

UNIT ONE

1.1 Definition and general effects of globalization.

1.1.1 Definition of Globalization.

There is no single definition for globalization; scholars from different fields of study have defined globalization differently. For instance, Malcolm explains, “Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole... both concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole.” (2001, 04). Malcolm’s definition emphasizes increasing interdependency between people and states. On the other hand, Giddens defines globalization from a different perspective. He argues, “Globalization can be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” (1990, 64). Giddens (1999) also describes globalization as a “runaway world” which “is emerging in an anarchic, haphazard fashion.” The global order is the result of an intersection of four processes – capitalism (economic logic), the interstate system (world order), militarism (world security and threats), and industrialism (the division of labor and lifestyles). Giddens’ definition emphasizes the effects of social change in unrelated places upon each other.

Scholte gives five different perspectives of globalization: “Globalization as internationalization, Globalization as liberalization, Globalization as universalization, Globalization as westernization or modernization and Globalization as deterritorialisation.” (Scholte, 2000).

Globalization has a wide range of meaning. All of these definitions can be synthesized in Malcolm’s words: “there will be no ‘there’ anymore. We will be here. ” (Malcolm, 182).

Globalization refers to the world wide diffusion of practices, expansion of relations across continents, organization of social life on a global scale, and growth of a shared global consciousness. Globalization in other words refers to the integration of world economy, and societies through cross country flow of information, ideas, technologies, goods, services, capital, finance and people. As new forms of communication and transportation enable individuals and groups to overcome spatial constraints and cross nation state boundaries in their activities, “supraterritorial” relations increased.

Conventionally associated with economic integration in a world market, globalization more broadly comprises many such forms of connectedness. Together, these mark the drawing together of the world as a single society. This is experienced as the “compression” of the world, which gives rise to a widespread intensification of “consciousness of the world as a whole”. Since it transforms the context of human experience, globalization ushers in a “global age,” the interpretation of which will require new ideas and concepts.

Reflecting a perception that Cold War conflict would give way to consolidation of a new world order through greater integration, the term *globalization* came into regular use at the end of the twentieth century. Yet it is a contested concept. Scholars have debated the meaning, origins, causes, extent, and consequences of globalization.

For example, while some treat globalization as a post-World War II phenomenon, others seek its origin in the European explorations of the sixteenth century. Some explanations of globalization stress particular causes, such as technological advances or the interests and ideology of economically dominant groups, while others portray globalization as the outcome of multiple, intertwined forces. Some theories argue that globalization entails increasing homogeneity of institutions, worldviews and lifestyles, but others predict greater diversity. Influential accounts of globalization vary along such lines, thus far precluding the rise of a single integrative view.

1.1.2 General effects of Globalization.

1.1.2.1 Globalization and Economy.

Many prominent economists believed that when NAFTA was created in 1994 it would lead to major gains in jobs. But by 2010, the evidence showed an opposite impact; the data showed 682,900 U.S. jobs lost across all states (Parks 2011). While NAFTA did increase the flow of goods and capital across the northern and southern U.S. borders, it also increased unemployment in Mexico, spurring greater amounts of illegal immigration motivated by a search for work.

There are several forces driving globalization, including the global economy and multinational corporations that control assets, sales, production, and employment (United Nations 1973). Characteristics of multinational corporations include the following: A large share of their capital is collected from a variety of different nations, their business is conducted without regard to national borders, they concentrate wealth in the hands of core nations and already wealthy individuals, and they play a key role in the global economy.

There are several components to the global economy and many changes that occur as countries grow more interdependent. First, there is an increasing number of global cities, which

1. headquarter multinational corporations, such as Coca-Cola
2. exercise significant international political influence, such as what comes from Beijing or Berlin
3. host headquarters of international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as the United Nations
4. host influential media such as the BBC and AlJazeera
5. host advanced communication and transportation infrastructure, such as is seen in Shanghai (Sassen 2001)

Second, we see the emergence of global assembly lines, where products are assembled over the course

of several international transactions. For instance, Apple designs its next-generation Mac prototype in the United States, components are made in various peripheral nations, they are then shipped to another peripheral nation such as Malaysia for assembly, and tech support is outsourced to India. Globalization has also led to the development of global commodity chains, where internationally integrated economic links connect workers and corporations for the purpose of manufacture and marketing (Plahe 2005). For example, in maquiladoras, mostly found in northern Mexico, workers may sew imported pre-cut pieces of fabric into garments.

Globalization also brings an international division of labor, in which comparatively wealthy workers from core nations compete with the low-wage labor pool of peripheral and semi-peripheral nations. This can lead to a sense of xenophobia, which is an illogical fear and even hatred of foreigners and foreign goods. Corporations trying to maximize their profits in the United States are conscious of this risk and attempt to “Americanize” their products, selling shirts printed with U.S. flags that were nevertheless made in Mexico

1.1.2.2 Globalization and culture

As the debate about globalization has rapidly expanded and become more, rather than less, contentious, there has emerged what might be called a “negative consensus” concerning the idea of global culture. While there is most definitely no widespread agreement, either “globally” or “locally,” about what we might mean by the term global culture(s), there is – for many, a seemingly reluctant – confirmation of the proposition that the issue of global culture is of paramount significance. Consideration of culture in global or at least transnational terms has led to much rethinking of the concept of culture and its part in social life, not least because practitioners of the metadiscipline of cultural studies have made major interventions in the discussion of globalization, globality, transnationality, global modernities, and so on. Thus, the oft-called cultural turn has had a major part in elevating culture to a position of significance in the globalization debate. This is not to say, however, that the cultural factor is totally accepted as central to the thinking of those working on matters global.

Almost certainly, the most controversial question in the general, non-reductionist discussion of globalization concerns whether the world as a whole is being swept by homogenizing cultural forces, at one extreme, or whether the world is, on the other hand, becoming increasingly marked by variety and difference. Insofar as the globalization-equals homogenization thesis has been so much in evidence in recent years, often in tandem with the conceptually unacceptable claim that Americanization is the same as globalization, the emphasis here is more on heterogeneity than homogeneity. Globalization – conceived, of necessity, as glocalization (Robertson 1992: 173–4) – is a self-limiting process. In the light of the idea of globality, globalization can only take hold if globalizing forces can find or produce a niche in relation to the

local and the particular. This is to be seen in the maxim that it is the particular which makes the universal work.

The circulation of practices, ideas, and institutional forms around the world is a central aspect of global culture. This has in the past often been indicated by the term cultural diffusion. But the latter term in itself lacks explicit sensitivity to the glocalizing character of the circulation of sociocultural phenomena. The same is true of what are frequently cast as flows from one context to others. In recent times non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have played as big a part in this as they have in the promotion and sustaining of diasporic relations with the “homeland.” In this case the multiplication of loyalties via population movements has become a crucial element of global culture. In particular, the assimilation of immigrants in the fully fledged sense is rapidly declining, so much so that the vast question of national societal membership and citizenship is a central and increasingly controversial problem of our time. Thus, the increasing significance of transnational communities with their own cultures, the prominence of these being greatly facilitated by the new and still expanding forms of electronic communication, the relative cheapness of air travel, and the growth of the illicit traffic in human beings. It would be perfectly plausible to insist that global culture is much richer and “thicker” than the culture of any given nation-state. It is indeed more than a pity that so much intellectual energy has been expended in debating the homogenization-cum-Americanization thesis, as well as in arguing about the degree to which global (or any other) culture should, if at all, be considered epiphenomenally, when there is so much to address with respect to the diversity of global culture or cultures.

