"ANOTHER WORLD IS POSSIBLE!" RESISTANCE TO THE UNIVERSAL ACCEPTANCE OF GLOBALISATION - AN INVESTIGATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Albert Schoeman[1]

1.   INTRODUCTION

The sudden and rather unexpected collapse of communism at the end of the 1980s changed the way in which future political affairs would be conducted. Not only did it bring an end to the ideologically motivated Cold War struggle between the West and communism, but it also promoted the spread of democracy across many parts of the world. After the fall of the Berlin Wall on 9 November 1989, President George Bush of the United States euphorically announced that the Cold War era would be replaced with what he termed as the "New World Order". Bush idealistically defined the latter as "a vision of a new partnership of nations that transcends the Cold War. A partnership based on consultation, cooperation, and collective action, especially through international and regional organizations. A partnership united by principle and the rule of law and supported by an equitable sharing of both cost and commitment. A partnership whose goals are to increase democracy, increase prosperity, increase the peace, and reduce arms" (Kissinger 1994:804-5). A scenario was envisioned in which peace, prosperity and democracy would flourish after the uncertainty of the Cold War era. At around the same time the influential American theorist Francis Fukuyama (1989:3-18) published his controversial "End of history" article in the summer edition of **The National Interest**.[2] He argues that liberal democracy, supported by a capitalist free market economic system can be regarded as the final stage in the ideological evolution of mankind after defeating all its major ideological rivals (such as communism and socialism). According to him liberal democracy, as the preferred system of government, would become the universal norm. The argument that Western liberal democracy would eventually be the final form of government was strengthened by

---

[1]   Department of Political Science, University of the Free State (Qwaqwa Campus). E-mail: schoemanpa.@qua.uovs.ac.za.

[2]   In 1992 Fukuyama published the work **The End of history and the last man** in which he expanded on the views expressed in the "End of history"-article.

an unprecedented wave of democratisation[3] that swept across the globe in the period after the end of the Cold War. Many states that had previously followed the authoritarian route now adopted democratic principles. A world consisting of a majority of democratic states, that followed free market economic policies, created fertile grounds in which globalisation could take root.

However, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the subsequent outbreak of the Gulf War as well as ethnic and religious conflicts in many newly formed post-communist states soon shattered the dream of universal peace. A spate of terrorist attacks by fundamentalist Muslim groups against American targets in recent years (for example the 1993 World Trade Center bombings, the US embassy bombings and the attacks on September 11) may be an indication that not all groups accept globalisation and democracy based on a Western value and norm system. The objective of this article is to investigate the forces opposing globalisation and to determine the reasons for their negative attitude towards this phenomenon. The spirit of this resistance is reflected in the slogan "Another world is possible!" that appears in the title of this article. According to Buzgalin (2003:63) this slogan is repeated in dozens of languages to emphasise the diverse nature of resistance against globalisation. Whether emphasis is placed on the landless peasants in Brazil to moderate "greens" and even intellectuals, they all have one thing in common - the desire to achieve "another world", or an alternative to what is being offered by globalisation. In order to investigate the diversity of the resistance, emphasis is firstly placed on a brief conceptualisation of globalisation. Thereafter, attention is focused on some general points of criticism against this phenomenon. These general points of criticism are then expanded into more specific points of criticism in the form of two categories of resistance. On the one hand cultural resistance against globalisation has increased dramatically over the past few years. Ethnic and religious conflicts in post-communist states as well as in Africa and Islamic rejection of the western value and norm system are examples of this. On the other hand more economically orientated social movement resistance against globalisation has also increased in recent years. Recent anti-globalisation protests in Seattle and Genoa serve as examples to illustrate this point.

2.   GLOBALISATION - A BRIEF CONCEPTUALISATION

Much has already been written about globalisation[4]. The aim of this article is to focus on resistance against this phenomenon and not to make an elaborate

---

[3]   For an in depth analysis of the waves of democratization see Samuel Huntington's work **The third wave**, published in 1991.

[4]   For excellent and detailed discussions on and criticisms of globalisation, compare the works of Stiglitz (2003); Schirato and Webb (2003); Soros (2002); Legrain (2004); as well as Held and McGrew (2003).

conceptual investigation of globalisation as such. However, in order to put the types of resistance that will be investigated into context (how does it fit into the broad processes of globalisation?), it is necessary to briefly explain globalisation as a concept. The word "global" is about 400 years old but common use of the term "globalisation" did not commence until the 1960s. The word was not recognised as academically significant until the early to mid 1980s (Guinness 2003:2). According to Beinart (1999-2000:1) the term globalisation finds its antecedents in the work of Adam Smith who argued that the spread of trade was both inevitable and pacific. By the early twentieth century the impressive growth of trade and investment between Britain and the rest of Europe, combined with an almost century long absence of a continent-wide war, practically expressed Smith's ideas. During the late 1960s and early 1970s the idea of globalisation once again found favour amongst academics. The rise of Germany and Japan led theorists to suggest that economic power was increasingly triumphant over military power in world affairs. However, interdependence arguments waned in the 1980s with the revival of the Cold War. But in the years since 1989 it has resurfaced with a vengeance in the form of what is now popularly referred to as "globalisation".

