to share these caring labours to free women to be equally and in an ongoing way in the forefront of radical contestations. Only then will women's familial affective and caring labour not be a hindrance to their leadership in such movements.

Fifty years prior to Hardt and Negri's assertions, Marxist revolutionary and guerrilla leader Ernesto Che Guevara (2003, p. 225) had also argued that 'the true revolutionary is guided by great feelings of love'. In reading a little deeper, however, we might notice a similar urge to escape the 'claustrophobic confines' of what Guevara referred to as 'the level where ordinary people put their love into practice'. The 'great feelings of love' he claims are necessary for the true revolutionary are situated firmly in the public domain. He defers the 'love practices' involved in affective and caring labour to the 'ordinary people', one assumes mainly women, in order to unlock the mobility and freedom required for 'genuine' revolutionary activity. Such a theory and practice of love fails to acknowledge the different subject positions held within a group, movement or society itself, and is therefore incomplete and requires further theorisation. It seems clear that in general, the ambitious attempts to theorise the potential application of love in the revolutionary transformation of contemporary global capitalism have so far failed to adequately account for the 'elephant in the (mainly white male) room' which are the multiple relations of care and love which *already exist* and, as Power (2017, p. 249) points out, without which social life would literally collapse! This hidden *loving-caring labour* (although currently exploited by patriarchy and capitalism) provides us with current material evidence of the possibility of organising society in a radically different way.

Love as a Creative, Productive and Positive Force

Are the experiences of unification and sameness (as critiqued by Hardt and Negri) necessarily the only outcome of love relations between couples, families and groups, or could this experience alternatively be sequential in a deeper process moving towards a radical, mutually contingent experience of interdependence? Might this experience actually bring into view the very fabric of our shared being, its co-creation and reproduction via an intricate material-psycho-socio-affective commons? Any corruption might then be seen to arise not due to the body itself, be it couple, family or group, but in it misperceiving itself to be individuated, separate and therefore to be either protected or dominated. Might this therefore be the optimum location to engage in the work of transformation, and for a reimagining of how we co-produce society? Where else could be a better place from which to extend the relational field to more fully and completely encompass the multitude? With regard to family love at least, Cantillon and Lynch (2017, p. 178) seem to concur. They claim that while it certainly has the potential to be a form of identitarian, corrupt love as Hardt and Negri suggest, it does not have to be so. They argue that the family, in its various manifestations, also provides a 'spatial and emotional site where mutualised other-centredness can be lived and learned', and a space in which we can learn to live 'otherwise'. Viewed in this way, processes of active affect upon bodies, be they individual or social bodies, might be utilised in the healing of affective damage, transformation of relations of domination *and* the constitution of the common *simultaneously*.

The research I previously conducted exploring transformative education and masculinities (York, 2014) indicates value in the concept of love as a lens through which to understand and transform the processes that reproduce domination, while simultaneously providing the frame, motivation and energy required for social change. The research found that through introducing the concept of love (in this case, via the Southern African concept of Ubuntu)² as a habit of mind, at a level of functioning where moral consciousness, social norms and world view are formed, substantial changes in the subjectivities of participants were produced. Further, due to the emphasis upon love and solidarity within the Ubuntu concept, newly formed attitudes, beliefs and behaviours reflected these values, allowing culturally congruent transformation to occur which promoted radical and non-violent social change and significant reframing of notions around patriarchy, power and violence.

There is now an increasing move towards examining the transformational nature of love, particularly in relation to subjectivity. Here subjectivity is seen as being formed and transformed through love interactions, and subjectivity itself is seen as co-produced, relational and interdependent. In neoliberal societies primarily focussed on effectiveness and productivity, love seems to be erased from daily practices of intimacy and relations, which are currently organised as projects and investments rather than spontaneous affects. Understood in this way, love can be seen as a practice clearly contradicting neoliberal values which reduce all things to profit and as offering an alternative to the profit-oriented organisations of affects shaped in neoliberal societies (Majewska, 2014, p. 208). Relations of love, care and solidarity matter not only for what they can produce

personally but for what they might generate politically in terms of encouraging alternative ways of relating beyond separateness and competition (Lynch, 2014, p. 183). Such materialist feminist approaches to a politics of relational/transformational love provide fertile ground on which to further develop theories relating to group politics and radical social change.