1.1.2.3 Globalization and religion

Globalization describes the historical process by which all the world’s people come to live in a single social unit. Religion constitutes an important dimension of globalization through its worldwide institutional presence, its importance in structuring individual and collective cultural difference, and as an effective resource for local and global social mobilization for various goals. Religion is a highly contested, occasionally powerful, and often conflictual domain of some consequence in the global social system. Although explicitly religious institutions are the foundation of religion’s global social presence, it is the implication of religion in other social, but especially political, movements that has thus far received the most attention in social scientific literature. It is no mere coincidence that the political impact of religion in developments ranging from the Islamic revolution in Iran and the New Christian Right in the USA to the Hindu nationalism of the Bharatiya Janata Party in India and the religiously defined cleavages of Orthodox, Catholic, and Muslim in the former Yugoslavia, appeared on the global scene at roughly the same time as

the notion of globalization. The often invidious term fundamentalism has gained a corresponding popularity, referring to religious movements like these, ones that advocate the public enforcement of religious precepts or the exclusive religious identification of state collectivities. Characteristic of such movements is that they seek to enforce highly particular and frequently absolutist visions of the world in their countries, but with explicit reference to the globalizing context which they deem to be the prime threat under such epithets as “global arrogance” (Iran) or “one-worldism” (USA). The religious visions that inform them are the basis for this combination of a claim to universal validity with being centered in a particular part of the world among a particular people. Thus does religion serve as a globally present way of making cultural difference a prime structural feature of a globalized world that also relativizes all such differences by incorporating everyone in a single social system. The explicit study of religion in the context of globalization is only in its beginnings. The sociological neglect of this topic may be due to the fact that religions usually ground themselves in tradition as opposed to contemporary developments, to the close relation between religion and local and regional culture, and perhaps to the lingering effect of secularization perspectives which have led many social scientists to expect religion to be irrelevant in the modern world. Be that as it may, a now rapidly growing literature that sees religion as an important player in today’s global context heralds a much needed new direction in this regard.

1.1.2.4 Globalization and sexuality

The globalization of sexuality refers to the sexualized and embodied nature of processes associated with the movement of people, capital, and goods across national boundaries. It also refers to how the consciousness of the world as a single place is sexualized. The globalization of sexuality is manifest in a range of processes and phenomena that are often couched and approached in highly emotive terms (e.g., the trafficking of women into prostitution, mail-order brides, the development of the sex industry, and sex tourism). It is also characterized by the AIDS pandemic, mass international tourism, and the development of cyberspace. Each of these has in turn intensified consciousness of the status of sexual minorities and the unevenness of their treatment across the globe. One of the main vectors of the globalization of sexuality is the global AIDS pandemic. Indeed, AIDS has often been seen as a metaphor for globalization itself, as it has brought into sharp relief ‘how lives on the planet are interconnected with the impotence of nation-states to control flows of people with HIV across national borders. While helping to shape our consciousness of the world as a single place, the AIDS pandemic has impacted disproportionately on specific localities – the impact of the pandemic is experienced unevenly. Policy responses to the AIDS pandemic have been held responsible for the promotion of modern western models of gay identity as opposed to indigenous or folk models of sexual identity in developing countries.

A considerable body of work has been produced on the globalization of gay identity. We have witnessed the growth of a global gay consciousness and an associated activism and politics. For instance, the International Lesbian and Gay Association founded in 1978 now represents 370 organizations in 90 countries. The Internet is also playing a major role in facilitating the intensification of transnational activism around the rights of sexual dissidents. At the same time, global gay tourism has become visible through the development of global mega-events such as the Gay Games and pride events such as Sydney's Mardi Gras. Debates on the globalization of gay identity have focused on whether the export of a western model of gay identity reflects the imposition of cultural imperialism, or whether the development of a global gay consciousness is a positive and empowering example of a cosmopolitan cultural politics which is forging transnational solidarities against homophobic policies and regimes. At the same time, it should be noted that groups and organizations such as the Christian Right that are hostile towards sexual dissidents also operate on a global scale.

Technological change is driving the acceleration of the globalization of sexuality. The development of the Internet in particular is significant in facilitating globalizing processes at a mundane level – for instance in aiding men's search for mail-order brides, but also enabling those involved in campaigning against the trafficking in women to maintain and develop transnational activist networks.

1.1.2.5 Globalization and sport

The emergence and diffusion of modern sport is bound up in a global network marked by power relations and global flows. The development of national and international sports organizations, the growth of competition between national teams, the worldwide acceptance of rules governing specific (western) sport forms, and the establishment of global competitions are all indicative of the globalization of sport. Global sport is connected, but not reducible, to the ideological practices and intentions of specific groups of people from particular countries. The receptivity of national popular cultures to non indigenous sport products is active and heterogeneous; however, there is a political economy at work in the production and consumption of global sport products. In the past, and continuing in the present, some male members of western societies have acted as a form of established group on a world level. Their tastes and conduct, including their sports, were part of this, and these practices acted and act as signs of distinction, prestige, and power. Given this growth in the multiplicity of linkages and networks that transcend nation-states, some argue that we may be at the earliest stages of the development of a “global culture,” of which sport is a part. This process entails a shift from ethnic or national cultures to “supranational” forms based upon a combination of the culture of a superpower and of cosmopolitan communication and migrant networks. However, there is considerable debate as to whether global sport is leading to a homogenized body culture – specifically,

along western or American lines. Yet global flows are simultaneously increasing the varieties of body cultures and identities available to people in local cultures. Global sport, then, seems to be leading to the reduction in contrasts between societies, but also to the emergence of new varieties of body cultures and identities.

1.1.2.6 Globalization and global justice

Globalization has brought about enormous changes in structural and interpersonal relations such that mechanisms of power distribution are in a state of flux. Sociology offers both descriptive and critical accounts of how shifting micro interactions and macro-structures negotiate material, legal, and political benefits, thereby reshaping identities. These transformations can assist, improve or worsen the well-being of individuals, groups, and the environment in potentially unjust ways. Globalization augments traditional spatio-temporal boundaries of fairness, introducing concerns of intergenerational and transnational justice, for instance climate change and financial debt. The normative content of sociological research on global justice is sometimes implicit, sometimes explicit reflecting the perceived role of the discipline. Core sociological concerns here are the emergence of an international civil society, universal human rights in a world of globalized risk and the effect of enhanced communication technologies on how we understand “globalization” itself.

