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Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the contemporary theoretical debates surrounding globalisation. It illustrates the main features of protests against the social consequences of a globalised economy, and it identifies some of the key political issues that scholars and students of International Relations must face when addressing the promotion of justice and effective governance within a more densely connected world.

Since the mid-1990s the term globalisation has entered common usage and become a central issue in public debates in most countries around the world because of the apparently changed structure of world politics and economics. Globalisation has become associated with the controversial social outcomes that have stemmed from an increasingly integrated global economy, and the resulting public disquiet and controversy around the world, as particularly symbolised by the 1999 protests in Seattle against the World Trade Organization (WTO). Globalisation has also become an important – although essentially contested – concept within the field of International Relations and other social science disciplines. It is therefore essential to try to understand what globalisation means.

Understanding globalisation

Globalisation is a messy term that encompasses a wide variety of human activity. As you may be aware there are trade statistics and other economic facts that suggest the world is becoming increasingly globally integrated (Held et al 1999: 169–75). Nevertheless facts do not tell the whole picture. Consequently, in an effort to systematise the examination of globalisation, a variety of scholars have advanced arguments about what globalisation means. The seminal globalisation work Global transformations offers a systematic study of the history and nature of globalisation and suggests three explanations for contemporary global integration (Held et al 1999); see Box 25.1. The first is 'hyperglobalisation', a position held by liberals like Kenichi Ohmae (1995) who claim that globalisation represents a recent and near-complete triumph of liberal values and global markets that is tightly integrating states and people around the world. They argue globalisation is a significant force for human progress.
Box 25.1: Terminology

Three explanations of globalisation

Hyperglobalist

Globalisation is: Real and new.

Why? Globalisation is the consequence of information and communications technology as well as capitalism.

Main elements: Global economy.

Role of the state: End of effective state capacity.

Moral stance: Positive process.


Sceptical

Globalisation is: Nothing new: either is not real or is a long-standing process.

Why? Globalisation is a myth – there is a continuing international economy.

Main elements: Capitalism as usual.

Role of the state: Persistence of ‘normal’ state capacity for policy-making.

Moral stance: Globalisation is imaginary.


Transformationalist

Globalisation is: A real but long-standing spatial process.

Why? Long-term processes of technology, ideas and institutions have stretched human activity across time and space.

Main elements: Globalisation is multifaceted social process – different aspects of life are becoming global in varying degrees.

Role of the state: State capacity is undergoing transformation. The line between the foreign and domestic policy has become blurred.

Moral stance: An ambiguous process that is producing both ‘winners’ and ‘losers’, as well as reconstituting traditional political communities.


The second position is a sceptical set of observations which suggest that globalisation is overstated and largely a myth because the level of global integration during the 1990s is less than the period between 1870 and 1914 (Hirst and Thompson 1996: 2). Far from a world where markets have trumped states, the world economy is still shaped by state-to-state interaction; there remain significant differences between the strategic choices made by states in response to the world economy and strong states are still ‘able to work the system to their advantage’ (Waltz 1999: 7). Marxists are also sceptical on the grounds that global interconnections are an essential part of the capitalist mode of production; globalisation is seen as a ‘long standing process always implicit in capital accumulation rather than a political-economic condition that has recently come into being’ (Harvey 1997: 421).
The third account of globalisation is the 'transformationalist' perspective that seeks to locate globalisation in a more historical framework and has become the predominant explanation of globalisation. The transformationalist position conceives globalisation as a spatial process whereby various forms of human activity are increasingly traversing the world and connecting people in differing parts of the world more densely and more quickly than in previous times. This spatial interconnectedness is largely due to developments in transportation and communications technology that enable long-distance social relations. Anthony Giddens (1990: 64) exemplifies this account when he defines globalisation as 'the intensification of world wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa'. In this process national borders are transcended on a regular basis by various flows of resources, people and ideas. It is important to emphasise that this account contends that globalisation is multifaceted in that it is not restricted to the economic realm alone, as people are increasingly affected by various forms of economic, cultural and political activity. Equally important, the transformationalist position argues that globalisation is not novel to the late twentieth century as individuals and polities have been interconnecting across the world for at least 500 years, with some dynamics of globalisation evident even earlier.

