

## **RESISTING GLOBALIZATION**

The current forms and scope of worldwide resistance to globalization policies and processes is one of the most important political developments of the last decade. However, to speak singularly of “resistance” is itself something of a misnomer. For just as globalization must ultimately be recognized as comprising a multiplicity of forces and trajectories, including both negative and positive dimensions, so too must the resistance to globalization be understood as pertaining to highly complex, contradictory, and sometimes ambiguous varieties of struggles that range from the radically progressive to the reactionary and conservative.

“Globalization” itself is one of the most highly contested terms of the present era with passionate advocates and militant critics (Kellner, 2002). By the 19<sup>th</sup> century debates raged over whether the global reach of the capitalist market system and the disruptions it brought were producing a beneficial “wealth of nations” (i.e., Adam Smith) or producing an era of exploitation and imperialism (i.e., Karl Marx). For the Marxist tradition, globalization has since signified an oppressive hegemony of capital, and after the Great Depression and World War II many critics have discussed the manner in which a discourse of “modernization” emerged to celebrate the growth of a globalized capitalist market system against its ideological and geopolitical competitor, state communism. Counterhegemonic national liberation movements and attempts to develop a “Third Way” against capitalism and communism marked the post-World War II epoch up until the 1990s and collapse of communism.

Perhaps the most noted form of resistance to globalization at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was first popularly termed the “anti-globalization movement,” which can be seen

as attempting to constitute the beginnings of a global civil society that might produce new public spheres of political debate and cosmopolitan culture, as it upholds values of autonomy, democracy, peace, ecological sustainability, equality, and social justice. Around the turn of the new millennium activists began to more specifically describe their opposition to certain aspects and forms of globalization, thereby identifying the possibility of positive forms of globalization. As we shall see below, this resulted in terms like the “anti-corporate globalization movement” and the “social justice movement” gaining currency. Still, many activists have tended to portray globalization in a largely negative fashion. For them, globalization is often considered as being more or less equivalent with programs of top-down neoliberal capitalism, imperialism and terror war, McDonaldization of the planet by transnational corporations who exist only for profit and the states that cater to them, as well as dis-equilibrating cultural change resulting from the global proliferation and migration of Western/Northern science and technology. On the other hand, perhaps due to the significant political involvement of youth throughout the movement, the use of new media associated with the Internet has been key in helping anti-corporate globalizers to coordinate protests, proliferate counter-messages, and manifest oppositional technopolitics and subcultures (see Kahn and Kellner, 2003). Thus, the anti-globalization movement’s relationship to contemporary technology must itself be considered contested and complex, if not contradictory in some aspects.

The anti-corporate globalization movement initially began to receive widespread recognition in 1999, when the first in an ongoing series of large international protests was staged. These protests, which have often taken the name of the date on which they

occurred (e.g., J16 for “June 16th”) or the central city which they have occupied (e.g., “Battle for Seattle”), have continued to erupt outside almost every major international political and economic meeting. Protesters see economic policy-making institutions such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), as well as conferences such as the Davos World Economic Forum and the G8 Summits, as central to the growth and future planning of unjust globalization and have accordingly made protest of their major meetings a priority. Additionally, since 9/11, the anti-globalization movement has increasingly become associated with targeting the militarist policies of the Bush and Blair administrations as part of a growing anti-war grassroots movement. Indeed, on February, 15, 2003, an anti-war/globalization protest was convened that brought together an estimated 15 million people in some 60 countries worldwide, which resulted in media outlets such as the *New York Times* referring to the unprecedented resistance as the “other superpower.”

The manner in which the anti-globalization movement has remained mobile, changing its styles, messages, and constituencies depending on the situation, is one of its more important features. Scholars have often noted how the anti-corporate globalization movement is marked by the convergence and collection of political and cultural organizations involving more traditional political structures such as unions and parties, as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), along with a wide-range of citizen’s groups and individual persons representing what have been termed the “new social movements” (see the studies in Aronowitz and Gautney, 2003). Hence, the anti-capitalist globalization movement has been portrayed as an evolution of modern political rights struggles in which all manner of identity and single-issue politics have become loosely

linked, and to some degree hybridized, in joint contest against the rapacity of transnational neoliberalism as they fight for further extensions of universal human rights and a sustainable planetary ecology.