Karl Polanyi's (1944) *The Great Transformation* introduced the concept of “double movement” to describe societal reaction to the changes resulting from the growth of market economies in the nineteenth century. It has been adopted by many contemporary sociologists to explain the current proliferation of civil society organizations as a counter-balance to the perceived weakening of the nation-state and a swell of corporate influence. They are understood as rejecting a depoliticized mechanical conception of globalization that serves the interests of transnational elites and causes environmental degradation, economic crises and social insecurity. There has been a documented fall in membership of political parties (50.4 percent decline between 1980 and 1998 in the USA). Nevertheless, the World Social Forum attracted some 150,000 people in 2005, on February 15, 2003, an estimated 30 million people gathered across the globe to protest against the Iraq war and in 2007 Earth Day enjoyed one billion participants.

The biological essentialism underpinning much universal rights theory is difficult to accept for many sociologists. Bryan S. Turner influentially proposed a sociological theory of human rights based on human frailty, collective sympathy and, crucially, “the historical implications of technological change for human existence and the increasingly risky nature of social life with globalisation” (1993: 508). There is a paradox of justice for a society of such globalized risk. On the one hand it is capable of producing new and extreme forms of social exclusion and inequality, where all characteristics of a group can be reduced to its

level of risk. Nonetheless, it provides unprecedented opportunities for collective action amongst groups usually differentiated according to traditional identity types as they become aware of a common risk. Ultimately, who defines “globalization” is of fundamental sociological interest with the ability to affect this understanding itself an issue of justice

The proliferation of cheap communication technologies has created the potential for nonpersons, those excluded by conventional media and political processes, to have a voice. Power relationships in this age are characterized by two features of these new technologies: (1) locally grounded while globally connected and (2) organized around networks not individual units (Castells 2009). Nevertheless, as more importance is invested in these technologies the threat of exclusion becomes more potent, especially as state control, processes of commodification and legal frameworks are only beginning to grapple with the wide-ranging effects of these modes of globalized communication. glocalization

The neologism “glocalization” has emerged in recent years in economic, sociological, and cultural theories in response to the proliferation of writings about globalization and its local implications. It might best be described as the relationship between global and local processes, which are increasingly viewed as two sides to the same coin rather than being diametrically opposed.

Glocalization represents the intersection of political economics and sociocultural concerns, with its emphasis on the local and community impacts of global structures and processes. Ritzer (2004: 73) defines glocalization as “the integration of the global and the local resulting in unique outcomes in different geographic areas.” Glocalization can thus represent the consequences (both tangible and intangible) of globalization, e.g., the creation of heterogeneous or hybridized cultures, communities, and identities. Nevertheless, glocalization could also be viewed somewhat negatively. For example, Bauman (1998) suggests that the term glocalization is best thought of as a restratification of society based on the free mobility of some and the place-bound existence of others. Tourist flows, for example, are mainly unidirectional (e.g., west to east, or developed to less developed countries). For this reason, tourism has sometimes been described as a new form of imperialism, which causes acculturation and radical social change rather than hybridization (the inevitable consequence of sustained foreign influence over time). Similarly, global economic and business developments are often deemed “imperialistic,” even where they have a local orientation. Ritzer (2004) suggests that this dominance of capitalist nations and organizations might be termed “grobalization” rather than “glocalization.” He argues, like Robertson (1994), that the key characteristics of glocalization are sensitivity to differences, the embracing of cosmopolitanism, and respect for the autonomy and creativity of individuals and groups. Overall, therefore, glocalization could be

seen as a positive interpretation of the local impacts of globalization, that is, a process by which communities represent and assert their unique cultures globally, often through new media.

1.2 Development of the process of globalization.

Appearing first in the 1960s, “globalization” has become a central but contested sociological concept. Although the origins of globalization can be found in the distant past, the concept was used widely after the end of the cold war, after which it was possible at least to imagine a “borderless” world in which people, goods, ideas, and images would flow with relative ease. The global division between capitalism and state socialism gave way to a more uncertain world in which capitalism was the dominant economic and social system. This coincided with the development of digital communication technologies from the late 1980s and their dramatic consequences for socioeconomic organization and interpersonal interaction. Global restructuring of states, financial systems, production technologies and the politics of neo liberalism in turn accompanied these developments, creating previously unprecedented levels of transnational interdependence. Globalization is not a single process. Economic globalization refers to such things as the global dominance of transnational corporations, global finance, flexible production and assembly, and the rise of information and service economies. Political globalization refers to the growth of international organizations, sub national regional autonomy, post-welfare public policies, and global social movements. Globalization is a cultural process, exemplified by the growth of global consumption cultures, migration, tourism, media and information flows, and transnational identities. Digital communication facilitates the experience of spatially distant events at the same time (sometimes called “instantaneity”), while creating a complex range of social interconnections along with a partial collapse of boundaries within national, cultural, and political spaces. However, the meaning and significance of globalization remains far from clear. There are globalization optimists such as Friedman (2000) and Ohmae (2005) who see a “borderless world” increasing human potential, but others are more pessimistic and critical of globalization’s consequences (e.g., Falk 1999). Some such as Urry (2003) and Giddens (1999) regard globalization as an emergent process sui generis, while Rosenberg (2000) rejects this view arguing that what is called “globalization” is the effect of complex social, economic, cultural and political changes. Globalization does not simply refer to increasing global interconnections but also to socio-spatial restructuring. For example through privatization and deregulation during the 1980s and 1990s various governance functions shifted from governments to the corporate world. Global financial cities then become strategic sites for the acceleration of capital and information flows, and increased in importance and power relative to nation-states. There have emerged new “corridors” and zones around nodal cities that are increasingly

independent from their environs (Sassen 1996). But there remains considerable debate over the relationship between states and globalization (Ray 2007).

There are many theories of globalization. Robertson emphasizes “global consciousness,” referring to “the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (1992: 8). This provokes new cultural conflicts for example between universalism and particularism. Religious traditions can be mobilized to provide an ultimate justification for one’s view of the world – thus “fundamentalist” groups combine traditionalism with a global agenda. A globalized world is thus integrated but not harmonious.

For Giddens the concept of time–space distantiation is central. Locales are increasingly shaped by events far away and vice versa, while social relations are disembodied, or “lifted out” from locales. For example, peasant households in traditional societies were largely self-sufficient and money was of limited value. Modernization replaced local exchange with universal money exchange, which simplifies otherwise impossibly complex transitions and enables the circulation of complex forms of information and value in abstract and symbolic forms. Money exchange establishes social relations across time and space, which get intensified with globalization. Similarly, expert cultures arise as a result of the scientific revolutions bringing increases in technical knowledge and specialization. Specialist knowledge is then globally organized while increased social distance is created between professionals and their clients. As expert knowledge dominates globally, local perspectives become devalued and modern societies are reliant on expert systems. Trust is increasingly crucial to both monetary and expert systems and is the “glue” that holds modern societies together. But where trust is undermined, individuals experience ontological insecurity and a sense of insecurity with regard to their social reality.