Essentially we can see the history of globalisation as a spatial process firmly etched into the history of Australia. The incorporation of the Australian continent into the British Empire can be seen as a form of political and cultural globalisation in that colonialism involves global forms of political and economic structures of domination. Indeed, it is clearly the case that global connections have sped up, with the First Fleet taking 252 days to reach Australia, the first commercial airlines from the UK taking nine days in the 1930s, and contemporary airlines from the UK taking twenty-two hours. Global economic connections have been important to Australia since its inception as an English colony, as it was set up to service English economic interests. In many senses this logic of external connection has continued but the external interests have changed, with other nations being involved in various economic linkages and new forms of economic coordination such as Australia's involvement with the Bretton Woods economic institutions after World War II. Private transnational corporations have also become more systematically involved in recent decades. These political and economic connections have not been culturally neutral, as they have exposed Australians to various cultural values from around the world. It is safe to say that Australia, like most countries around the world at present, is increasingly affected by decisions and events elsewhere as its people are increasingly aware of events happening in other parts of the world. There is a faster transmission of fashions, information and ideas, an increased ability to participate in new forms of association, from non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and transnational corporations (TNCs) to internet chat rooms, and an increasing sensitivity to economic and political events in other parts of the world.

There are four main political implications of this spatial process for Australia and world politics. First, while nation-states remain as important actors in world politics, global connections and the development of communications technology have empowered a new range of actors to operate in politically significant ways (Held et al 1999: chapter 1). Clearly globalisation has made it easier to develop NGOs that promote a certain set of political values, but it has also made it easier for terrorist groups and organised crime to transfer people, resources and harm across national borders. Transnational corporations have also been greatly
empowered - if not enabled - by these accelerated forms of global linkage. Second, globalisation leads to *global connections and ramifications* that are more authentically transnational and universal. Indeed,

political communities and civilisations can no longer be characterised simply as 'discrete worlds': they are enmeshed and entrenched in complex structures of overlapping forces, relations and movements . . . But even the most powerful among them - including the most powerful nation-states - do not remain unaffected by the changing conditions and processes of regional and global entrenchment (Held et al 1999: 77-80).

However, these overlapping forces are often uneven and have greater local or regional implications for some people or states. Third, in many senses, *the lines between foreign and domestic policy have blurred* due to the intense and widespread forms of global integration and connection. This leads to issues such as *terrorism*, organised crime and environmental impact that intersect national borders and thereby can only be addressed by elaborate international cooperation.

Fourth, as a result of the previous points, there are increasingly complex forms of international and transnational cooperation that have become referred to as 'global governance'. The previous points create the situation where the nation-state cannot be assumed to be the only major political actor in issues like *security*, economic prosperity, or environmental sustainability. It is now the case that international or intergovernmental forms of organisation such as the UN, regional bodies like the EU or non-public bodies like TNCs, business councils or NGOs are increasingly important to understanding the enactment of policy-making. Jan Aart Scholte (2000: 138-9) indicates that these public and private bodies are 'supraterritorial constituencies' that are external influences over the operation of state policy-making. As we will see in the last section of this chapter, this is problematic because it can be seen to undermine *democracy* within nation-states.

It is important to be aware that some scholars are sceptical of the incidence or significance of the spatial implications of globalisation. As I mentioned previously, sceptics claim the *power* of the state is still largely intact - and there is plenty of evidence, especially in the post-September 11 context, to demonstrate the power of the state. Even transformationalist scholars argue that globalisation is not a monolithic force - different states and groups of people are affected by global integration in differing ways. However, there are also scholars who believe that while the spatial implications of contemporary global integration may be largely correct, they ignore any examination of the ideas and interests that are dominating and championing the contemporary shape of global economic integration. Some critically minded scholars emphasise the importance of *neoliberal and free market capitalist ideologies and policies* in shaping the way the global economy has developed since the 1970s (Cox 1997; Gill 1998).