In as much as neoliberal globalization represents a continuation of the sort of modernization agenda that Western and Northern states began to propound in less developed countries following World War II, and especially since the reformation of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in the early 1960s, there are reasons to link the resistance of today's new social movements to a number of historical precedents. These include earlier examples of resistance to burgeoning globalization such as Latin American popular education programs and the rise of African nationalism in the 1950s and 1960s, southeast Asia's Chipko movement, Chico Mendes's unionization against Amazonian rain forest destruction, and China's Tiananmen Square democracy movement in the 1980s, the 56 "IMF riots" that occurred in Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Europe and the Middle East from 1985 to 1992, and manifestations of resistance such as the formation of the Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People in 1991 to fight Shell Oil in Nigeria, as well as the election of a self-determining Government of National Unity in South Africa and the emergence of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation in Chiapas, Mexico in 1994. Whereas some of these resistance movements were regionalized and based their approach in local traditions, which they utilized to contest the negative and colonizing influences of unrestrained capitalist development, others such as the Zapatistas have demonstrated a closer resemblance to recent mass-mobilizations against capitalist globalization through their mix of violent and non-violent protest, attempts to form solidarity with a myriad of

oppressed peoples and groups around the world, and their subversion of new media (e.g., the Internet) which they incorporate as weapons in the furtherance of resistant goals.

Undeniably, much of the resistance to globalization today cannot be understood apart from its use of the new technologies associated with the Internet. It is for this reason, as well as for more ideological reasons such as the fact that many involved in the so-called “anti-globalization movement” actually desire something like the globalization of positive values and culture, that many scholars and activists have begun to reject the moniker of “anti-globalization” altogether. Instead, people often speak of “globalization from below” as opposed to “globalization from above,” of anti-capitalist or anti-corporate globalization, of the “alter-globalization movement” and of “alternative globalizations,” of the “global justice movement,” or the “movement of movements.” The latter is particularly used to express the political idea of a global solidarity based in the tremendous diversity of resistance to be found to today’s mainstream ruling practices, neoliberal capitalist economics, repressive cultural norms, and other aspects of global society that appear to augment the divides between rich and poor and oppressor and oppressed. Notably, since 2001, the World Social Forum has been held as a sort of annual counter-summit to the World Economic Forum. With its motto of “Another World is Possible,” attendance in the many tens of thousands hailing from over 100 countries, and highly inclusive nature that involves diverse representatives from all manner of progressive groups and causes, many have come to highlight the World Social Forum as a prominent example of the movement of movements that can characterize an alternative to capitalist globalization (see Hardt, 2002).

The new movements against capitalist globalization, then, have placed issues like global justice and environmental destruction squarely in the center of the important political concerns of our time. Whereas the mainstream media failed to vigorously debate or even report on globalization until the eruption of a vigorous anti-corporate globalization movement and rarely, if ever, critically discussed the activities of the WTO, the World Bank, and the IMF, there is now a widely circulating critical discourse and controversy over these institutions. Stung by criticisms, representatives of the World Bank in particular are pledging reform, and pressures are mounting concerning proper and improper roles for the major global institutions, highlighting their limitations and deficiencies and the need for reforms such as debt relief for overburdened developing countries to solve some of their fiscal and social problems. In fact, this highlights that another aspect of the current resistance to globalization is that it works both to counter and reform it at once, with some social movements working for direct and participatory democracy and autonomous communities (sometimes utilizing alternative economic structures such as “local exchange trading systems”), on the one hand, while others seek truly representative and democratically accountable national and global political structures, on the other.