There are almost as many definitions of globalisation as there are theorists studying this phenomenon. According to Held and McGrew (2003:3) no single universally agreed definition of globalisation exists. As is the case with all core concepts in the social sciences its precise meaning remains contested. In their contribution Smith and Baylis (1999:7) argue that by globalisation "we simply mean the process of increasing interconnectedness between societies such that events in one part of the world more and more have effects on peoples and societies far away". The "events" mentioned here refer to those social, economic and political factors that are effected by globalisation. For Wingfield (2001:5) globalisation is simply the disintegration of political, economic, and cultural barriers between nations and the people who inhabit them. Fischer (2001:1) is of the opinion that globalisation is multifaceted with many dimensions - economic and social, political and environmental, cultural and religious - which effect everyone in some way. Its influence ranges from trade and investment flows that interest economists to changes in our everyday life. The speed with which data can be transmitted around the world, the ease and speed of modern travel and the ease with which we can observe and hear news of cultural events from anywhere in the world illustrates this point. Globalisation has also revolutionised information and telecommunication technology. These days fast, reliable and immediate worldwide communication is possible through the use of cell phones, satellite television and the Internet. The Internet, for instance, can be utilised to access stores of knowledge and information in all the world's computers at the push of a few buttons. In fact, much of the research for this article was done by accessing Internet web sites from around the world!

In addition, Ouattara (1997:1) argues that the globalisation of the world economy is "the integration of economies throughout the world through trade, financial flows, the exchange of technology and information, and the movement of people". The extent of the trend toward integration is clearly reflected in the rising importance of world trade and capital flows in the world economy. An increasingly large share of the world's gross domestic product (GDP) is generated in activities linked directly or indirectly to international trade. Especially over the last ten years, globalisation has been the result of the expansion, diversification and deepening of trade and financial links between countries. Kegley and Wittkopf (1999:246) are of the opinion that goods, money, people, and technology are moving across national borders at lightning pace. The world is becoming so interconnected that the possibility of it tightening into a single integrated community and market cannot be excluded. The movement and interactions across frontiers are uniting the world. The result is that new levels of wealth are created in a cutthroat marketplace, making national boundaries and governments less important. In their contribution Held and McGrew (2000:3) summarise all the different focus points in the aforementioned definitions by arguing that globalisation "has been variously conceived as action at a distance…time-space compression…accelerating interdependence…a shrinking world…and, among other concepts, global integration, the reordering of inter-regional power relations, consciousness of the global condition and the intensification of interregional interconnectedness". This description of globalisation highlights the fact that it is diverse and difficult to define.

The above-mentioned definitions tend to paint an over optimistic and positive picture of globalisation as something that is all-inclusive and beneficial to all of earth's inhabitants. There is, however, also a very different side to the story. The ever-growing gap between the "haves" and "have-nots" has left increasing numbers in the developing world in dire poverty, living on less than a dollar a day. In contrast to this the total world income (which surely only apply to the "haves"!) increased by an average of 2,5 percent annually (Stiglitz 2003:5). In this regard Schirato and Webb (2003:2) argue that "for some globalisation means freedom, while other see it as a prison. For some it means prosperity, while for others it guarantees the poverty of the developing world." The "others" mentioned here form the basis of the resistance against globalisation.

In the light of the above-mentioned overview, and with particular reference to the arguments favouring globalisation, an idealistic image of the world is envisioned, creating the impression that globalisation is accepted as a universal norm. On the contrary, some powerful opposing forces are increasingly challenging this phenomenon.

3.   RESISTANCE TO GLOBALISATION

Why has globalisation been resisted so severely in recent times? In order to provide answers to this question it is necessary to shortly focus on how globalisation has impacted on and changed world affairs, especially since the end of the Cold War. Apart from influencing many other areas it seems as if globalisation has had its most incremental impact on global socio-economic factors. Guinness (2003:8) refers to the latter as the "dimensions of globalisation" to highlight its benefits as well as its disadvantages. In terms of the aim of this article, focus will especially be placed on the disadvantages. The "dimensions of globalisation" include the fol-lowing:

- **Economic dimension.** Under the influence of especially the World Trade Organisation (WTO) world trade has expanded rapidly and multi-national corporations have become a major force in the process of increasing economic interdependence. The emergence of newly industrialised countries (with reference to for instance the so-called South-East Asian tiger states) has been the main evidence of the success of the global economy. However, the frequency of recent "anti-capitalist" demonstrations has shown that many people and groups are concerned about the current direction of the global economy.
- **Urban dimension.** A hierarchy of global cities such as New York, London and Tokyo has emerged to act as the "command centres" of the global economy. The competition within and between these global hierarchies are also intensifying.
- **Social/cultural dimension.** Western culture has influenced all parts of the world to a considerable degree through TV, cinema, the Internet, newspapers and magazines. The international interest in brand name clothes, fast food, pop music and sport stars has increased tremendously. Cultural transmission can, however, not be regarded as a one-way process. In reaction to the Western value and norm system the popularity of Islam has also increased in many Western states.
- **Linguistic dimension.** English has now emerged as the most dominant working language of the "global village". Of the world's 1,9 billion English speakers, some 1,5 billion people speak English as a second language. In many areas of the world there is great concern about the future of native languages.
- **Political dimension.** The traditional role and power of nation states have diminished in many parts of the world as a number of states have organised themselves into trade blocs of which the European Union can be regarded as the most advanced model. In recent years the United Nations has intervened

militarily in an increasing number of states. Many observers have regarded the latter actions as a gradual movement towards "world government". This state of affairs has also influenced the growth of global terrorism.