*Neoliberalism* (also known as economic rationalism) is a strand of liberal thought that advances a range of policies ushered in by many Western - especially Anglo-Saxon - countries and the multilateral economic institutions (MEIs), such as the *International Monetary Fund* (IMF) and the *World Bank*. Neoliberalism is an ideology and philosophy based on the principle that human welfare is best promoted by economic growth, which in turn is best enabled by reducing the interference of governments in the private sector. Neoliberals also support
measures that enable trade and finance to have unrestricted movement across national borders. These policies attempt to ‘roll back’ the state and the role of government, and leave decisions about allocation, production and distribution in the economy to the global market thereby excluding or limiting measures that restrict or redistribute the wealth of individuals (Gill 1998). These ‘market friendly’ policies are evident in the policies of deregulation that remove ‘political’ interferences and rules from the operation of markets, privatisation, which entails the sale of state assets to the private sector or the ‘contracting out’ of public services to the private sector, and the liberalisation of restrictions on the movements of capital or trade across state borders. Neoliberals claim that an unregulated market is the best way to promote individual freedom and increase global economic growth, which will ultimately benefit – and ‘trickle down’ – to everyone. These policies have been influential around the world and have replaced the more moderate Keynesian liberalism that sought economic growth and social stability by allowing an active domestic role for the state.

Consequently we can see a close relationship between neoliberalism and contemporary processes of global integration. Indeed, the hyperglobalist position best captures the perspective of many Western governments – including that of Australia – which conceives globalisation as an inexorable economic force. From the early 1980s onwards, globalisation was seen as an external technological and economic force compelling Australia to adjust its economic policies, largely through liberalisation and deregulation. This vision was articulated in Australian economic foreign policy in the 1997 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade white paper:

Not only are national policy settings judged by the international marketplace, individual companies – irrespective of whether they are exporters – are increasingly subject to the disciplines of international best practice. Globalisation makes further integration with the global economy even more essential to advancing Australia’s national interests. It also makes reform of the Australian economy essential: continuing reforms are crucial to the international competitiveness of Australia in a global economy (DFAT 1997: 20).

This idea of globalisation being a monolithic external force was challenged by scholars who claimed that successive Australian governments used the idea of ‘globalisation’ to mask the neoliberal agenda driving economic policy (Emy 1993; Walter 1996). While it is now
generally accepted that globalisation is a broader phenomenon encompassing more than just economics, there is no doubt that neo-liberal ideas and policy-making are an important component of political life at a national and global level.

The focus of neoliberal ideas and policies is upon unleashing innovation, profitability and economic growth through encouraging unimpeded transnational economic linkages. Neoliberal ideas underpinned the formation of the 'Washington Consensus' orthodoxy of the MEIs in the 1980s (see chapter 20), expressing a view articulated by the US government and development economists that neoliberal policies were the only path to prosperity and development. As such this orthodoxy has been evident in the policies of the IMF and World Bank, especially in the policies of structural adjustment, in directing developing countries to introduce neoliberal measures. Substantiation of the impact of neoliberalism is also evident in the rising tide of public concern over the implications of neoliberalism. While trade liberalisation can promote public disquiet – because jobs are often affected and the losers in this scenario tend to be more vocal than the winners – during the 1990s the focus throughout the Western world shifted towards a broader concern for global justice. This is perhaps an indication that globalisation as a spatial process had impacted on public awareness and that neoliberal policies had some unpalatable social implications. We now turn to the substance of these public concerns and protests.

**The anti-capitalist movement**

Although NGOs like Oxfam and Greenpeace have been interested in the global economy for many years, and people in developing parts of the world have likewise contested the policies of the IMF for some decades, since the mid-1990s individuals and NGOs concerned with global social justice grew exponentially in number and voice. As such, it has become common to refer to these protests as a social movement – the ‘anti-globalisation’ or more accurately, the ‘anti-capitalist movement’. However, the unity of this movement is open to debate. The anti-capitalist movement (ACM) is a global social movement (or collection of movements) that challenges the domination of transnational corporate interests and neoliberal/free market policies because of the perceived impact of this type of global capitalism on social justice. As such, sometimes this movement is referred to as the ‘global justice movement’. Ultimately, the groups involved in this movement seek to challenge the orthodoxy of trade liberalisation and neoliberalism that exclude efforts to regulate or redistribute economic activity (Klein 2001). They do not accept the economic assumptions and arguments associated with neoliberalism, and they see that economic gain and the interests of market actors need to be considered along with other public goals such as good labour standards, environmental protection and human rights. They claim that the defenders of neoliberalism and free trade frequently fail to acknowledge the needs of vulnerable people around the world in favour of the economic interests of the affluent (Klein 2001).