Beyond Anthropos: Entangled Empathy

With great relevance to this article, a number of scholars are starting to extend their thinking about love to include non-humans, the environment, technology and even matter itself, challenging the anthropocentric bias of contemporary political thought. Oliver (2015, p. 104) calls for a 'love of the world' leading to an ethics of political cohabitation grounded in a respect for and responsibility towards our more-than-human plurality. Her search for a 'non-totalising, non-homogenising earth ethics' (p. 240) leads her to invite us to join her in embracing 'the uncanny queasiness of our belonging to this planet with a multitude of others, most of whom we have never encountered' (p. 242). The responsibility to engender response, or facilitate the ability to respond, in others and the environment is the primary obligation of this earth ethics. 'Eros', argues Oliver, 'is the drive toward home that returns the globe back to the earth' (p. 242). Barad (2003, p. 829) claims that the separation of epistemology from ontology assumes an inherent difference between human and non-human, subject and object, mind and body, matter and discourse. In remedy, she proposes the use of an 'onto-epistemology—the study of practices of knowing in being' as a better way to think through how we understand how specific intra-actions matter. In this way, post-human theory (Braidotti, 2013) positions the (human) subject as fully immersed in and imminent to a network of non-human relations. The Anthropocene has coincided with an era of high technological mediation which challenges anthropocentrism from within. This decentring of Anthropos challenges the separation of bios (life—as the prerogative of humans) from zoe—the life of non-human entities (Braidotti, 2016, p. 388). What has come to the fore instead is 'a nature-culture continuum' which reconceptualises the self as embodied, embedded, relational and extended (p. 381). The frame of reference therefore becomes the world, in all its 'open-ended, interrelational, transnational, multisexed, and transspecies flows of becoming' (p. 388).

In unity, Barad (2012, p. 69) explores how all bodies, human and non-human, come to matter through the world's 'iterative intra-activity', and therefore concludes that 'the very nature of materiality itself is an entanglement'. What we commonly take to be individual entities are not 'separate determinately bounded and propertied objects', but rather are (entangled parts of) phenomena that extend across time and space (Barad, 2011, p. 125). Ethics therefore shifts focus from finding the correct response to an externalised other to an obligation to be responsive to the other, who is not entirely separate from what we call the self. Gruen (2015) further theorises an entangled empathy as a caring perception extended from human to non-human through which identity and agency are co-constituted by our social and material entanglements. We are who we are

at any particular time as an expression of entanglements in multiple relations across space, species and substance (Gruen, 2017, p. 458). Therefore, through an entangled empathy we care about others because they are fundamentally part of our own agency. As Cherry (2017, p. 449) points out: 'Political responses lack an important ethical and epistemic dimension when they are not also entangled empathic responses'.

In relation to this particular enquiry, the *more than human* material-psycho-socio-affective commons being approached by these theorists might offer potential as a location through which to (a) co-produce and develop the subjectivities and inter-subjectivities required for more equitable gender, ethnic and class relations, (b) develop the sense of interconnectedness/entangled empathic connection required to support the revolutionary transformation (alter-globalisation) of contemporary global capitalism and (c) encourage collective action in support of averting the imminent anthropogenic ecocide.

Alternative System Models and Transitions

A radical system change aligned to such a love ethic might seem an unrealisable vision for a world within which 'there is no alternative' (TINA) remains a dominant narrative, but much detailed and practical work is underway on transition strategies which could support such a transformation in an immediate way. The Commons Movement, for instance, offers transitional opportunities which move towards an entirely new socio-political-economic model (Bollier & Helfrich, 2015). Commoners work to reclaim the commonwealth, both materially and politically, aiming to rollback the widespread privatisation and marketisation of our shared resources and to reclaim greater participatory control over those resources and community life. They aim to ensure that common resources are protected from sale on the market and conserved for future generations. The commons honour diversity. An indigenous commons will be quite different from an urban commons and yet they are both commons. The Commons Movement aims to develop institutions and norms for a post-capitalist, post-growth order, confronting the monoculture of neoliberal globalisation with a richer, more vibrant sense of human (and more-than-human) possibilities.

Nembhard (2016) proposes a 'cooperative solidarity commonwealth' as a system of interlocking cooperative ownership structures in all industries and all sectors of the economy, where cooperatives and other community-based enterprises support one another by building linked supply chains, collaborating on projects and sharing funding. These inter-connections start locally but build into regional, national and international interlocking structures. This solidarity system is a non-hierarchical, non-exploitative, equitable set of economic relationships and activities geared towards the grassroots, indigenous, participatory and based on human needs, humane values and ecological sustainability. In this system, surplus, or profit, is shared in equitable ways, through democratic decision-making, and used for the common good. Risks are collectivised, skills are perfected, learning is continuous, and economic practices are sustainable (both ecologically and from a business point of view), bringing collective prosperity. Capital is democratised and widely owned or controlled. In this system, capital is subordinate to labour, and

returns go to labour rather than to capital. A solidarity system recognises the evils of racism, sexism and patriarchy and deliberately addresses oppression and exclusion by developing values, policies and practices to mitigate them. It aims to give voice and power to those who are usually without them.