- **Demographic dimension.** The ease with which people move across international borders, and the desire to do so, has increased considerably in recent decades. The result of this is that more and more people become multicultural. However, the number of illegal immigrants and asylum seekers have also increased, putting an additional welfare burden on many states.

- **Environmental dimension.** Increased world wide economic activities have placed enormous pressure on the environment. With the long-range transportation of airborne pollutants, the economic activity in one state has an influence on the environment of another state. The global environmental conferences (held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 and Johannesburg in 2002) is evidence that most states acknowledge the seriousness of the situation and regard the scale of the problems as so large that only co-ordinated international action can bring realistic solutions (Guinness 2003:8).

The universal ideal of a globalised world in which peace, democracy and the financial fruits and prosperity of a free market economic system is shared by all its inhabitants, is still a long way from being realised. Contrary to expectations, the end of the Cold War did not bring an end to the economic gap that still exists between rich and poor states or those cultural differences that threaten to destabilise prospects of peace. Mansbach (1994:336) is of the opinion that in reality "the economic gulf between the developed and developing worlds is wide and continues to grow. In fact, some would identify the gap as the most challenging issue in world affairs. Ultimately, unmet economic (and social) problems may lead the poor to 'desperate politics' versus the rich. The poor have little reason to be satisfied by the liberal international economic system, which, in their eyes, perpetuates their poverty." Page (2002:2) argues that since 1950, there has been an eleven-fold increase in world trade, yet the gap between rich and poor countries continues to grow. The 225 richest individuals in the world have assets greater than the annual income of 2,5 billion people, or more than 40% of the world's total population. Globalisation is often criticised for being uneven in its effects or even somewhat exclusive. In reality, globalisation is only functioning in and applicable to a small percentage of the global population. It is astonishing to think that even though only a small number of the world's population have access to the World Wide Web, the majority of people probably have never made a telephone call in their lives. With regard to this, the argument is that globalisation only applies to the developed (so-called global "North") world and basically exclude the developing (so-called global

"South") world[5]. Because of the growing gap between rich and poor, globalisation is often seen as just the latest stage of Western imperialism. The forces that are being globalised are conveniently those found in the Western world. According to this view, non-Western values are neglected or not even taken into consideration. There is serious concern that these non-Western values might not "fit in" and that globalisation would personify the triumph of the Western world-view at the expense of the world-views of other cultures. However, if globalisation is personified as the triumph of the Western market-led value system, it becomes difficult to explain the enormous recent economic success of the so-called South East Asian "tigers". Even though these states have definitely operated their economies according to free market capitalist principles, they have declined to accept the Western value and norm system to accompany it. They rather institutionalised their traditional "Confucian"[6] value and norm system (Smith and Baylis 1999:10-1; Heywood 1997:34).

Apart from being imperialist, many observers also argue that globalisation is exploitative. Because of the perception that globalisation represents the success of liberal democracy in an economically divided world, one outcome might be that less well off nations are exploited in the name of "openness". Those technologies associated with globalisation usually only benefit the richest economies of the world and allow their interests to override local ones (Smith and Baylis 1999:10). According to Page (2002:2), workers in the global South are becoming increasingly dependent upon large foreign corporations for employment. In the process they lose all other options as their own local and national economies collapse. In their desperation they can be forced to accept poorer wages and working conditions.

According to Smith and Baylis (1999:10), many observers question the fact that all globalising forces can be regarded as "good ones". In fact, globalisation makes it much easier for drug cartels and terrorist groups to operate. The recent attacks on the United States can serve as an example of a terrorist group that made use of the technologies of globalisation to plan and execute the assault. The uncontrolled spread of indecent material (such as child pornography) on the Internet has also raised crucial questions regarding censorship. Page (2002:2) is of the opinion that globalisation also has a negative impact on the environment. As trade increases so does transport which also means more pollution. Scientists have proven that an

---

[5]   In this regard Heywood (1997:152) argues that "although the division of the world into the 'North' and 'South' is based on the tendency for industrial development to be concentrated in the northern hemisphere, and for poverty and disadvantage to be concentrated in the southern hemisphere (apart from Australasia), the terms are essentially conceptual rather than geographical".

[6]   Heywood (1997:403) defines Confucianism as "a system of ethics derived from the philosophy of Confucius which emphasises respect and loyalty in human relations and the cultivation of the self".

increase in the use of fossil fuels will lead to serious climatical changes (including the dangerous rise of sea levels, flooding and droughts) as a result of global warming. Regardless of this, globalisation seems to demand the use of even more fossil fuels. What is disturbing is the fact that billions of acres of South American rainforest will have turned into desert by the year 2050. The rise of sea levels will mean that the number of people affected by flooding will rise from 5 million to 200 million by 2080. By 2050 another 30 million people will go hungry and an additional 170 million will suffer from extreme water shortages. Regarding development in the global South, emphasis is usually placed on the production of food, raw materials and manufactured goods for export. A reason for concern is the fact that land, mineral and timber rights are frequently sold to multinational corporations at a fraction of their true value, often leading to widespread deforestation and pollution (Page 2002:2).