Resistance to globalization is also occurring in the form of extreme right political movements that seek to defend ideas such as frontier-style self-determination, national isolationism, and fundamentalist culture against what they perceive as the growing imposition of total global governance, in some cases, or modern liberal and secular culture, in others. Since the 1990s, there has been a dramatic rise in fascist groups and ultra-nationalist and xenophobic politics in European countries, with nations such as

France, Italy, Austria, Belgium, and Norway having seen over 15 percent of the popular vote captured by politicians representing these ideological aims. Indeed, xenophobia is also growing in the United States with the rise of groups such as the Minutemen, who as armed vigilantes patrol the border zone with Mexico in order to prevent illegal entry and who additionally monitor corporations and the government for violations of tax, immigration, and employment laws. Further, the United States possesses a significant far right population that fights for individualist liberties such as the right to bear arms, live free from governmental intrusions into private affairs, and possess inalienable private property, which it sees as under threat from a global conspiracy of political institutions that seek one form or another of the globalization of a New World Order. Finally, against the globalization of Western culture and political norms, the last few decades have seen the rise of highly conservative and reactionary forms of religious fundamentalism. In particular, Islamic fundamentalism has been portrayed as a major opponent of globalization, with groups such as the Taliban in Afghanistan signifying an extreme form of resistance to the globalization of modern secular culture and democratic politics. Yet, as the Taliban is also associated with Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda network, who actively use new media technologies to promote their cause and who seek in their own image a “global jihad movement,” it is clear that even here resistance must be revealed as embodying a myriad of complexities and contradictions.

It would thus be incorrect to perceive a simple dichotomy between globalization processes and its resisters. Just as there are positive and negative dimensions to globalization, the same can be said of the various forces which seek to resist it. Thus, in understanding the resistance to globalization, one needs to be context specific and look

for the variety of forms of struggle – including individuals practicing lifestyle politics, civic groups and grassroots activist networks, non-governmental and transnational social movement organizations, as well as more national groups and parties – that are often combined in producing resistance events and which comprise a broad spectrum of resistance to globalization.

### **Technopolitics of Resistance**

Significant contemporary political struggles against globalization are mediated by technopolitics, in which new technologies such as computers and the Internet are used to advance political goals (Kellner, 2003a; Kahn and Kellner, 2005). To some extent, politics in the modern era have always been mediated by technology, with the printing press, photography, film, and radio and television playing crucial roles in politics and all realms of social life, as Marshall McLuhan, Harold Innis, Lewis Mumford, and others have long argued and documented. Today, participation in representative democracies is mediated by technology, and as the disastrous failure of computerized e-voting machines in the U.S. 2000 and 2004 Presidential elections and the grassroots online response has dramatized, computers themselves are now crucial political tools for competing groups as they attempt to access state power. Further, international organizations like Third World Network, Mexican Action Network on Free Trade, and Globalise Resistance are able to influence global policy making in large part because of the coalition-building and informative power their websites have brought to them.

What is especially novel about computer and information technology mediated politics is that information can be instantly communicated to large numbers of individuals

throughout the world who become connected to one another via computer networks. The Internet is also potentially interactive, allowing discussion, debate, and on-line and archived discussion. It is also increasingly multimedia in scope, allowing the dissemination of images, sounds, video, and other cultural forms and it has likewise begun to produce its own styles. Moreover, the use of computer technology and networks is becoming a normalized aspect of politics, just as the broadcasting media were some decades ago. The use of computer-mediated technology for technopolitics, however, opens new terrains of political struggle for voices and groups excluded from the mainstream media and thus increases potential for intervention by oppositional groups, potentially expanding the scope of democratization and challenging the naturalization of free trade agreements and neoliberal capitalism.

Given the extent to which capital and its logic of commodification have colonized ever more areas of everyday life in recent years, it is somewhat astonishing that cyberspace is by and large de-commodified for large numbers of people – at least in the overdeveloped countries like the United States. On the other hand, using computers, transforming information into data-packets that can be sent through networks, and hooking oneself up to computer networks, involves a form of commodified activity, inserting the user in networks and technology that are at the forefront of the information revolution and global restructuring of capital. Thus the Internet is highly ambiguous from the perspective of global commodification, as from other perspectives, even as it is notable for being a major tool in the production of resistance to globalization.