Giddens (1999) also describes globalization as a “runaway world” which “is emerging in an anarchic, haphazard fashion.” The global order is the result of an intersection of four processes – capitalism (economic logic), the interstate system (world order), militarism (world security and threats), and industrialism (the division of labor and lifestyles). However, Giddens does not say what the weight of each of these factors is and whether they change historically. Similarly, David Harvey emphasizes the ways in which globalization revolutionizes the qualities of space and time. As space appears to shrink to a “global village” of telecommunications and ecological interdependencies and as time horizons shorten to the point where the present is all there is, so we have to learn how to cope with an overwhelming sense of compression of our spatial and temporal worlds (1990: 240–2). Time–space compression is driven by flexible accumulation and new technologies, the production of signs and images, just-in-time delivery, reduced turnover times and speeding up, and both de- and reskilling. Harvey points for support to the

ephemerality of fashions, products, production techniques, speedup and vertical disintegration, financial markets and computerized trading, instantaneity and disposability, and regional competitiveness.

For Urry the changes associated with globalization are so far-reaching that we should now talk of “sociology beyond societies.” The alleged decline of the nation-state in a globalized world results in the redundancy of the concept of “society” as a territorially bounded entity, which in turn shakes the foundations of the discipline. In its place Urry proposes new socialities of space (social topologies), regions (interregional competition), networks (new social morphology), and fluids (global enterprises).

Mobility is central to this thesis since globalization involves the complex movement of people, images, goods, finances, and so on that constitutes a process across regions in faster and unpredictable shapes, all with no clear point of arrival or departure. Despite the contrasting theoretical understandings of globalization, there is some measure of agreement that it poses new opportunities and threats. For example, globalization offers new forms of cosmopolitanism and economic growth but also increased global risks such as ecological crisis, global pandemics, and international crime and terrorism (Beck 2000). Globalization may be seen as encroachment and colonization as global corporations and technologies erode local customs and ways of life, which in turn engenders new forms of protest and assertion of local cultural identity. By contrast with globalization enthusiasts it can be argued that global patterns of inequality have become increasingly polarized. The global “war on terror” further dents the idea of a “borderless world.”

Globalization has been the focus of extensive social movement activism, especially to neoliberal globalism represented by bodies such as the WTO. Such activists include churches, nationalist parties, leftist parties environmentalists, peasant unions, anti-racism groups, anarchists and some charities. Glasius et al. (2002) identify the emergence of a “global civil society” exemplified by the growth of “parallel summits” such as the 2001 Porto Alegre meeting in Brazil to protest against the Davos (Switzerland) World Economic Forum. These are organized through multiple networks of social actors and NGOs operating on local and international levels. Many activists are not necessarily opposed to globalization as such but to economic neoliberalism intent on constricting local lifestyles in the pursuit of profit. For anti-globalization critics, globalization creates a “borderless” world for capital and finance but not for labor, since increasingly severe immigration controls exist in most developed countries while labor often lacks basic rights. If we take a broad view of globalization, though, these movements are themselves part of the process by which global solidarities (albeit rather weak and transitory ones) come to be formed.

Globalization and consumption

“Globalization” and “consumption” emerged as key concepts in social theory in the last decades of the twentieth century, and combined with reference to the emergence of a “global consumer culture”: the same products, services, and entertainment sold in the same kinds of retail and leisure spaces to consumers around the world. Product availability is less tied to specific places, first because the same global brands are on sale at the same time throughout the world and second because deterritorialized immigrants recreate the retail environment of their homeland by importing familiar products. New technologies accelerated the flow of information, money, people, and goods across national borders, creating a world market with a global division of labor and global consumers. These developments challenged sociology’s implicit understanding of “society” in terms of bounded cultures within nation-states, and shifted the locus of social identity from class position and work to consumption and lifestyle.

Globalization of consumption is often equated with Americanization, an argument reinforced by the number of prominent global brands with corporate headquarters in the USA, including Coca-Cola, Disney, McDonald’s, Nike, and Microsoft. Coca-Cola is in that sense iconic, with the term “Coca-Colanization” used to signify economic and cultural domination by the USA (Wagnleitner 1994). So, too, McDonald’s, its golden arches metonyms of American culture and its restaurants regular targets for anti-American protest (Ritzer 2004). From this perspective, “global culture” is in fact “American culture” and its consumers are “Coca-colonials.” Critics of this view point out that the sources of global culture are not all American, arguing that Ikea furniture, Indian (“Bollywood”) movies and food, Japanese animation, electronics, and sushi – not to mention the global audience for soccer, a sport in which the USA is an inconsequential player – all point to more complex processes of global cultural flow. In addition, global products are consumed in culturally specific contexts which inflect them with different meaning.

Globalization has contradictory implications for consumption. The idea that consuming global products involves interplay between global and local rather than cultural homogenization gives rise to the terms “glocal” and “glocalization” (Robertson 1995) to describe what happens when consumers incorporate global culture into local practice and meaning to produce culture that is neither fully global nor strictly local. By implication, globalization of consumption increases cultural diversity, adding “glocal” hybrids to the existing pool of local cultures. A less optimistic view would see “glocal” cultures as replacing rather than coexisting with “local” cultures, with the balance between global and local shifting inexorably in favor of the global as what’s left of the local in “glocal” decreases over time.

1.3 Definition of economic globalization and general effects on society.

Economic globalization refers to the global economic integration in terms of the increasing speed of the movement of goods, services, capital across the boundaries of the states'. In public debate, globalization has come to be associated with:

- ✓ the liberalization of markets,
- ✓ the privatization of assets,
- ✓ the growing power of multinational corporations, and
- ✓ the intensification of competition,

This is summarized under the common, often pejorative, label “neoliberalism.” Current debate centers on the costs and benefits of the changes captured by this label, with some presenting a defense focusing on benefits such as:

- ➔ Increased liberty and individual choice,
- ➔ While larger groups focus on costs such as:

Increases in poverty, environmental degradation, and destruction of local cultures.

Globalized trade is nothing new. Societies in ancient Greece and Rome traded with other societies in Africa, the Middle East, India, and China. Trade expanded further during the Islamic Golden Age and after the rise of the Mongol Empire. The establishment of colonial empires after the voyages of discovery by European countries meant that trade was going on all over the world. In the 19th century, the Industrial Revolution led to even more trade of ever-increasing amounts of goods. However, the advance of technology, especially communications, after World War II and the Cold War triggered the explosive acceleration in the process occurring today.

One way to look at the similarities and differences that exist among the economies of different nations is to compare their standards of living. The statistic most commonly used to do this is the domestic process per capita. This is the gross domestic product, or GDP, of a country divided by its population.

There are benefits and drawbacks to globalization. Some of the benefits include the exponentially accelerated progress of development, the creation of international awareness and empowerment, and the potential for increased wealth (Abedian 2002). However, experience has shown that countries can also be weakened by globalization. Some critics of globalization worry about the growing influence of enormous international financial and industrial corporations that benefit the most from free trade and unrestricted markets. They fear these corporations can use their vast wealth and resources to control governments to act in their interest rather than that of the local population (Bakan 2004). Indeed, when looking at the countries at the bottom of the list above, we are looking at places where the primary benefactors of mineral

exploitation are major corporations and a few key political figures. Nigeria, for example, is a country that produces tens of billions of dollars in oil revenue, but the money does not go to the country's people.