In the globalisation debate it is often argued that multinational corporations are superseding nation-states in terms of autonomous decision-making power. In terms of the issue of global governance (being one of the characteristics of globalisation), to whom then are multinational corporations responsible and democratically accountable? The main concern is that if multinational corporations such as IBM and Shell become more and more powerful and influential, how accountable are they to democratic control? Real fear exists that globalisation might threaten the traditional role and influence of the democratic nation-state (Smith and Baylis 1999:10). In the light of this dilemma, Page (2002:3) is of the opinion that democracy is actually under threat because "increasingly, national policy is being determined by global economic institutions. We still have the right to vote, but the people we are voting for are often powerless to act on our behalf. Power rests more and more with bodies such as the WTO, OECD, IMF and the EU, all of which in turn are heavily influenced by corporations." Page (2002:1) further argues that of the 100 largest economies in the world today, 51 are corporations and 49 are nation-states. A major concern for Africa is the fact that the combined annual sales of General Motors and Ford are higher than the gross domestic product (GDP) of all sub-Saharan Africa. Only six or less companies control primary commodities such as coffee and cotton.

According to Page (2002:3), the cultural impact of globalisation is equally devastating. As the world economy becomes more centralised, rural areas are being marginalised with diverse cultures being lost in the process. Multinational corporations are able to create a global consumer monoculture because they can enter countries at will and destroy competition by spending millions on advertising. In the global North, countries improve their transportation networks to link major cities with one another, rarely serving small towns and villages. Local economies

are not able to compete with the big corporations any more and usually collapse, also destroying any real sense of community. The mutual dependence on which the economies of towns and smaller villages used to be based has given way to increasingly anonymous individualism. The result of this has been families splintering up and more and more people living alone. Instead of looking up to flesh and blood role models, children are mesmerised by distorted television and advertising images and base most of their ideals on those of media stars.

For the purpose of this article and in the light of the above discussion, two broad areas of resistance against the global influence of globalisation can be identified. On the one hand it seems as if globalisation is generally perceived as a Western value orientated and driven process, which dominates, controls and excludes all non-Western cultural groups. It is, therefore, almost logical that most non-Western cultural groups will be motivated to oppose such a system to protect their own cultures. Globalisation is, on the other hand, also accused of being economically exclusive, domineering and exploitive. According to this view it is only the developed Western states that reap the economic benefit of globalisation at the expense of the developing world. The latter's labour force, environment and natural resources are also exploited to benefit the developed world. Firstly, the focus will be placed on those factors influencing cultural resistance against globalisation.

3.1   Cultural resistance

The rejection of a future world order based on cultural factors has received wide attention in two very influential contributions. In a controversial article entitled "Jihad vs. McWorld",[7] Benjamin Barber (1992:53-65) argues that "beyond the horizon of current affairs lie two possible political futures - both bleak, neither democratic. The first is a retribalization of large swaths of humankind by war and bloodshed: a threatened Lebanonization of national states in which culture is pitted against culture, people against people, tribe against tribe - a Jihad in the name of a hundred narrowly conceived faiths against every kind of interdependence, every kind of artificial social cooperation and civic mutuality." He further argues that "the second is being borne in on us by the onrush of economic and ecological forces that demand integration and uniformity and that mesmerize the world with fast music, fast computers and fast food - with MTV, Macintosh, and McDonald's, pressing nations into one commercially homogenous global network: one McWorld tied together by technology, ecology, communication and commerce". World affairs

---

[7]   Barber expanded on the ideas expressed in this article in a work entitled **Jihad vs. McWorld. How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world**, published in 1996. He also published a post-September 11 edition of the same work entitled **Jihad vs. McWorld. Terrorism's challenge to democracy**, published in 2003.

are, therefore, polarising itself into two camps: almost a new bipolarity based on traditionalism versus globalisation. The one camp (Jihad) is founded on tribalism and anchored in strong traditional and parochial values. They reject the process of modernisation (from the Western perspective) and are, therefore, totally opposed to globalisation. The other camp (McWorld) form part of those states that fully participate in all the processes of globalisation, especially regarding technology and commerce. According to Barber (1992:1), both the forces of Jihad and McWorld operate with equal strength in opposite directions. The one is driven by what he terms as parochial hatreds, and the other by universalising markets, the one re-creates ancient subnational and ethnic borders from within, the other makes national borders porous from without. The only thing that these two opposing poles have in common is the fact that neither of them offer much hope to citizens who are looking for practical ways to govern themselves democratically.

The second major contribution regarding the role of culture was made by Samuel P Huntington (1993:22-49) in his influential "Clash of civilizations"[8] article. In this rather controversial publication, Huntington (1993:22) argues that world politics entered a new phase at the end of the Cold War. The most fundamental source of conflict in the "new" world would no longer be primarily ideological or economic. The main dividing factor and source of conflict will be based on cultural factors. Future politics will be characterised by a clash of different civilizations. Huntington (1993:23-5) defines civilization as "the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species". Civilizations also consist of common objective elements such as language, history, religion, customs and institutions. The future political order will be characterised by the increasing importance of a civilization identity and the interaction among seven or eight possible civilizations namely Western, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic Orthodox, Latin American and possibly African civilizations. Huntington (1993:25-7) argues that civilizations will clash for various reasons including differences in language, culture, tradition and religion and because of the fact that through globalisation different civilizations will come in closer contact with one another. Within different civilizations a feeling of civilization-consciousness will develop. He believes that the West is at the moment at the peak of its power and in a position to dominate all other civilizations. Other civilizations, especially Islam, has been particularly vulnerable against the domination of the West in recent times. Understandably, the article received