There have been many campaigns against the excesses of global capitalist corporations such as Nike and McDonald's. Hackers attacked Nike's site in June 2000 and

substituted a "global justice" message for Nike's corporate hype. Many anti-Nike web-sites and list-serves have emerged, helping groups struggling against Nike's labor practices circulate information and organize movements against Nike, which have forced them to modify their labor practices.

A British group, London Greenpeace, that created an anti-McDonald's website against the junk food corporation and then distributed the information through digital and print media has received significant attention. This site was developed by supporters of two British activists, Helen Steel and Dave Morris, who were sued by McDonald's for distributing leaflets denouncing the corporation's low wages, advertising practices, involvement in deforestation, cruel treatment of animals, and patronage of an unhealthy diet. The activists counterattacked and with help from supporters, organized a McLibel campaign, assembled a McSpotlight website with a tremendous amount of information criticizing the corporation, and mobilized experts to testify and confirm their criticisms (see [www.mcspotlight.org](http://www.mcspotlight.org)). . The three-year civil trial, Britain's longest ever, ended ambiguously on June 19, 1997, with the Judge defending some of McDonald's claims against the activists, while substantiating some of the activists' criticisms.

The case created unprecedented bad publicity for McDonald's which was disseminated throughout the world via Internet websites, mailing lists, and discussion groups. The McLibel/McSpotlight group claims that their website was accessed over 15 million times and was visited over two million times in the month of the verdict alone. Additionally, the newspaper *The Guardian* reported that the site "claimed to be the most comprehensive source of information on a multinational corporation ever assembled" and was part of one of the more successful anti-corporate campaigns to have been undertaken.

On the whole, websites critical of global capitalist corporations have disseminated a tremendous amount of information. Many labor organizations are also beginning to make use of the new technologies. The Clean Clothes Campaign, a movement started by Dutch women in 1990 in support of Filipino garment workers, has supported strikes throughout the world, exposing exploitative working conditions. In 1997, activists involved in Korean workers strikes and the Merseyside dock strike in England used websites to promote international solidarity. In like manner, representatives of major U.S. labor organizations have indicated how useful email, faxes, websites, and the Internet have been to their struggles and, in particular, indicated how such technopolitics helped organize demonstrations or strikes in favor of striking English or Australian dockworkers, as when U.S. longshoremen organized strikes to boycott ships carrying material loaded by scab workers. Technopolitics thus helps labor create global alliances in order to combat increasingly transnational corporations.

Indeed, one can argue that against the capitalist organization of neoliberal globalization, a Fifth International, to use Waterman's phrase (1992), of computer-mediated activism is emerging that is qualitatively different from the party-based socialist and communist Internationals of the past. Advances in personal, mobile informational technology are rapidly providing the structural elements for the existence of fresh kinds of highly informed, autonomous communities that coalesce around local lifestyle choices, global political demands and everything in between. As the virtual-community theorist Howard Rheingold (2002) describes, these multiple networks of connected citizens and activists transform the "dumb mobs" of totalitarian states into "smart mobs" of socially active personages linked by notebook computers, PDA devices, Internet cell phones,

paggers and global positioning systems (GPS). Increasingly, this is being done with great political effect. For instance, these technologies were put to use in a March 2004 mobilization in Spain that spontaneously organized the population to vote out the existing conservative government and replace it with an anti-war, socialist party. Thus, while emergent mobile technology provides yet another impetus toward experimental identity construction and identity politics, such networking also links individuals up with diverse communities such as labor, feminist, ecological, black bloc anarchist, and anti-racism and war organizations, along with peasant movements like Via Campesina, and various anti-capitalist groups, thereby providing the evolving basis for a democratic politics of alliance and solidarity to overcome the limitations of postmodern identity politics.