Other critics oppose globalization for what they see as negative impacts on the environment and local economies. Rapid industrialization, often a key component of globalization, can lead to widespread economic damage due to the lack of regulatory environment (Speth 2003). Further, as there are often no social institutions in place to protect workers in countries where jobs are scarce, some critics state that globalization leads to weak labor movements (Boswell and Stevis 1997). Finally, critics are concerned that wealthy countries can force economically weaker nations to open their markets while protecting their own local products from competition (Wallerstein 1974). This can be particularly true of agricultural products, which are often one of the main exports of poor and developing countries (Koroma 2007). In a 2007 article for the United Nations, Koroma discusses the difficulties faced by "least developed countries" (LDCs) that seek to participate in globalization efforts. The countries typically lack the infrastructure to be flexible and nimble in their production and trade, and therefore are vulnerable to everything from unfavorable weather conditions to international price volatility. In short, rather than offering them more opportunities, the increased competition and fast pace of a globalized market can make it more challenging than ever for LDCs to move forward (Koroma 2007).

The increasing use of outsourcing of manufacturing and service-industry jobs to developing countries has caused increased unemployment in some developed countries. Countries that do not develop new jobs to replace those that move, and train their labor force to do them, will find support for globalization weakening.

Chapter two.

2.1 Impact of Globalization on Contemporary Social Movements

Social movements are purposeful, organized groups striving to work toward a common social goal. While most of us learned about social movements in history classes, we tend to take for granted the fundamental changes they caused—and we may be completely unfamiliar with the trend toward global social movement. But from the anti-tobacco movement that has worked to outlaw smoking in public buildings and raise the cost of cigarettes, to uprisings throughout the Arab world, movements are creating social change on a global scale

Social changes are now proceeding so rapidly thanks to the effects of globalization. Globalization has a major impact on social movements and has largely changed the patterns of their development. The impact of globalization has become greater with the passage of time. The impact of globalization since the industrialization revolution has been felt in different areas including

democratization, human rights, the changing role of women, the role of the media and the role of NGOs and multinational companies and this has played out largely because of more widely available technologies. Definitions of terms is needed in order to better understand the impact of globalization on social movements.

Since globalization breaks down traditional national constructs, an agreed definition of social movements is needed. In Tarrow's words, "Contentious politics occurs when ordinary people, often in league with more influential citizens, join forces in confrontation with elites, authorities and opponents... When backed by dense social networks and galvanized by culturally resonant, action-oriented symbols, contentious politics leads to sustained interaction with opponents. The result is a social movement." (Tarrow, 1998: 2). According to Tarrow's definition, a social movement is the uprising of an oppressed section of society against the elites and authorities who exploit its rights. For a social movement to be successful, the oppressed people who are fighting for their rights must have the back-up of influential actors of the society.

Nick Crossley gives Della Porta and Diani definition of social movements as "informal networks, based on shared beliefs and solidarity, which mobilize about conflictual issues, through the frequent use of various forms of protest." (2002: 16) According to this definition, social movements are staged by people of similar identity struggling for a common interest.

In order to measure the impact of globalization on contemporary social movements, it is useful to look at two specific examples, the Feminist movement and the Jasmine movement in the Middle East. The impact of globalization can be analysed in the light of two schools of thought, Resource Mobilization and Political Opportunity Structure theory.

Although scholarly definitions vary, common usage portrays social movements as sustained and intentional efforts to foster or retard social changes, primarily outside the normal institutional channels encouraged by authorities. Sustained implies that movements differ from single events such as riots or rallies. Their persistence often allows them to develop formal organizations, but they may also operate through informal social networks. Intentional links movements to culture and strategy: people have ideas about what they want and how to get it, ideas that are filtered through culture as well as psychology. Movements have purposes, even when these have to do with transforming members themselves (as in many religious movements) rather than the world outside the movement. Foster or retard: although many scholars have a Whiggish tendency to view movements as progressive, dismissing regressive efforts as "counter movements," this distinction seems arbitrary and unsustainable (not to mention the unfortunate effect that different tools are then used to analyze the two types). Noninstitutional distinguishes movements from

political parties and interest groups that are a more regular part of many political systems, even though movements frequently create these other entities and often maintain close relationships to them. Most movements today deploy some tactics within mainstream institutions – and “noninstitutional” protest is itself often quite institutionalized.

2.2 Levels of Social Movements

Movements happen in our towns, in our nation, and around the world. Let’s take a look at examples of social movements, from local to global. No doubt you can think of others on all of these levels, especially since modern technology has allowed us a near-constant stream of information about the quest for social change around the world.

2.2.1 Local

Chicago is a city of highs and lows, from corrupt politicians and failing schools to innovative education programs and a thriving arts scene. Not surprisingly, it has been home to a number of social movements over time. Currently, AREA Chicago is a social movement focused on “building a socially just city” (AREA Chicago 2011). The organization seeks to “create relationships and sustain community through art, research, education, and activism” (AREA Chicago 2011). The movement offers online tools like the Radicalendar—a calendar for getting radical and connected—and events such as an alternative to the traditional Independence Day picnic. Through its offerings, AREA Chicago gives local residents a chance to engage in a movement to help build a socially just city.

At the other end of the political spectrum from AREA Chicago, there is a social movement across the country in Texas. There, the statewide Texas Secede! organization promotes the idea that Texas can and should secede from the United States to become an independent republic. The organization, which has 3,400 “likes” on Facebook, references both Texas and national history in promoting secession. The movement encourages Texans to return to their rugged and individualistic roots, and to stand up to what proponents believe is the theft of their rights and property by the U.S. government (Texas Secede! 2009).

2.2.2 National

A polarizing national issue which has helped spawn many activist groups is gay marriage. While the legal battle is being played out state-by-state, the issue is a national one and crops up in presidential debates quite frequently. There are ardent supporters on both sides of the issue.

The Human Rights Campaign, a nationwide organization that advocates for LGBT civil rights, has been around for over 30 years and claims more than a million members. One focus of the organization is their Americans for Marriage Equality campaign. Using public celebrities such as athletes, musicians, and political figures, the campaigns seeks to engage the public in the issue of equal rights under the law.

The campaign raises awareness of the over 1,100 different rights, benefits, and protections provided on the basis of marital status under federal law, and seeks to educate the public on why they believe these protections are due to committed couples, regardless of gender (Human Rights Campaign 2011).

A movement on the opposite end would be the National Organization for Marriage, an organization that funds campaigns to stop same-sex marriage (National Organization for Marriage 2011). Both of these organizations work on the national stage and seek to engage people through grassroots efforts to push their message.

2.2.3 Global

Despite their successes in bringing forth change on controversial topics, social movements are not always about volatile politicized issues. For example, let's look at the global movement called Slow Food. Slow Food, with the slogan "Good, Clean, Fair Food," is a global grassroots movement claiming supporters in 150 countries. The movement links community and environmental issues back to the question of what is on our plates and where it came from. Founded in 1989 in response to the increasing existence of fast food in communities that used to treasure their culinary traditions, Slow Food works to raise awareness of food choices (Slow Food 2011). With more than 100,000 members in 1,300 local chapters, Slow Food is a movement that crosses political, age, and regional lines.

