The establishment of capitalist globalization by western countries during the last thirty years of the last century has been characterized by the implementation of strategies for the “global market” and “global governance”. The global market is founded on an economic system created by the “triad” of transnationals (TNCs). Global governance is patiently legitimized by the policies imposed on the world scale by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The perception of this new era, aiming to produce a “global village”, has produced the image of a new “Empire”, able to absorb all internal contradictions among countries and national classes under the leadership of a new enlightened “global bourgeoisie”. The ideology of a world without borders is based on the belief that it is possible to achieve the control of the global market and control over global governance, taming the national bourgeoisies and local cultures. Their resistance would be overthrown by implementing the strategies of economic marginalization and political destabilization.

The choice of the word “strategies” is highly appropriate to express the overall militarization of the policy-making and policy-makers that is taking place. The policies for market liberalization, for the standardization of products and norms, belong to the process of economic marginalization. This will inevitably produce the erosion of countries’ social cohesion and political consensus within national governments, reducing their bargaining strength in the international context.

Since the events in Seattle (1999) and the September 11th, 2001 attack on the U.S., there has been a rise of people’s resistance and an organized opposition by national and international power groups to such strategies and policies. There are two main reasons that made this new situation possible. The first one is the triad’s institutions’ underestimation of the importance of local economies and communities. The second reason is the underestimation of the polycentric character of western culture and the attempt to reduce it to one model: “made in USA”. The sudden abandoning of the multilateral character of global governance, reduced to one-state military dominance, contradicts the transnational structure of the capitalist economy and has generated new contradictions.

Amoroso criticizes the IMF based on its activities in the areas of finance and its role as governing body of the triad’s interests. Finance, together with technology, belongs to the most distinctive character of globalization; it is the highest level of degeneration of the market economy imposed by the capitalist system in the direction of the substitution of value added creation with speculation. The WTO has also drawn the criticism and anger of societies around the world. It represents the danger of the triad’s economic penetration into the production systems in different countries. Many developing countries are trying to avoid the negative impact of the WTO’s measures by keeping their domestic legislation. The areas where there is a clear conflict of interest between the WTO and developing countries are as follows:

1. The Triad Related Intellectual Property Rights;
2. The Agreement on Agriculture (AOA);
3. The Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMs);
4. The Multifiber Agreements (MFA); and
5. The “Green Room/Consensus process”.

The pressure of the global bourgeoisie on other countries creates, via trade and business relations, divisions inside the developing and developed countries because of the different positions social groups take in the value added chain. The problem of agriculture and the maintenance of small farmers in rural societies can neither be considered just as a sector of production or in term of abstract and general efficiency criteria. Amoroso considers agriculture a classic and paramount example of the contradictions created by capitalist development in the relations between production systems and society. Agriculture has undergone two main waves of transformations with devastating results for rural societies: the first provoked by the “industrial revolution” with its commodification of production, and the second by the technological revolution. These contradictions concern developing countries and backwards economies as much as advanced industrialized countries. The capitalist market distortions on agriculture and agribusiness are even more relevant for industrialized countries as a result of the high technology revolution. Problems in agriculture and agribusiness development are not due to market imperfections, and low productivity, but to the very nature of globalization, conflicting with a community/society perception based on the principle of balance among culture-nature and production systems. Issues such as the social aspects of this transformation and the roles of technology and economic policies must be addressed.