Of course, one of the most instructive examples of the use of the Internet to foster collective networks of struggle against the excesses of corporate capitalism occurred in the protests in Seattle and throughout the world against the WTO meeting in December 1999, which has resulted in the subsequent emergence of worldwide anti-globalization and alter-globalization movements. Behind the Seattle actions was a burgeoning global protest movement that was experimenting with the Internet to organize resistance to the institutions of capitalist globalization and champion democratization. In the build-up to the 1999 Seattle demonstrations, many websites generated anti-WTO material and numerous mailing lists used the Internet to distribute critical material and to organize the protest. The result was the mobilization of caravans from throughout the United States to take protestors to Seattle, as well as contingents of activists throughout the world. Many of the protestors had never met and were recruited through the Internet. For the first time ever, labor, environmentalist, feminist, anti-capitalist, animal rights, anarchist, and other groups organized to protest

aspects of globalization and to form new alliances and solidarities for future struggles. In addition, demonstrations took place throughout the world, and a proliferation of anti-WTO material against the extremely secret group spread throughout the Internet.

Furthermore, the Internet provided critical coverage of the event, documentation of the various groups' protests, and debate over the WTO and globalization. Indeed, it was at this event that a collective of alternative and independent media organizations and activists formed the first Independent Media Center, resulting in the website Indymedia.org which has since grown to be perhaps the most major form of alternative media, as Indymedia includes over 160 such centers in some 60 countries worldwide. In Seattle, whereas the mainstream media presented the IMF protests as "anti-trade," featured the incidents of anarchist violence against property, and minimized police brutality against demonstrators, Indymedia provided the Internet with pictures, audio, video, eyewitness accounts, and reports of police viciousness and the generally peaceful and nonviolent nature of the protests. While the mainstream media framed the Seattle anti-WTO activities negatively and privileged suspect spokespeople like Patrick Buchanan as critics of globalization, Internet-based media provided multiple representations of the demonstrations, advanced reflective discussion of the WTO and globalization, and presented a diversity of critical perspectives.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that extreme right-wing and reactionary forces can and have used the Internet to promote their political agendas as well. One can easily access an exotic witch's brew of websites maintained by the Ku Klux Klan and myriad neo-Nazi assemblages, including the Aryan Nation and various militia groups. Internet discussion lists also disperse these views and right-wing extremists are aggressively active on many computer forums. These types of organizations are hardly

harmless, having carried out terrorism of various sorts extending from church burnings to the bombings of public buildings. Adopting quasi-Leninist discourse and tactics for ultra-right causes, such groups have been successful in recruiting working-class members devastated by the developments of global capitalism, which has resulted in widespread unemployment for traditional forms of industrial, agricultural and unskilled labor. Moreover, extremist websites have influenced alienated middle-class youth as well (a 1999 HBO documentary “Hate on the Internet” provides a disturbing number of examples of how extremist websites influenced disaffected youth to commit hate crimes). An additional twist in the saga of technopolitics seems to be that allegedly “terrorist” groups are now also increasingly using the Internet and websites to organize and promote their causes, as has been alleged of Al Qaeda in particular, which encrypted and posted instructions to operatives on websites like Alneda.com and Qal3ah.net prior to their discovery by the U.S. government.

While former Bush administration cybersecurity czar, Richard Clarke, has warned of a “digital Pearl Harbor” that would result from terrorists using the Internet to attack key corporate and government computer systems with machine disabling codes known as network “worms,” such has yet to arise. Al Qaeda computers have been seized, however, that demonstrate their intention to train “hackers” – a term which initially meant someone who made creative innovations in computer systems but which as increasingly come to denote someone engaged in malicious online activities – that would write and propagate computer worms and viruses in this manner. Additionally, hackers such as Melhacker, who has publicly supported Al Qaeda and promised to release a “super worm” upon the invasion of Iraq, are actively involved in extreme right cyber-resistance.

On the other hand, progressive hackers called “hacktivists” have grouped together as a global movement under the banner of HOPE, which stands for “Hackers On Planet Earth.” Hactivists have involved themselves in creating open source software programs that can be used freely to circumvent attempts by government and corporations to control the Internet experience, and have been key in cracking commercial software authentication codes towards making programs available freely online. Wireless network hackers often deploy their skills toward developing a database of “freenets” that, if not always free of costs, represent real opportunities for local communities to share online connections and corporate fees. Such freenets represent inclusive resources that are developed by communities for their own needs and involve values like conviviality and culture, education, economic equity, and sustainability that have been found to be progressive hallmarks of online communities generally.