While most people became aware of the ACM with the protests against the WTO meeting in Seattle in 1999, the real beginnings of the movement against global capitalism began in 1994 with the Zapatista struggle against neoliberalism (See Box 25.3). On 1 January 1994, a grassroots rebellion in the impoverished southern Mexican state of Chiapas began against the introduction of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), a regional treaty
Box 25.3: Discussion points

A brief timeline of the global anti-capitalist movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998:</td>
<td>Internet-coordinated protests publicising details of secret negotiations on the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) bring about their collapse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June 1999</td>
<td>The first Day of Global Action, with protests against financial centres in forty-one countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>Sixty to eighty thousand people from around the world demonstrate as part of the Day of Global Action at the World Trade Organization (WTO) meeting in Seattle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2000:</td>
<td>Twenty thousand protesters against World Bank and IMF in Prague and more than 20,000 protesters against the World Economic Forum meeting in Melbourne that same year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2001:</td>
<td>Eighty thousand protest against the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) in Quebec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2001:</td>
<td>During protests by 200,000 people against the Group of 8 (G8) meeting in Genoa, the police kill one protester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2004:</td>
<td>Protests against the WTO in Cancun. WTO dialogue between the member-states stalls and collapses (again).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005:</td>
<td>Protests against the G8 meeting in Gleneagles; the Live 8 concerts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

animated by explicit neoliberal principles. While the Zapatistas employed some forms of active resistance, the true impact of the movement was its explicit recognition of the importance of challenging neoliberal ideas and an effective use of the internet to communicate their cause. This played a crucial role in mobilising a wide variety of causes from around the world to the question of neoliberalism. These events were followed by a global internet campaign against the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI). The MAI was an agreement being devised by the OECD in secrecy from 1995, with the aim of applying trade liberalisation principles to the realm of investment. It was feared by those in and beyond the ACM that this would have eliminated the right of states to control many aspects of policy-making such as regulated working conditions or environmental standards (Goodman and Ranald 1999: 34). Once a copy of the MAI draft treaty was leaked onto the internet it catalysed a worldwide campaign that exacerbated the differences within the OECD and in 1998 negotiations collapsed, leading to the treaty being scrapped. The successful anti-MAI campaign was quickly followed up by large-scale physical protests at Seattle in 1999 and a protest against the WEF in Melbourne on 11 September 2000 (see Box 25.4), which, despite some violence, involved the heavy use of entertainment and carnival-like themes to capture public attention.

An important development for the ACM occurred in January 2001 when the World Social Forum (WSF) was created in Porto Alegre in Brazil. The WSF was created as a political space to discuss and formulate alternatives to neoliberal globalisation and thus challenge the ideas of the World Economic Forum that meets annually in Davos, Switzerland and intermittently in other places. The WSF annual meetings have been growing in size and in 2006 there were simultaneous meetings in Mali, Venezuela and Pakistan (see Box 25.5).
Box 25.4: Case study

The Australian anti-capitalist movement: The S11 protests in Melbourne

'THE S11-S13 protests in Melbourne marked a sea-change in Australian politics. Thousands of workers and even more young people came out onto the streets for 72 hours of continual actions against capitalism. They blockaded a meeting of the World Economic Forum (WEF) at the Crown Towers hotel, where 1,000 of the world's richest chief executive officers met to discuss furthering their neo-liberal agenda' (Stephen Jolly, S11 activist and Socialist Party secretary: see www.socialismtoday.org/51/australia.html).

Box 25.5: Discussion points

World Social Forum attendance at a glance

The World Social Forum is not a formal organisation, but:

... an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences and inter-linking for effective action, by groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neoliberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a society directed towards fruitful relationships among Humankind and between it and the earth (World Social Forum 2002).