2.3 Types of Social Movements.

We know that social movements can occur on the local, national, or even global stage. Are there other patterns or classifications that can help us understand them? Sociologist David Aberle (1966) addresses this question, developing categories that distinguish among social movements based on what they want to change and how much change they want. **Reform movements** seek to change something specific about the social structure. Examples include anti-nuclear groups, Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), and the Human Rights Campaign's advocacy for Marriage Equality. **Revolutionary movements** seek to completely change every aspect of society. These would include the 1960's counterculture movement, as well as anarchist collectives. Texas Secede! is a revolutionary movement. **Religious/Redemptive movements** are "meaning seeking," and their goal is to provoke inner change or spiritual growth in individuals. Organizations pushing these movements might include Heaven's Gate or the Branch Davidians. **Alternative movements** are focused on self-improvement and limited, specific changes to individual beliefs and behavior. These include trends like transcendental meditation or a macrobiotic diet. **Resistance movements** seek to prevent or undo change to the social structure. The Ku Klux Klan and pro-life movements fall into this category.

2.4 Stages of Social Movements.

Later sociologists studied the lifecycle of social movements—how they emerge, grow, and in some cases, die out. Blumer (1969) and Tilly (1978) outline a four-stage process. In the *preliminary stage*, people become aware of an issue and leaders emerge. This is followed by the *coalescence stage* when people join together and organize in order to publicize the issue and raise awareness. In the *institutionalization stage*, the movement no longer requires grassroots volunteerism: it is an established organization, typically peopled with a paid staff. When people fall away, adopt a new movement, the movement successfully brings about the change it sought, or people no longer take the issue seriously, the movement falls into the *decline stage*. Each social movement discussed earlier belongs in one of these four stages. Where would you put them on the list?

2.5 Theoretical Perspectives on Social Movements

Most theories of social movements are called collective action theories, indicating the purposeful nature of this form of collective behavior. The following three theories are but a few of the many classic and modern theories developed by social scientists.

2.5.1 Resource Mobilization

Social movements will always be a part of society, and people will always weigh their options and make rational choices about which movements to follow. As long as social movements wish to thrive, they must find resources (such as money, people, and plans) for how to meet their goals. Not only will social movements compete for our attention with many other concerns—from the basic (our jobs or our need to feed ourselves) to the broad (video games, sports, or television), but they also compete with each other. For any individual, it may be a simple matter to decide you want to spend your time and money on animal shelters and Republican politics versus homeless shelters and Democrats. But which animal shelter, and which Republican candidate? Social movements are competing for a piece of finite resources, and the field is growing more crowded all the time.

McCarthy and Zald (1977) conceptualize **resource mobilization theory** as a way to explain movement success in terms of its ability to acquire resources and mobilize individuals. For example, PETA, a social movement organization, is in competition with Greenpeace and the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), two other social movement organizations. Taken together, along with all other social movement organizations working on animals rights issues, these similar organizations constitute a **social movement industry**. Multiple social movement industries in a society, though they may have widely different constituencies and goals, constitute a society's **social movement sector**. Every **social movement organization** (a single social movement group) within the social movement sector is competing for your attention, your time, and your resources.

2.5.2 Political Opportunity Structure:

The theory of Political Opportunity Structure can be defined as “the availability and strategic posture of potential allies and also political conflicts between and within allies” (Tarrow, 1989). According to this definition, a social movement is likely to arise in those states where there is political conflict and people are deprived of their rights. Globalization has also influenced social movements in the perspective of Political Opportunity Structure theory. Some authors define globalization in terms of political liberalization, equal human rights and democratization and these characteristics are the key factors in contemporary social movements. For instance, the Jasmine movement of the Middle East was spurred by popular discontent with autocratic governments in the face of economic deprivation. People demanded change in stagnating economic systems prey to widespread corruption and called for democratization to end their disenfranchisement.

Similarly, globalization has played an important role in the Feminist movement. Traditional societies make it difficult for women to take part in social activism but the possibility of equal rights for all has politicized women, especially those from the younger, more educated and politically aware generation. Education has been a major factor. Commenting on Egypt, Al Jazeera stated, “the greatest shift is educational. Two generations ago, only a small minority of the daughters of the elite received a university education. Today, women account for more than half of the students at Egyptian universities. They are being trained to use power in ways that their grandmothers could scarcely have imagined” (Al Jazeera). Contemporary social movements are greatly influenced by globalization which has increased the ability of citizens to organize between themselves. It remains to be seen whether activism on the street translates into changed realities for the participants. It may be that while there have been transformations on the surface, vested interests and the force of inertia combines to produce a result which fails to respond to the demands made by the social movements in question. For instance, Egyptian military apparatus are still in charge. Democracy has made it easy for the women to participate in the political process and therefore many women have got important positions in the governments which are helping the Feminist movement.

In sum, it can safely be said that globalization has greatly shifted the patterns of contemporary social movements. Thanks to the resources and the political structure that is provided by globalization, now social movements are having many advantages in many factors which were not available to them earlier. Additionally the repertoire of human advancement is strongly correlated with the innovation of traditional mood of representing self identity.

2.5.3 New Social Movement Theory

A development of European social scientists in the 1950s and 1960s, attempts to explain the proliferation of post-industrial and post-modern movements that are difficult to analyze using traditional social movement theories. Rather than being one specific theory, it is more of a perspective that revolves around understanding movements as they relate to politics, identity, culture, and social change. Some of these more complex interrelated movements include ecofeminism, which focuses on the patriarchal society as the source of environmental problems, and the transgender rights movement. Sociologist Steven Buechler (2000) suggests that we should be looking at the bigger picture in which these movements arise—shifting to a macro-level, global analysis of social movements.

2.6 Characteristics of social movements

in our definition of social movements the issue of transformative change involves changing the underlying assumptions and overt behaviors, processes and structures of a society. civic action implies that the key actors in a social movement are citizens, often from social groups with less political power and on the periphery of economic and social decision making (as well as those working with these groups), and the actions usually constitute a series of demands or challenges to structures of power and the power holders. the focus of the actions and the issues around which social movements mobilize people, can vary. in terms of relevance to pro-poor growth and empowerment, a typology of issues that social movements mobilize around include, but are not limited to:

- movements that mobilize around issues of access to and control of productive assets. Examples include movements relating to rural or urban land (e.g. pastoralists movements) or indigenous communities access to forest resources.
- movements that mobilize against perceived economic exploitation and inequality of access to markets, labour markets in particular. They comprise people and organizations in specific trades or industries as well as networks of social and environmental justice activists. movements related to extractive industries such as mining, or movements that challenge trade liberalisation and their impact are some examples.
- movements that challenge discrimination, social exclusion and systemic and structural forms of racism, patriarchy and sexism e.g. gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation. Movements such as the human rights movement or the women's movement from its suffragist origins would fall into this category.
- movements that advocate for overall economic, social or political change, the construction of a new worldorder. an example of this is the world social forum. social movements also have a tendency to be unstructured and non-institutional and are characterised by “more nebulous, uncoordinated and cyclical forms of collective action, popular protest and networks that serve to link both organised and dispersed actors in processes of social mobilisation” (mitlin and Bebbington, 2006). mobilisation and/or disruption

are often seen as defining characteristics of a social movement; a movement's capacity to disrupt or threaten an existing social order are seen as linked to its ability to bring about change, and a way of introducing new thinking into the political agenda.

however, the ability of social movements to challenge and transform existing structures of power and domination can be offset by internal divisions or could vary with the context and determine the length and nature of their engagement with the core issue. for example, the south Africa anti-apartheid movement took more than 25 years to have any effect in promoting social inequality because of the repressive nature of the apartheid state that it was trying to engage with. however the treatment action campaign has been able to influence the government of south africa to develop an antiretroviral treatment plan after four years of advocacy (stackpool-moore, 2006). the objectives of social movements may change over time. for instance, what were deemed "peasant movements" concerned with defending a way of life and type of rural production from intrusions and demands of large corporations and the state, have now been replaced in with social movements that are contesting economic control in markets, demanding the right to determine prices and returns to labour, challenging institutional constraints to restraining economic opportunities for the poor (webster, 2004).