Hactivists are also directly involved in the immediate political battles played out around the dynamically globalized world. Hactivists such as The Mixter, from Germany, who authored the program Tribe Floodnet that shut down the website for the World Economic Forum in January 2002 and which has been utilized by militant activists like Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) against corporations related to vivisection company Huntingdon Life Sciences, routinely use their hacking skills to cause disruption of governmental and corporate presences online. On July 12, 2002, the homepage for the *USA Today* website was hacked and altered content was presented to the public, leaving *USA Today* to join such other media magnets as the *New York Times* and Yahoo as the corporate victims of a media hack. In February 2003, immediately following the destruction of the Space Shuttle Columbia, a group calling themselves Trippin Smurfs

hacked NASA's servers for the third time in three months. In each case, security was compromised and the web servers were defaced with anti-war political messages. Another repeated victim of hacks is the Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA), which because of its attempt to legislate P2P (peer-to-peer) music trading has become anathema to Internet hactivists. A sixth attack upon the RIAA website in January 2003 posted bogus press releases and even provided music files for free downloading.

### **Theorizing Global Resistance**

While scholars and others have shown a tremendous interest in theorizing globalization throughout the 1990s and up to the present, and while there is a healthy body of literature describing new social movements since the 1980s, it is only recently that the resistance to globalization proper has begun to warrant equal interest and debate (Appadurai, 2000; Aronowitz and Gautney, 2003). Still, there are a number of concepts and frameworks that have begun to be used in order to characterize global resistance that are worthy of summary here.

Some scholars have returned to the work of Karl Polanyi (1944), finding in his idea of countermovements a workable framework for understanding contemporary resistance movements. In this way, movements towards greater neoliberalization and corporatization of the economy as part of a general trend towards the globalization of politics are perceived as generating countermovements that are arising to protect people and society against market dominance. These countermovements are based in mutual solidarity and are conflictual and defensive of the non-market oriented social relations and institutions in which countermovement actors exist. Yet, it has been argued by

scholars such as James Mittelman (2000) that the transposition of Polyani's theory onto the movements which have arisen to resist globalization is problematic in at least two ways. First, it assumes a united front where there is not one to be found, as it collects the diversity of new social movements and identity positions into a homogenizing political space. This is not to say that solidarities do not exist, or that there are not at times common foes, but as pro-global justice movement theorist George Monbiot has written in a 2003 article for *The Guardian* newspaper, a major division exists in the movement between "diversalists and the universalists."

A second problem with applying Polyani's theory to today's resistance is its reliance upon notions of organizational structure. As critics point out, certainly many NGOs and political groups do resist in an organized way. But it is not clear that the movement on the whole does, or even can do so, despite the formative attempts of new global institutional summits such as the World Social Forum – which despite its often positive valorization has come up for critique from notable *No Logo* theorist/activist Naomi Klein (2002), who challenged the forum's billing as an opportunity "to whip the chaos on the streets into a structured shape" as contrary to the movement's mobility and diversity, which she felt should instead be loosely "hotlinked" like websites on a network. Further, over-emphasizing the organized quality of today's resistance to globalization overlooks the many resistances people are making in their everyday lives and culture, whether by altering their behavior as consumers or engaging in acts of cultural dissent such as culture jamming or subcultural participation.

Another theorist often employed to illustrate current resistances is Antonio Gramsci, who developed a theory of hegemony and counterhegemony that has proven

especially fruitful for understanding the relationship between transnational state actors and grassroots and other popular forms of contestation and social transformation. Put simply, Gramsci felt social stability was achieved through the mixture of dominant force and the formation of and consent to the ideology of ruling groups who form hegemonic blocs across a wide range of institutions. Against this, he felt that counterhegemonic forces, groups, and ideas form their own blocs and so serve to challenge hegemonies in the quest for power. In recent theories such as those that pit globalization from above against globalization from below (Falk, 1999; 2000; Brecher, Costello, and Smith, 2000; Brecher, 2003), one can see the neo-Gramscian influence in understanding new social movement resistance to hegemonic orders of neoliberalism and market capitalism, as well as of patriarchy, racism, industrialism, and other ruling ideologies. However, for all of its efficacy this model can also occlude the complexities of actual resistance. As Raymond Williams has echoed in a different context, applications of Gramscian hegemony theory to global resistances often devolve into one form or another of reductive base-superstructure analyses in which there is theorized only an hegemony and a counterhegemonic movement in opposition to it. Rather, as we have seen, each is multiple and multifaceted, containing a variety of contradictions and potentials.