2001 Porto Alegre: 10,000
2002 Porto Alegre: 40,000
2003 Porto Alegre: 70–80,000
2004 Mumbai: 100,000+
2005 Porto Alegre: 155,000
2006 Bamako (Mali), Caracas (Venezuela) and Karachi (Pakistan): 120,000+

Sources: www.glovesoff.org/columns/cooney_2005wsf.html;

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 had a significant impact on the ACM, with the political climate moving away from social justice concerns. However, in the lead-up to the US-led war in Iraq, the increased public concern on the defensibility of that war led to a high level of cross-pollination of anti-war and global social justice concerns. This was followed in 2005 with the 'Make Poverty History' campaign and the 'Live 8' concerts aimed at galvanising public awareness about the impact of global poverty. It should be noted however, that there is some controversy about the coherence of the Make Poverty History campaign with the previously stated goals of the ACM. In particular while the ACM has sought to significantly reform or dismantle global capitalism, the Make Poverty History campaign seemed to accept the core aspects of global capitalism coupled with measures that promote 'trade justice', 'drop the debt' and offer 'more and better aid' (Make Poverty History campaign 2005). Whether this is a maturating or a weakening of the ACM's agenda depends ultimately on your perspective.
It must be clear that there have been, and continue to be, significant differences within the ACM over the goals of protest and the tactics that should be utilised. There are groups that advocate violence and vandalism against capitalist icons, those who support non-violent protests and those who wish to engage in constructive dialogue with TNCs and the MEIs. There are socialist groups that aspire to move beyond capitalism and some groups that seek to reform the capitalist system. However, while the diversity and global extent of the protest movement speaks volumes about the social problems facing the world and the diversity of moral viewpoints of those resisting neoliberalism, developing political coherence amidst such diversity is the most significant challenge facing the protest movement. It is important also to see that the ACM itself has been actively countered by the MEIs and the many pro-capitalist business councils and lobby groups that continue to play an important role in supporting the development of economic globalisation. There are, as Leslie Sklair (1997) has pointed out, ‘social movements for global capitalism’ in developing and defending economic globalisation. Economists and business councils play a crucial role in supporting and legitimating neoliberal ideas and the type of global capitalism we take for granted.

Also, while there has not yet been a momentous transformation in the economic orthodoxy away from neoliberalism, the impact of these protests is not insignificant. It is clearly the case that the protest movements have brought the structure and neoliberal policies of the MEIs to world attention when previously they were not significant topics of public consideration. The protest movement has politicised the global economy and opened up some avenues for dissenting ideas and voices by making clear that contemporary globalisation is a political and cultural structure as much as an economic one. The ACM has essentially politicised the ideas and private bodies that stand behind the institutional infrastructure of contemporary globalisation, such that corporate think tanks and transnational business councils have been taken out of the realm of conspiracy theory and placed into the discourse of any reasonable explanation of the contours of contemporary globalisation. The increasing attention paid to the social and institutional underpinnings of prosperity by the MEIs can also be seen to reflect a reaction to outside voices as much as internal learning processes inside the MEIs (O'Brien et al 2000: 228). In some cases the ACM has frustrated and slowed the development of the institutionalisation of neoliberalism. The Seattle protest and the anti-MAI campaigns are examples of protests that amplified the divisions within the intergovernmental negotiations and were consequently successful at slowing down the institutional growth of neoliberal globalisation.

Most significantly, it appears that in terms of organising global economic affairs we are witnessing a shift away from conventional interstate cooperation towards a more complicated model of cooperation where NGOs and social movements have some impact. This is a significant departure from the Westphalian idea of international relations being about state-to-state interaction. Indeed, some scholars suggest that this is the emergence of ‘complex multilateralism’ where states are overlaid by non-state actors (O'Brien et al 2000: 207). The consequence of this is simple; the institutions that states have set up are not alone in making public decisions – they have to interact with NGOs in order to work effectively. The days of international bodies making decisions in splendid isolation are over – increasingly people are questioning the legitimacy and competency of these bodies (Esty 2002). The operation of the NGOs complicates the ‘smooth’ operation of the MEIs and can be seen to play a blocking role even if they cannot or do not play a constructive role. This is a trend that is
unlikely to go away: people are concerned that trade liberalisation and economic globalisation may be increasing inequality, poverty and environmental degradation. These public perceptions are important because NGOs play a growing role in the nature of world politics through informing the public and through promoting alternative perspectives on the desirability of neoliberal ideas and assumptions.