Partial achievement of a movement's objectives however, could rob a movement of its dynamic energy or the movement may be overtaken by shifts in social and political attitudes. at another level, social movements may become institutionalised, as in the case of the British "labour movement", which remains a useful umbrella term for the labour Party, trade unions, co-operatives, and socialist organisations, but no longer conveys a sense of a dynamic force seeking radical change. in recent times, social movements have emerged as an important force in international politics influencing global norms and practices. They resist globalisation, and challenge the authority of the countries and the international institutions that shape international relations and international development assistance.

In the developing world, social movements, like member-based organisations are often seen as empowering the disempowered and creating positive social, economic and political change through citizen action. There is a danger however, of over-rating the potential of social movements to engender change. The process of empowerment of a movement's constituents, for example, can be limited to increased self-confidence, the development of organisational skills and practical knowledge but not result in actually gaining and exercising economic or political power. The democratising potential of social movements has also not been uniform (hellman, 1997). Recent history has also shown the possibility of very destructive and reactionary identity based movements in countries like India and Rwanda (sogge and dutting, 2010), and the far right Christian movement in the US.

2.7.1 **The issue of Social justice:** a recent and politically charged concept the concept of social justice and its relevance and application within the present context require a more detailed explanation. As mentioned previously, the notion of social justice is relatively new. None of history's great philosophers—not Plato or Aristotle, or Confucius or Averroes, or even Rousseau or Kant—saw the need to consider justice or the redress of injustices from a social perspective. The concept first surfaced in Western thought and political language in the wake of the industrial revolution and the parallel development of the socialist doctrine. It emerged as an expression of protest against what was perceived as the capitalist exploitation of labour and as a focal point for the development of measures to improve the human condition. It was born as a revolutionary slogan embodying the ideals of progress and fraternity. Following the revolutions that shook Europe in the mid-1800s, social justice became a rallying cry for progressive thinkers and political activists. Proudhon, notably, identified justice with social justice, and social justice with respect for human dignity.

By the mid-twentieth century, the concept of social justice had become central to the ideologies and programmes of virtually all the leftist and centrist political parties around the world, and few dared to oppose it directly. Social justice represented the essence and the *raison d'être* of the social democrat doctrine and left its mark in the decades following the Second World War. Of particular importance in the present context is the link between the growing legitimization of the concept of social justice, on the one hand, and the emergence of the social sciences as distinct areas of activity and the creation of economics and sociology as disciplines separate from philosophy (notably moral philosophy), on the other hand. Social justice became more clearly defined when a distinction was drawn between the social sphere and the economic sphere, and grew into a mainstream preoccupation when a number of economists became convinced that it was their duty not only to describe phenomena but also to propose criteria for the distribution of the fruits of human activity.

The application of social justice requires a geographical, sociological, political and cultural framework within which relations between individuals and groups can be understood, assessed, and characterized as just or unjust. In modern times, this framework has been the nation-State. The country typically represents the context in which various aspects of social justice, such as the distribution of income in a population, are observed and measured; this benchmark is used not only by national Governments but also by international organizations and supranational entities such as the European Union. At the same time, there is clearly a universal dimension to social justice, with humanity as the common factor. Slaves, exploited workers and oppressed women are above all victimized human beings whose location matters less than their circumstances. This universality has taken on added depth and relevance as the physical and cultural

distance between the world's peoples has effectively shrunk. In their discussions regarding the situation of migrant workers, for example, Forum participants readily acknowledged the national and global dimensions of social justice.

2.7.2 Economic justice: a component of social justice.

Economic justice, defined as the existence of opportunities for meaningful work and employment and the dispensation of fair rewards for the productive activities of individuals, will be treated here as an aspect of social justice. The customary distinction between economic justice and social justice is intellectually unsatisfactory, as it serves to legitimize the dichotomization of the economic and social spheres. This tendency can seriously limit the potential for the advancement of justice, particularly within organizations that exercise a normative function with regard to matters of development. In recent years there has been a discernable trend in international discourse towards the attenuation not only of the concept of social justice, but also of the related concepts of social development and social policy. The social sphere has in many respects been marginalized. One reason for the decline in "social" orientations is the failure to adopt a comprehensive perspective on what the concept encompasses. As asserted later, support for the idea of social justice has gradually diminished because its advocates and practitioners have neglected one of its essential dimensions, which is for individuals to have the opportunity to exercise their initiative and use their talents and to be fairly rewarded for their efforts. To acknowledge the necessity of viewing economic justice as an element of social justice is, again, to argue for a social perspective on human affairs. Economic justice is one among many interrelated dimensions of life in society. It is suggested here that the distributive and redistributive aspects of justice do not have to be separated or perceived as antagonistic.

2.8 Sustainable development and Environment.

After 1970s people realized that environment and development needed to be seen together. Development requires extensive use of natural resources and all the basic resources required for living come from the Earth. "**Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs**" Brundtland Report (1987) 'Our Common Future'.

Different people with different perspectives have come up with various definitions of Sustainable Development. Some of the well known definitions are as follows:

Sustainable Development (SD) implies economic growth together with the protection of environmental quality, each reinforcing the other. Sustainable Development, thus, is maintaining a balance between the human need to improve lifestyles and feeling of well-being on one hand, and preserving natural resources and ecosystems, on which we and future generations depend

SD may also be defined as :

“To improve the quality of life while living within the carrying capacity of ecosystems” IUCN (The World Conservation Union), 1991.

Thus, Sustainable development does not focus solely on environmental issues. More broadly, it encompasses the three general policy areas namely **economy, environment, and society**.

The Swiss ‘Monitoring of Sustainable Development Project’ in 2001, proposed the following definition: **‘Sustainable development means ensuring dignified living conditions with regard to human rights by creating and maintaining the widest possible range of options for freely defining life plans.** The principle of fairness among and between **present and future generations** should be taken into account in the use of environmental, economic and social resources.

Putting these needs into practice entails comprehensive protection of bio-diversity in terms of ecosystem, species and genetic diversity, all of which are the vital foundations of life.’MONET , 2001

The main features that all the above definitions have (either explicitly or implicitly) are as follows:

- **A desirable human condition** : a society that people want to sustain because it meets their needs
- **A enduring ecosystem condition**: an ecosystem that maintains its capacity to support human life and others
- **A balance between present and future generations**; and within the present generation.