Such participatory economies will require a transition from corporations and markets towards social ownership and participatory planning. Hahnel (2012) discusses how a majority of the population must support making these changes for such an economy to work, and proposes that in most countries a transition strategy spanning decades will be necessary. There are countries, however, that could transition more rapidly given the right conditions. Progressive governments in a number of Latin American countries could immediately take steps towards implementing various parts of a participatory economy. Had the Syriza-led Greek government not submitted to the neoliberal austerity plan, but instead launched their own economic recovery plan, its economic programme could have built worker and neighbourhood councils and the beginnings of participatory planning. The same would be true for a Podemos-led government coming to power in Spain or a Left Bloc government coming to power in Portugal.

Similarly from an African perspective, associational cooperative activity has been a normal practice of many cultures across the region to minimise individual disadvantages and maximise the collective good, without the rigid rules and structural forms some might expect as necessary, at least until the onset of neoliberal globalisation. In the Ugandan context, for instance, economic liberalisation and privatisation saw the closing of the ministry of cooperatives, the divesting of the cooperative banks and privatisation of agricultural produce marketing. While official government sources credited liberalisation for achieving an average of a 6 per cent growth per annum over a twenty-year period (ActionAid, 2013), this is in stark contrast to the depressed economic reality of the majority of Ugandans, about 80 per cent of whom reside in rural areas. These rural communities had their cooperative assets appropriated without compensation and their social systems near destroyed. Encouragingly, in a movement which is possible to observe in countless other communities across the globe, Ugandan citizens are organising themselves in collectives to deal with the socio-economic challenges effecting them on a daily basis. Throughout Uganda, ordinary citizens are converging through social justice campaigns, cooperatives, village savings and credit unions, community health insurance associations and more, all grounded on social capital and trust. As previously argued, for these locally based actions to collectivise into transnational networks and ultimately lead a transition towards the next system model there remains a pressing need for a framework of unity within this movement of movements which (a) avoids the dominations and hierarchies of previous structures, (b) maintains its constituent diversity, and yet (c) allows for the construction of a cohesive collective identity.

Love as the Means and the End

The potential of a revolutionary politics of love as transformative of the structures of domination which underpin neoliberal globalisation, and in support of a

transition towards a new system model, offers a powerful alternative to the TINA narrative. While such a shift will require a ‘convergence of constituencies on a scale previously unknown’ (Klein, 2014, p. 459), a radical reversal of current development trajectories is essential if we are to realise a truly environmentally sustainable, egalitarian and just world. We can begin to legitimately imagine love as a frame of reference within which a ‘genuinely realistic and visionary set of transformations could occur’ (Berlant, 2011, p. 690), one that ‘nurtures not only individual growth but principled and non-violent revolutionary social change as well’ (Davis, 2011, p. 113).

For love to truly act as a key concept in political theory/philosophy and fulfil its potential role in the revolutionary transformation (alter-globalisation) of contemporary global capitalism, the development of theory and practice must be augmented by an intersectional analysis of current social domination relations. Emerging scholarly work from feminist, anarchist, affect theory and queer theory perspectives exploring love as a creative, productive and positive force offers openings for new subjectivities, new practices and new group formations to emerge. Further, through challenging the anthropocentric bias of contemporary political thought, the emerging post-humans and entanglement theories which extend love to include non-humans and the environment present exciting opportunities for a reimagining of the frame within which an alter-globalisation might occur. Such a reorientation would require further theorisation of loving policies and practices (a) which ensure access to and the doing loving-caring practices are equally shared and distributed; (b) that dismantle structures and practices of domination, inequality and abuse (of human, non-human and the environment); and (c) that promote positive gender, class and ethnic relations, extending the resultant affective field to a care and respect for non-human beings and the environment.