---

[8]   So controversial was the original article, that Huntington also, a while later, elaborated on his traditional arguments in a work entitled **The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order**, published in 1996.

wide praise but also severe criticism[9]. One event however, seemed to substantiate some of the claims (regarding culturally motivated conflicts between civilizations) made by Huntington in this article: the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States. Suddenly, the world came to the shocking realisation that not all its citizens were willing to accept the Western value system and its globalising influence, as the universal norm.[10] In a more recent article entitled "The age of Muslim wars", Huntington (2001-2002:6-13) defends his "Clash of civilizations" theory in the light of the terrorist attacks. He argues that the hate and resentment of most Muslim countries towards the West is mostly the result of the latter's imperialistic domination of the Muslim world for most of the 20th century. Islam can be regarded as a very dogmatic religion based on deep-rooted moral values and norms. Most Muslims regard Western values as morally corrupt and decadent. Many Muslims argue that these corrupt morals and values are spread across the world through globalisation and must, therefore, be rejected. Consequently Huntington (2001-2002:12) contemplates the possibility of the violence of the terrorist attacks escalating into a major violent civilizational war between Islam and the West and possibly other civilizations. He argues that this was precisely the goal of Osama bin Laden when he declared a "holy war" on the United States, attempting to mobilise Muslims worldwide and encouraging all Muslims to kill Americans indiscriminately as part of his jihad. Due to the many divisions that exist within Islam, this has not happened yet, even though the making of a general clash of civilizations exists.

In essence, Barber and Huntington both argue that the world is currently dominated by the Western civilization that, through the use of globalisation, imposes its economic power and authority upon other civilizations (especially Islam). The terrorist attacks against Western targets, and especially the attacks of 11 September, are regarded as the first signs of cultural conflict involving one civilization (Islam) attacking another civilization (the West) because of the domination of the latter over the first. Globalisation and its spread of Western values are often seen as a threat to the cultural heritage of other civilizations.

Another type of resistance against globalisation focuses on the socio-economic, rather than the cultural, domination of the West over the rest of the world. According to observers like Earley (2005a:1), the negative characteristics of

---

[9]   For more detail about the criticism against the Clash of civilization thesis consult the contributions of Adjami (1993:2-9); Binyon (1993:19-21); Bartley (1993:15-8); and Mahbubani (1993:10-4).

[10]   This view is also shared by Scruton (2002:vii) who argues that "Samuel Huntington's celebrated thesis that the Cold War has been succeeded by a 'clash of civilizations' has more credibility today than it had in 1993, when it was put forward. For many observers, reflecting on the calamity of September 11, the world has divided into two spheres - the sphere of freedom and democracy, and the sphere of despotism, 'failed states' and religious zeal."

globalisation[11] have, in part, contributed to the fact that humanity is now facing, for the first time in its existence, a planetary crisis. Although our current modes of operation have served us well for the past few centuries, it is no longer able to solve the ever-increasing problems and crises. Apart from a major ecological crisis that is looming, humanity is now struggling with seemingly insurmountable economic problems, huge discrepancies in wealth, homelessness, terrorism, nuclear prolifera-tion, genocide and many other unrelated issues. With regard to the latter the need for a process of social transformation is emphasised by Earley (2005a:1), who further argues that "triggered by the planetary crisis, the world is undergoing a whole-system transformation of all aspects of society, from our consciousness to our economy, from our values to our politics, from our technology to our organizations. For the first time in human history, we have the knowledge and power to choose our overall direction with foresight. We have the opportunity to construct a planetary society that will provide security, health and prosperity for everyone, that will foster love, harmony and creativity."[12]

In order to achieve these goals, Earley (2005b:1) identifies four "vehicles" that can foster social transformation, namely:

- ❑ **Social change organizations**, which aim to initiate fundamental change.
- ❑ **Social change programmes**, that can be defined as a specific initiative or campaign organised by a social change organisation.
- ❑ **Transformative networks.** The latter can be regarded as a network of trans-formative individuals or organisations.
- ❑ **Social movements.** The latter refers to a flow of individuals, groups, networks and organisations that have a similar goal in terms of social transformation.

In terms of criticism against the forces of globalisation, most of the grass-root resistance has come from social movements on which the focus will now be placed.

3.2   Social movement resistance

Interest groups were mainly responsible for organising protest politics in especially the United States and Europe (during the 1960s and 1970s) by directly approaching

---

[11]   With reference to "dimensions of globalisation" and its socio-economic implications discussed earlier (Guinness 2003:8).

[12]   For Early (2005:1) this process of social transformation means fundamental change in society and implies:
- ❑   addressing the root causes and systematic nature of social problems;
- ❑   the need for humanities to change its world views and the institutions that embody it;
- ❑   affecting every aspect of society, culture, consciousness, technology and ecology;
- ❑   that the balance of political, economic, and communicative power should alter in ways that will accommodate further positive changes;
- ❑   evolving to a higher level of consciousness, social and cultural development.