In this respect, a promising theory of globalization and resistance is offered by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire* (2000) and *Multitude* (2004). For Hardt and Negri, globalization is characterized by a new imperialistic logic that conducts virtuous wars and makes decisions over who is to live and who is to die. They see it as a complex process that involves a multidimensional mixture of expansions of the global economy and capitalist market system, new technologies and media, expanded judicial and legal

modes of governance, and emergent modes of power, sovereignty, and resistance. Yet, as a global order of power in an age of nation states, it transcends and is not traceable to any particular center of power or state capital. Rather, they believe it is maintained hegemonically by the consent of the “multitudes,” some of whom they optimistically note are producing alternatives by deserting from mainstream order, migrating to points of struggle, and attempting to achieve a counter-Empire based on global citizenship, living wages for all, and other progressive political agendas.

Hardt and Negri have engendered their share of criticism, partly for being unprogrammable and partly for having failed to account for the role of American exceptionalism and militarism in global empire, but their theory rises above many other competing accounts that tend to be too uncritically binary in their opposition of globalization and its discontents. Thusly, Benjamin Barber (1998) describes the strife between McWorld and Jihad, contrasting the homogenous, commercial, and Americanized tendencies of the global economy and culture to traditional cultures which are often resistant to globalization. Likewise, Thomas Friedman (1999) makes a more benign distinction between what he calls the "Lexus" and the "Olive Tree." The former is a symbol of modernization, of affluence and luxury, and of Westernized consumption, contrasted with the Olive Tree that is a symbol of roots, tradition, place, and stable community.

Barber, however, is too negative toward McWorld and Jihad, and does not adequately describe the democratic and progressive forces within both. Although Barber recognizes a dialectic of McWorld and Jihad, he opposes both to democracy, failing to perceive how they each generate their own democratic forces and tendencies, as well as

oppose and undermine democratization in their own right. Within the Western democracies, for instance, there is not just top-down homogenization and corporate domination, but also globalization from below and a multitude of social movements that desire alternatives to capitalist globalization. Thus, it is not only traditionalist, non-Western forces of Jihad that oppose McWorld. Likewise, Jihad contains progressive forces along with the reactionary Islamic fundamentalists, who are now the most demonized elements of the contemporary era. Like McWorld, Jihad has its contradictions and its potential for democratization, as well as elements of domination and destruction.

Friedman, by contrast, is too uncritical of globalization and fails to perceive the depth of the oppressive features of globalization and breadth and extent of resistance and opposition to it. In particular, he fails to articulate contradictions between capitalism and democracy, and the ways that globalization and its economic logic undermines democracy as well as circulates it. Likewise, he does not grasp the virulence of the pre-modern and Jihadist tendencies that he blithely identifies with the Olive tree, and the reasons why globalization and the West are so strongly resisted in many parts of the world.

Ultimately, what is required is a critical theory of globalization and its resistance that articulates the complexity of globalization and of the movements resisting it. Such a dialectical theory would avoid globophobia and globophilia, or dualistic optics that oppose a “good” globalization from below to a “bad” globalization from above. Additionally, it would avoid determinism and pessimism, while acknowledging the power of state corporate globalization and its destructive tendencies, as well as the idealized celebration of anti-global forces. Finally, a critical theory of globalization

would articulate the dialectic of the global and the local, recognizing resistance and domination as complex and multilayered forces and events. Unquestionably, the struggle over globalization is one of the defining issues of our time whose dynamics will surely influence the course of the next century. Movements of resistance are continually arising and changing, even as technological inventions proliferate throughout the world and produce a global media culture, while economic crises, natural disasters, militarism, and war threaten to undermine the global order. Therefore, theories of globalization and resistance must ultimately remain sensitive to ongoing change, be rigorously critical, and so overcome the tendency towards being either dogmatic or overly explanative.