To conclude, this article proposes two immediate areas of potentiality for the alter-globalisation movement as offered by a political concept of love:

1. ‘Love is a universally accessible concept, simultaneously experienced subjectively and intersubjectively’

The effects of neoliberalism have reached such pandemic proportions that it is often not consciously recognised as an ideology but accepted on faith as a natural and self-evident universal truth. Default ways of knowing and being have been developed in response to the neoliberal hegemony we inhabit, absorbing the objective social structures of wider society into a more subjective and mental experience. Once these objective social structures have been fully internalised as personal core beliefs and values, our mutually contingent relationships lead these core beliefs and values to reproduce the same (neoliberal) objective structures ad infinitum, generating and regulating societal norms. So pervasive has the ideology become, that if we are to undermine and dismantle its hold, a similarly universally accessible concept is required (enter love). With great relevance for the alter-globalisation movement, the emerging theories relating to affect, entanglement and the posthuman present opportunities for the disorientation of our conventional political schemas and for the reimagining of new political schemas based upon love, solidarity and justice.

2. 'A political concept of *Revolutionary Love* offers a frame of reference for transition to the next system *and* a means of sustaining such a system in the absence of domination'

While neoliberal globalisation has required the enforced standardisation of its socio-economic model in order to secure its dominance at the expense of local communities and their unique cultural identities, a politics of love as discussed in this article offers an ethical counter-hegemony to subvert and supplant neoliberalism while simultaneously freeing and celebrating this world's rich social and cultural diversity. It is clear from the experience of revolution in the 20th century that authoritarian attempts at societal change towards alternative systems, however noble the intended outcomes, were conclusive failures. If we are to successfully realise a more participatory, cooperative, non-exploitative, ecologically sustainable and peaceful world, the forms of organisation which lead the transition towards such a system (in order to avoid similar authoritarian results) require a pre-modelling of the quality of world envisioned, by adopting propositional activities firmly grounded in love. Such a widespread co-production of this revolutionary love *via* a more-than-human material-psycho-socio-affective commons might offer a clear, cohesive frame of reference within which the new system can be incubated, nurtured and sustained.

Another world (might still be) possible!

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. The alter-globalisation movement is generally described as a specific, isolated movement wave spanning from the WTO protests in Seattle in 1999 into the first decade of the 21st century. For this article the author reclaims and extends the meaning of this term as a useful way of framing the ongoing and current movement of movements whose proponents support international cooperation and interaction while opposing global capitalism—in general subscribing to anarchistic principles of freedom and the practice of a non-hierarchical democratic politics—within which I would include movements such as the Arab Spring, Spain's Indignados and the Global Occupy Movement.
2. The concept of Ubuntu is best expressed through the Nguni proverb, 'Umuntu ngumuntu ngobantu' meaning 'I am because we are'. This sense of collective solidarity characterises Ubuntu through love, caring, tolerance, respect, empathy, accountability and responsibility.

References

- ActionAid. (2013). *The cooperative movement and the challenge of development: A search for alternative wealth creation and citizen vitality approaches in Uganda*. Kampala: ActionAid International Uganda.
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Angelou, A. (2012). The living and being of the streets: Fanon and the Arab uprisings. *Globalizations*, 9(3), 451–466.
- Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Gender and Science*, 28(3), 801–831.
- . (2011). Nature's queer performativity. *Qui Parle*, 19(2), 121–158.
- . (2012). *Matter feels, converses, suffers, desires, yearns and remembers*. In R. Dolphijn & I. Van der Tuin (Eds.), *New materialism: Interviews and cartographies* (pp. 1–15). Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press.
- Berlant, L. (2011). A properly political concept of love: Three approaches in ten pages. *Cultural Anthropology*, 26(4), 683–691.
- Boaventura de Sousa, S. (2003). The world social forum: Toward a counter-hegemonic globalization. In J. Sen, A. Anand, A. Escobar, & P. Waterman (Eds.), *World social forum: Challenging empires* (pp. 191–204). New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation.
- Bollier, D., & Helfrich, S. (2015). *Patterns of commoning*. Amherst, MA: The Commons Strategies Group.
- Bookchin, M. (2005). *The ecology of freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- . (2016). The critical posthumanities or is medianatures to naturecultures as Zoe is to bios? *Cultural Politics*, 12(3), 380–390.
- Canitlon, S., & Lynch, K. (2017). Affective equality: Love matters. *Hypatia*, 32(1), 169–186.
- Chatterton, P., & Pickerill, J. (2010). Everyday activism and transitions towards post-capitalist worlds. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(4), 475–490.
- Cherry, M. (2017). What an [en]tangled web we weave: Emotions, motivation, and rethinking US and the other. *Hypatia*, 32(2), 439–451.
- Conway, J. (2013). *Edges of global justice: The world social forum and its 'others'*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Davis, L. (2011). Love and revolution in Ursula Le Guin's four ways to forgiveness. In J. Heckert & R. Cleminson (Eds.), *Anarchism and sexuality: Ethics, relationships and power* (pp. 103–130). New York, NY and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Dearden, N. (2015). A manifesto for global justice. *Red Pepper*, 200, 12–13.
- Dillabough, J. (2004). Class, culture and the 'predicaments of masculine domination': Encountering Pierre Bourdieu. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 489–506.
- Feixa, C., Pereira, I., & Juris, J. (2009). Global citizenship and the 'New, New' social movements: Iberian connections. *Nordic Journal of Youth Research*, 17(4), 421–442.
- Ferguson, A. (2014). Feminist love politics: Romance, care, and solidarity. In A. G. Jónasdóttir & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century* (pp. 250–264). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ferguson, A., & Toye, M. (2017). Feminist love studies—Editor's introduction. *Hypatia*, 32(1), 5–18.
- Foran, J. (2005). *Taking power: On the origins of Third World revolutions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gruen, L. (2015). *Entangled empathy: An alternative ethic for our relationships with animals*. New York, NY: Lantern Books.