their governments. Since the collapse of communism (and the ensuing pressure that the expanding free market system has placed on the sovereignty of nation states in particular), however, social movements have orchestrated most of the resistance. Tarrow (1998:4) defines social movements as "collective challenges by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interaction with élites, opponents and authorities. Unlike parties, social movements do not seek state power. And unlike interest groups, they do not operate through detailed engagement with government." They would rather try to bypass government through a self-help ethos or seek publicity through the media. In terms of resistance against globalisation, Markoff (1996:23) views social movements as "an open, collective, sustained challenge to prevailing ways of doing things. A social movement is open in that there is an explicit statement calling for change; it is collective in that there is a group doing the calling; and it is sustained in that it is more than a single event or a small number of events." Social movements usually challenge the way in which power holders are chosen, the relationship of different power holders to one another or the particular policies of those in power. According to Norris (2002:188) traditional interest groups usually have well-established organisational structures and formal membership rules and are orientated towards influencing government. In contrast to this, new social movements (which has its roots in the civil rights and anti-nuclear movements of the 1950s as well as the environmental and women's movement of the 1970s) tend to have more fluid and decentralised organisational structures, more open membership criteria, and tend to focus on lifestyles and achieving social change through direct action and community building as much as formal decision-making processes.[13]

In terms of the broad aim of this study, the emphasis will be focused on the anti-globalisation group as a protective movement within the broader social movement. Before the focus can be placed on the anti-globalisation groups, an important question needs to be asked. How is cultural and social movement resistance different from one another? In reaction to the claim that different civilizations will clash with one another (with reference to the Barber/Huntington thesis), Burbach (2002:1) argues that "we need to start by recognizing that there is indeed a global

---

[13]   Early (2005b:2) identifies five types of social movements:

- ❑ **Self-protective.** These groups aim to stop or change destructive policies that are affecting its members (for example labour, anti-Vietnam and civil rights movements).
- ❑ **Protective.** These groups aim to stop destructive or dangerous policies that are affecting others or the world (for example anti-nuclear, environmental and anti-globalisation groups).
- ❑ **Constructive.** They strive towards creating healthier alternatives to what is currently available (soft-energy path, living economies and participatory democracy).
- ❑ **Personal.** Their main goal is to improve one's personal life (in terms of for instance holistic health, personal growth and voluntary simplicity).
- ❑ **Identity.** These groups strive towards affirming the rights of oppressed people (women's, gay and civil rights).

clash occurring. However, it is not between the Islamic and Western worlds, but between the forces of international corporate capital and the innumerable cultures, societies and even civilizations that are being undermined, uprooted and shattered as corporate capital expands its hold on the globe's peoples and resources." In contrast to the idea that a Western value and norm system is suffocating other cultures, social movements (and especially anti-globalisation groups) are mainly concerned with the negative socio-economic and environmental effects of the global capitalist system. Supporting this idea, many opponents of globalisation argue that "American-driven" free-market capitalism drives a wedge between rich and poor. They believe that only developing nations profit from increased technology and freer capital and labour movements, while developing economies remain mired in debt and poverty. Globalisation opponents further argue that multinational corporations are already superseding nation states in importance as trade barriers between nations crumble and countries become more reliant on foreign direct investment for their growth. The result of this is that some states lose their identities as they bow to the globalisation movement, while others (such as the United States) only become more powerful. These opponents have in recent years been referred to as the anti-globalisation group (Wingfield 2001:3).

But who are these protesters and what is meant when referring to anti-globalisation groups? According to Bailey (2002:4), the anti-globalisation contingent incorporates different groups, which include environmental, Third World debt, animal rights, child labour, anarchist, anti-capitalist as well as anti-corporate groupings. Most of the attention of anti-globalisation groups is paid to protesting against the alleged abuse of corporate power by multinational companies. They accuse large corporations with international undertakings of social injustice, unfair labour practices (which include slave labour wages, living and working conditions) as well as lack of concern for the environment, mismanagement of natural resources and damage to the ecology. Their activism is directed at what they term "big businesses" (multinational corporate power) and "big money" (global agreements on economic growth). In Europe, for instance, they are usually categorised as being liberal thinkers and members of the middle class who advocate a commitment to improvements in human rights, with membership usually coming from a variety of EU nations. One movement, the so-called Genoa Social Forum under the leadership of anti-AIDS activist Vittorio Agnoletto, acts as a peaceful umbrella group for nearly 750 anti-globalisation groups. Other non-violent groups such as Drop the Debt, Oxfam, and Greenpeace oppose the negative effects of globalisation. Many anti-globalisation groups also have celebrities as talking heads. Bono, lead singer of the Irish rock group U2, for instance, is the spokesperson for the Drop the Debt movement while the British rocker and humanitarian Bob Geldof recently held a meeting with G-8 leaders in Genoa to discuss the abolition of Third World debt.

Unfortunately, many violent groups have also entered the fray. One such pro-violence movement is the so-called Black Block, a covert group of anarchists and neo-Marxists who were responsible for fueling the violence at the Genoa conference (Wingfield 2001:4).