### **Bibliography**

- Appadurai, A. 2000: Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public Culture* 12(1): 1-19.
- Aronowitz, S. and H. Gautney (eds.) 2003: *Implicating Empire: Globalization and Resistance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century World Order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Barber, B. R. 1998: *A place for us: How to make society civil and democracy strong*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Brecher, J.T. 2003: Globalization today. In S. Aronowitz and H. Gautney (eds.), *Implicating Empire*, 199-210.
- Brecher, J., T. Costello and B. Smith 2000: *Globalization From Below*. Boston, MA: South End.
- Cvetkovich, A. and D. Kellner 1997: *Articulating the Global and the Local: Globalization and Cultural Studies*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

- Falk, R. 1999: *Predatory Globalization*. London and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Falk, R. 2000: Resisting “globalization from above” through “globalization from below”. In B. Gills (ed.), *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*. London: Macmillan.
- Friedman, T. 1999: *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.
- Hardt, M. 2002: Porto Alegre: Today’s Bandung? *New Left Review* 14 (March-April).
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri 2000: *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri 2004: *Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Kahn, R. and D. Kellner 2003: New media, Internet activism, and blogging. In D. Muggleton (ed.), *The Post-Subcultures Reader*, 299-314. London: Berg.
- Kahn, R. and D. Kellner 2005: Oppositional politics and the Internet: A critical/reconstructive approach. *Cultural Politics* 1:1, 75-100.
- Kellner, D. 2002: Theorizing globalization. *Sociological Theory* 20:3 (November), 285-305.
- Kellner, D. 2003a: Globalization, technopolitics, and revolution. In J. Foran (ed.), *The Future of Revolutions. Rethinking Radical Change in the Age of Globalization*, 180-194. London: Zed Books.
- Kellner, D. 2003b: *From 9/11 to Terror War: The Dangers of the Bush Legacy*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Klein, N. 2002: Farewell to the end of history: Organization and vision in anti-corporate movements. *Socialist Register* 2002, 1-13.
- Mittelman, J. 2000: *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Polanyi, K. 1944: *The Great Transformation*. New York: Toronto, Farrar, and Rinehart.

Rheingold, H. 2002: *Smart Mobs: The Next Social Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Waterman, P. 1992: International labour communication by computer: The fifth international? *Working Paper Series 129*. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.

### **Suggested Further Reading**

Amoore, L. (ed.) 2005: *The Global Resistance Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Barlow, M. and T. Clarke 2001: *Global Showdown: How the New Activists are Fighting Global Corporate Rule*. Toronto: Stoddart Publishing Co.

Broad, R. 2002: *Global Backlash: Citizen Initiatives for a Just World Economy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hayden, P. and C. el-Ojeili (eds.) 2005: *Confronting Globalization: Humanity, Justice and the Renewal of Politics*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Smith, J. and H. Johnston (eds.) 2002: *Globalization and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Stiglitz, J.E. 2002: *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

DOUGLAS KELLNER and RICHARD KAHN

DOUGLAS KELLNER is George Kneller Chair in the Philosophy of Education at UCLA and is author of many books on social theory, politics, history, and culture, including *Television and the Crisis of Democracy*; *The Persian Gulf TV War*; *Media Culture*; *Grand Theft 2000*; *Media Spectacle*; *September 11, Terror War, and the Dangers of the Bush*

*Legacy*; and *Media Spectacle and the Crisis of Democracy*. His website is:  
<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/kellner.html>. Contact: [kellner@ucla.edu](mailto:kellner@ucla.edu).

RICHARD KAHN is a doctoral candidate at the UCLA Graduate School of Education. He is the co-editor of the recent book, *Theory, Facts, and Interpretation in Educational and Social Research* (Routledge “WOM” Publishers, 2004). His website is:  
<http://richardkahn.org>.  
Contact: [rvkahn@ucla.edu](mailto:rvkahn@ucla.edu).