The significance and future prospects of these protests against global capitalism depend heavily upon how the ideas and energy created by the ACM are interpreted by citizens around the world and especially how powerful political and economic actors respond to future social problems that are directly or indirectly connected to global capitalism. The future of these protests and indeed globalisation itself also depend heavily upon what we consider as being the appropriate political structures that should be maintained or developed in future. Should we develop extensive forms of global democracy or protect state sovereignty? Consequently, questions of international relations theory and political theory are tremendously significant to the future shape of globalisation.

Scholarly critiques of globalisation

One of the core questions facing International Relations scholars, and indeed everyone on our planet, is: how are we to organise political authority and effective governance within the context of globalisation? Despite significant public disquiet about the type of globalisation that currently exists, the fact remains that over the last two or three decades various forms of international cooperation and governance have developed so that global capitalism and other forms of global integration are able to secure their existence. The role of non-state actors has also increased. These forms of international and transnational governance coupled with processes of economic and cultural globalisation have called into question the nation-state's future role in a world system that promotes stability or justice. We are witnessing a 'double displacement of state authority' towards private market influences and towards global and regional bodies that are external to any state (Slaughter 2005: 71). There are real questions whether states around the world, even the most powerful, can control their domestic affairs in the face of globalised structures and forces.

Consequently, in international relations literature the idea of 'cosmopolitan democracy' has become a significant conjectural alternative to contemporary globalisation. Contemporary scholars such as Richard Falk, Anthony McGrew and David Held have argued we need to institutionalise the idea that people are 'citizens of the world'. While the idea of cosmopolitanism has been around for some time (see chapter 9), in recent times cosmopolitans are more forthright in their support for global institutions and a single global democratic space. They contend that the various processes of globalisation have fundamentally limited the capacity of the nation-state to have any real sense of control over its destiny because its populace is now routinely affected by 'outside' decisions and forces (Falk 1995; Held 1995). Held claims that 'the idea of a political community of fate – of a self-determining collectivity which forms its own agenda and life conditions – can no longer meaningfully be located within the boundaries of a single nation-state alone' (1998: 21). In the context of globalisation, cosmopolitans argue that the only way to overcome these disjunctures is to include in decision-making processes...
everyone who stands to be affected by them, thereby making the appropriate site for democracy, at least on some issues, a global one. In pursuing this alternative and globally extending democracy across states borders – the state and other actors such as TNCs will be increasingly bound by global laws and standards (Held 1995: 234–5), and individuals – not states – will be the primary moral agents in world politics.

Obviously, there are many critics of cosmopolitan proposals. After all, the idea of global democracy seems a far-fetched and utopian attempt at world government. While the proponents of cosmopolitan democracy suggest that we think creatively for a more just form of global order, the communitarian critics of cosmopolitanism claim that cosmopolitans understate the power and utility of national forms of identity and loyalty (Miller 1999). More particularly, communitarian and republican critics claim that a global democracy is not necessary for global cooperation and that citizens of democratic states ought instead direct their states to be more just and cooperative with respect to their foreign policies (Slaughter 2005). While it is easy to be critical of the feasibility of cosmopolitan democracy, it is harder to be critical of calls to promote an increased concern for human rights at home and abroad. However, in terms of the future, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that we need new forms of governance and political community, and while cosmopolitan claims may not square with the political realities of a world where nation-states are still predominant, cosmopolitans are posing important questions.

Conclusion

This chapter has indicated the variety of ways in which world politics is increasingly important to our everyday lives. Contemporary globalisation entails a blurring of local, national and world politics. Neoliberal policy-making’s emphasis on promoting economic growth and excluding efforts to regulate or redistribute economic activity are having profound effects around the world and are provoking public concern as to whether this is the path to a sustainable and socially just future. This chapter has also illuminated the way that ordinary people around the world have become engaged with the question of how global political life should be organised in the hope of promoting a more just and stable world. Consequently, the level of our knowledge of world politics and our stance in relation to how we could achieve effective governance and justice are fundamental questions to us as citizens and as students, as we live a shared future in an increasingly globalised world.

Questions

1. Do you think the hyperglobalists, sceptics or transformationalists provide the better account of globalisation?
2. Why has globalisation stimulated so much resistance? Is it justified?
3. Why has democracy become such a central issue in globalisation debates?
4. Do protests against globalisation make a difference? If so, how?
5. Who or what should the anti-capitalist movement target?
6. Do protests against globalisation reflect cosmopolitan or communitarian sentiment?
Further reading