According to Bailey (2002:3), anti-globalisation protesters first grabbed the world's attention when they mobilised in their thousands to disrupt the World Trade Organisation Ministerial Conference in Seattle in November/December 1999. The 50 000 protesters comprised of farmers, ordinary citizens, students, environ-mentalists, human rights activists and labour union groups, all showing their collective dissatisfaction. The protests were so severe that they forced the city of Seattle to declare a civil emergency. The incident sparked a dusk to dawn curfew and forced police to use teargas, pepper spray and rubber bullets to control the mobs. In January the following year (2000) protesters also disrupted the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland. During April of that year about 10 000 demonstrators protested at the spring meeting of the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in Washington DC. The year 2000 was concluded with similar protests in Prague, Vienna and Melbourne, Australia. The year 2001 was also very eventful in terms of anti-globalisation pro-tests. During the April "Summit of America's" meeting in Quebec, Canadian police were forced to use water cannons and rubber bullets to quell anti-free trade protests. June saw anti-capitalist protests in Gothenberg, Sweden, in July protests rocked Salzburg, Austria and in Barcelona, Spain, protests erupted against a planned WB meeting that was later cancelled. From 20-22 July 2001, nearly 150 000 protesters, mostly from Europe, descended upon Genoa to express their rejection of the "New World Order" that characterises industrialised, Western democracies, most notably the United States. During this protest Carlo Guiliani became the first casualty of the anti-globalisation protests after he had been fatally wounded in violent clashes with riot police. In view of the intensity of the protests, anti-globalisation groups have proved to be more influential than was originally anticipated. For the first time the supporters of globalisation had to sit up and take notice of the fact that unopposed actions could no longer be taken.

In his contribution, Borosage (2000:1-2) acknowledges the importance of the role of students in the anti-globalisation struggle. On more than 175 campuses, students are protesting against global corporations to account for their apparent exploitation of workers abroad. Their actions come in the form of demonstrations, hunger strikes, seizing administration buildings, confronting university trustees and administrators and getting arrested in dozens of non-violent protests. Their main moral argument is to stop supporting companies that profit from exploiting workers abroad. On many campuses, they have for instance targeted apparel shops that buy

logo clothing from corporations that have factories in Honduras, Indonesia and China, where worker rights are apparently trampled. The main issue identified by students is the spread of so-called "sweatshop labour". The latter implies long working hours at a minimum wage.

To summarise, Page (2002:3-4) is of the opinion that the actions of anti-globalisation groups are already bearing fruit. Prominent financiers and politicians have started to question the free market system. The global financier George Soros has apparently admitted that the global capital system is "coming apart at the seams". Adding his voice the French Prime Minister, Lionel Jospin, argues that it (capitalism) is structurally weak. In India already half a million farmers have protested against unfair trade agreements. In the UK farmers have also started challenging big corporate buyers and supermarkets are being forced to respond to the needs of a more informed public. Many consumers are demanding local organic produce. On grassroots level groups are also developing ways to defend and rebuild their communities and re-localise the economy. National and local enterprises and businesses are also encouraged to "site here and sell here", keeping both money and jobs in the community.

4.   CONCLUSION

 The end of the Cold War (which placed an ideological stranglehold on the functioning of a worldwide free market economic system) provided the ideal fertile ground in which globalisation could develop. Over the last few years the world has been characterised by the spreading influence of the free market economic system and the accompanying advances in technology, communication and transportation. Whether it succeeded in its initial ideal to bring universal prosperity and peace to a world torn by war, bloodshed and economic division, has been fiercely debated. In their contribution, Kegley and Wittkopf (1999:246-7) summarise the above dis-cussion in a striking way. To them globalisation is controversial because "it portends two very different possible futures. In one optimistic scenario, neoliberal theory sees sovereignty is at bay as the globalization of markets and cultures transcends contemporary geopolitical boundaries and erodes the meaning of national identity, creating 'global citizens' who assign loyalty to the common interests of all peoples. In the other, more pessimistic, forecast states will compete with one another although their goals are essentially the same: to attain or retain the trappings of independence from and control over the homogenizing forces now sweeping the world. This competition will divide the world as countries become more alike, making some wealthy and stable but others poorer and fragile." With regard to advances in technology, communications and the ease with which trade and financial transactions take place, globalisation has succeeded in many of its

objectives. But unfortunately, there is also a darker and more unpleasant side to this phenomenon.

The current dominance of the Western value and norm system (that functions in tandem with a free market economic system) has led to resentment and hatred from other cultural groups who feel they are being subordinated. Many Muslims regard the Western value system as morally corrupt and resent the fact that they are currently dominated by its influence. Because of this, many non-Western cultural groups are also rejecting globalisation and retreating into their own traditional and often parochial value and norm system. On the basis of the contributions of Barber and Huntington, the conclusion can be made that there is a definite cultural resistance towards globalisation. However, the latter has not been able to provide solutions to the fact that most of the states of the world are crippled by poverty. In fact, the world is still divided between the rich and developed global "North" and the poor and developing "South" with the gap between them still increasing. To function properly globalisation needs labour and it needs natural resources. A major point of criticism against globalisation is the fact that the developed "North" (who mainly reaps the benefits of globalisation) exploits the developing global "South" for its natural resources and cheap labour. Instead of at least assisting them in economic development, the argument is that the developed world is letting the developing world sink deeper into economic hardship and poverty. In reaction to the apparent economic exploitation of the developing world by the developed world, a number of anti-globalisation groups have been formed to openly protest against the state of affairs. Interestingly, most of these movements are established by citizens of states in the developed word. Anti-globalisation groups are often referred to as the voice of those in the developing world that cannot speak for themselves. On the basis of these arguments a distinct social movement resistance towards the economic exploitation of globalisation was identified.

It would seem as if another type of bipolar system is developing in the age of globalisation. In contrast to the ideological bipolar system (liberal democracy vs. communism) of the Cold War era, the recent one is based on economic and cultural differences. The one pole might consist of all the developed nations who accept the principles of a free market system (and, but not necessarily, the Western value system). The other pole will probably consist of two different forces of resistance. The one might be non-Western cultures that reject globalisation on the basis of its dominance and negative influence on traditional values. The other is anti-globalisation groups who reject globalisation on the basis of its economic dominance and exploitation of the developing world.