- Gruen, L. (2017). Expressing entangled empathy: A reply. *Hypatia*, 32(2), 452–462.
- Guevara, E. C. (2003). *Che Guevara reader: Writings on politics and revolutions* (D. Deutschmann, Ed.). Melbourne: Open Press.
- Hahnel, R. (2012). *Of the people, by the people*. Auckland: Soapbox Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2011). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy, AAPSS*, 610(21), 22–44.
- Hennessy, R. (2014). Bread and roses in the common. In A. G. Jónasdóttir & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century* (pp. 265–278). London, UK: Routledge.
- Holloway, J. (2002). Twelve theses on changing the world without taking power. *The Commoner*, 4, 1–6.
- Horvat, S. (2016). *The radicality of love*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Jónasdóttir, A. G., & Ferguson, A. (2014). *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Klein, N. (2014). *This changes everything: Capitalism vs. the climate*. London, UK: Penguin.
- Kropotkin, P. (2011). *Mutual aid: A factor of evolution* (First published in 1902). London, UK: Freedom Press.
- Lynch, K. (2014). Why love, care, and solidarity are political matters: Affective equality and Fraser's model of social justice. In A. G. Jónasdóttir & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century* (pp. 173–189). London, UK: Routledge.
- Majewska, E. (2014). Love in translation: Neoliberal availability or a solidarity practice? In A. G. Jónasdóttir & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century* (pp. 207–219). London, UK: Routledge.
- Manji, F. (2007). World Social Forum: Just another NGO fair? *Pambazuka News*, 26(288). Retrieved from <http://www.pambazuka.net/en/category.php/features/39464>
- Morrison, C., Johnston, L., & Longhurst, R. (2012). Critical geographies of love as special, relational and political. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(4), 505–521.
- Nembhard, J. G. (2016). *Building a cooperative solidarity commonwealth*. Retrieved from <http://thenextsystem.org/building-cooperative-solidarity-commonwealth/>
- Oliver, K. (2015). *Earth and world*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Pleyers, G. (2013). *A brief history of the alter-globalization movement* (J. Zvesper, trans. with the help of the Institut Français). Booksandideas.net. Retrieved from <http://www.booksandideas.net/A-Brief-History-of-the-Alter.html>
- Power, N. (2017). Feminism and the Eros Effect. In J. Del Gandio & A.K. Thompson (Eds.), *Spontaneous Combustion: the Eros effect and global revolution* (pp. 237–250). New York: SUNY Press.
- Robinson, W. I. (2001). Social theory and globalization: The rise of a transnational state. *Theory and Society*, 30(2), 157–200.
- Scerri, A. (2013). The World Social Forum: Another world might be possible. *Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, 12(1), 111–120.
- Steger, M., & Wilson, E. (2012). Anti-globalization or alter-globalization? Mapping the political ideology of the global justice movement. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(3), 439–454.
- Toye, M. (2010). Towards a poethics of love: Poststructuralist feminist ethics and literary creation. *Feminist Theory*, 11(1), 39–55.

- Wainwright, H. (2015). The Red Pepper editorial charter. In S. Platt (Ed.), *20 years of Red Pepper* (pp. 12–13). London, UK: Red Pepper.
- Wilkinson, E. (2014). Love in the multitude? A feminist critique of love as a political concept. In A. G. Jónasdóttir & A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Love: A question for feminism in the twenty-first century* (pp. 237–249). London, UK: Routledge.
- York, M. (2014). Transforming masculinities: A qualitative study of a transformative education programme for Young Zulu men and boys in rural Kwazulu-Natal. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 7(7), 55–78.