With these odds stacked against it, the ideal of the universal acceptance of globalisation seems impossible. In a world characterised by diversity, no single idea has ever been accepted universally. The many different ideologies, religions and value systems that have developed over the years are proof of this. However, Fischer (2001:1) argues that "globalization is here to stay: the reality is that we already live in a global economy - where flows of trade, capital and knowledge across national borders are not only large, but are also increasing every year. Countries unwilling to engage with other countries risk falling farther behind the rest of the world in terms of both income and human development." The forces resisting globalisation that have been identified in this article are seemingly already marginalising the world order. In order to sell the idea of globalisation to a diverse world, its proponents will somehow need to integrate the concerns of the anti-globalisation groups as well as those who reject it from a cultural/religious point of view if the elusive goal of global harmony is to be achieved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADJAMI F 1993. The summoning. **Foreign Affairs** 72 (4):2-9.

BAILEY F 2002. **From subculture to world force.** http://iafrica.com/highlife/lowlife/559488 htm

BARBER B 1992. **Jihad vs. McWorld.** http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/foreign/barberf.htm

BARBER B 1996. **Jihad vs. McWorld. How globalism and tribalism are reshaping the world.** New York: Ballantine Books.

BARBER B 2003. **Jihad vs. McWorld. Terrorism's challenge to democracy.** London: Corgi Books.

BARTLEY RL 1993. The case of optimism. **Foreign Affairs** 72 (4):15-8.

BEINART P 1999-2000. **Globalization and Africa: An interpretation.** http://www.africana.com/Utilities/Content.html?&../cgibin/banner.pl?banner=EncartaArticles&../Articles/tt_739.htm

BINYON L 1993. Civilization grafting. **Foreign Affairs** 72 (4):19-21.

BOROSAGE R 2000. **Mixing '60s activism and anti-globalization.** http://www. commondreams.org/views/042300-101 htm

BURBACH R 2002. **Globalization's war.** http://www redress.btinternet.co.uk/ rburbach2.htm

BUZGALIN A 2003. The specter of "antiglobalism". **Russian Politics and Law** 41 (5):62-76.

EARLY J 2005(a). **Why we need social transformation.** http://www.early.org/ Conscious_Action/why_need_social_transformation.htm

EARLY J 2005(b). **Vehicles for social transformation.** http://www.early.org/ Conscious_Action/vehicles.htm

FISCHER S 2001. **The challenge of globalization in Africa.** http://www.imf.org/ external/np/speeches/2001/011901.htm

FUKUYAMA F 1989. The end of history? **The National Interest** 16 (Summer): 3-18.

FUKUYAMA F 1992. **The end of history and the last man.** London: Penguin Books.

GUINNESS P 2003. **Globalisation.** London: Hodder and Stoughton.

HAGUE R, HARROP M and BRESLIN S 1998. **Comparative government and politics. An introduction.** London: Macmillan.

HELD D and MCGREW A 2000. The great globalization debate: An introduction. In: Held D and McGrew A (eds). **The global transformation reader. An introduction to the globalization debate**. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 1-45).

HEYWOOD A 1997. **Politics.** London: Macmillan.

HUNTINGTON SP 1991. **The third wave: Democratization in the late twentieth century.** London: University of Oklahoma Press.

HUNTINGTON SP 1993. The clash of civilizations. **Foreign Affairs** 72 (4):22-49.

HUNTINGTON SP 1996. **The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order.** London: Touchstone Books.

HUNTINGTON SP 2001-2002. The age of Muslim wars. **Newsweek**, Special Davos Edition: 6-13.

KEGLEY CW and WITTKOPF ER 1999. **World politics: Trend and transformation.** New York: St. Martin's/Worth.

KISSINGER H 1994. **Diplomacy.** New York: Touchstone.

LEGRAIN P 2004. **Open world. The truth about globalization.** Chicago: Ivan R Dee.

MAHBUBANI K 1993. The dangers of decadence. **Foreign Affairs**, 72 (4):10-4.

MANSBACH RW 1994. **The global puzzle. Issues and actors in world politics.** Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

MARKOFF J 1996. **Waves of democracy. Social movements and political change.** Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

OUATTARA AD 1997. **The challenges of globalization for Africa.** http://www. imf.org/external/np/speeches/1997/052197 htm

PAGE J 2002. **Globalization explained.** http://www.isec.org.uk/

SCHIRATO T and WEBB J 2003. **Understanding globalization.** London: Sage Publications.

SCRUTON R 2002. **The West and the rest. Globalization and the terrorist threat.** London: Continuum.

SMITH S and BAYLIS J 1999. Introduction In: Baylis J and Smith S (eds). **The globalization of world politics. An introduction to international relations**. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-11.

SOROS G 2002. **On globalization.** Oxford: Public Affairs Ltd.

STIGLITZ JE 2003. **Globalization and its discontents.** New York: WW Norton and Company.

TARROW S 1998. **Power in movement. Social movements and contentious politics.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WINGFIELD B 2001. **The new face of (anti) globalization.** http://www.jhubc.it/bcjournal/online2001/2001wingfield-genoa.cfm.