2.9 Specific characteristics of natural capital

There is a strong argument for treating natural capital as a significant factor of production in its own right, alongside produced capital, human capital and social capital, and to fully take account of it in production and consumption decisions.

Under traditional assumptions of wealth creation, there are assumed to be no limits to the availability of capital in the long run – it can either be replenished or substituted for by produced goods and services – and the objective of economic growth is consistent and aligned with the efficient use of resources. However, there are a number of attributes that differentiate natural capital from other types of capital.

- **Environmental assets may have critical thresholds.**

Changes to some renewable environmental assets beyond unknown thresholds may cause non-linear and irreversible changes to occur. These thresholds mark the boundary between alternate stable states. If these critical thresholds are breached, the asset may no longer be able to continue providing services or may no longer be adequately replenished, leading to eventual depletion of the asset.

Ecosystems are often subject to these thresholds, including ‘source limits’ such as fish stocks and top soil (where breaching this threshold will lead to a change or collapse in the ecosystem) and ‘sink’ limits, such

as limits to the degree that water and soil can absorb chemical outputs from production, and where breaching this limit can cause temporary or permanent disruption to ecological functioning. However, there is a great deal of scientific uncertainty around if and where critical thresholds might exist. In the absence of robust evidence, the precautionary principle would suggest preventing degradation or depletion well before these thresholds are reached.

- **Environmental assets may have finite limits**

Stocks of non-renewable environmental assets are limited not just in the short run, as traditionally assumed for capital assets, but also in the long run. For example, non-renewable assets such as metals and minerals are limited in the long-run and continued depletion will eventually lead to no virgin reserves remaining. However, identifying where and when these limits exist remains a challenge; for example, identifying which assets are non-renewable and face limits, and over what timescale.

- **Changes to environmental assets are potentially irreversible** Depletion and degradation of natural assets can often be irreversible, at least within timescales of interest to human civilization. For example, whereas a degraded road can be repaired or worn-out machinery replaced, it is not as simple to replant an ancient woodland ecosystem, and not possible to recreate an extinct species. In many cases, these natural assets are not substitutable to the same degree as produced or human capital.

- **Changes to environmental assets have impacts that extend over many generations**

The present generation's actions will have an impact on the welfare and endowment of future generations. For example, damage to environmental capital not only affects people today, but its impact extends over several generations. Decisions regarding the use of environmental assets need to be evaluated over a similar time scale. Intergenerational impacts complicate the valuation and pricing of environmental assets into economic decisions. For example:

- Economic agents may not be able to accurately evaluate the costs and benefits of actions that far into the future.
- Individuals' discount rates may be higher than those displayed by society as a whole, and may vary over time such that individuals' short-run actions are inconsistent with their long-run preferences;
- Uncertainty around the social rate of time preference over the very long-term makes the choice of discount rate particularly difficult.

Chapter Three: Mobilization in civil society and alternative collective action.

3.1 what is civil society?

'Civil society' is the old concept, dating back to English political thought of the sixteenth century. The contemporary proliferation of broadly related terms perhaps in part reflects uncertainty, confusion and disagreement about the meaning of the older notion.

What, indeed, is civil society? The concept has been understood very differently across different time periods, places, theoretical perspectives and political persuasions. Thus, for example, ‘civil society’ for Hegel, as an academic philosopher in Prussia and Baden in the early nineteenth century, has not been the same as ‘civil society’ for a grassroots eco-feminist group in India in the late twentieth century. We therefore need not a definitive definition, but a notion of civil society that, with due regard for cultural and historical contexts, promotes insight and effective policy in the contemporary world.

We might begin by stressing what civil society is not. For one thing, civil society is not the state: it is non-official, non-governmental. Civil society groups are not formally part of the state apparatus; nor do they seek to gain control of state office. On this criterion political parties should probably be excluded from civil society, although some analysts do include party organisations (as distinct from individual party members who might occupy governmental positions). Other fuzzy cases arise in respect of non-official actors that are organised and/or funded by the state. At what point do such bodies cease to be ‘non-governmental’? In addition, some agencies outside government help states and multilateral institutions to formulate, implement, monitor and enforce policies. To what extent can ‘civil society’ be involved in official regulatory functions? Clearly, the precise boundaries of ‘non-governmental’ activity are a matter for debate. Nevertheless, it is generally agreed that civil society lies outside the ‘public sector’ of official governance.

Second, civil society is not the market: it is a non-commercial realm. Civil society bodies are not companies or parts of firms; nor do they seek to make profits. Thus the mass media, the leisure industry and cooperatives would, as business enterprises, not normally be considered part of civil society.

For the purposes of the present discussion, activities are considered to be part of civil society when they involve a deliberate attempt from outside the state and the market, and in one or the other organised fashion to shape policies, norms and/or deeper social structures. In a word, civil society exists when people make concerted efforts through voluntary associations to mould rules: both official, formal, legal arrangements and informal social constructs. ‘Civil society’ is the collective noun, while ‘civic’ groups, organisations, etc. are the individual elements within civil society.

Civil society encompasses enormous diversity. In terms of membership and constituencies, for example, it includes academic institutes, business associations, community-based organisations, consumer protection bodies, criminal syndicates, development cooperation groups, environmental campaigns, ethnic lobbies, foundations, farmers’ groups, human rights advocates, labour unions, relief organisations, peace activists, professional bodies, religious institutions, women’s networks, youth campaigns and more.

3.2. Utopia ideas and developments.

The terms utopia as a form of writing about future expectations for ideal societies and history as a way of thinking and writing about the past have been considered as opposite concepts, devoid of any contact. Presupposing that there is a common denominator to historical ways of thinking and also to the utopian imagination, and assuming the existence of a recognisable demarcation between them, do they also share any middle ground? Is utopian material discernible in the background of historical thinking? Did the ways in they changed over time share a common tempo? Did both respond in the same way to the same questions in different eras? My starting point is not to investigate history as a background for imagining utopias, nor utopias as participating in the prefiguration and realisation of historical change; rather, I am concerned with the role of history within imagined utopian societies, and the place of utopia in the background of historical thinking. According to utopian writers, what do the ideal societies they have created have to do with history? What do they advise utopian citizens to do in regard to their past? What is the place of history as a cognitive method? Where is memory in utopian societies? Would they require historical thinking? Would they have an historical culture of the past as historical societies do? The central idea here is that despite their multifarious appearance and categorisation as different genres in each historical period, the terms history and utopia were subjected to transformation in their attitudes towards the past and the future. Both experienced the same changes. As a consequence, it is worth exploring the relationship between imagining the future in utopian language and thinking and writing history. The dimension of future time and of the social expectations and anxieties in writing and thinking history is often undervalued in the history and theory of historiography. This paper argues that the exploration of the link between utopian and historical thinking is necessary for understanding the horizon of long-term social expectations in writing history. From this point of view, ideas about the future are part of the deep structure which forms our understanding of what is historical thinking.

3.3 Institutionalizing a Utopia.

As a societal utopia, sustainable development offers significance and a direction for institutional change and societal activity beyond these contradictions. Utopias are spaces for speculation, and utopian thinking has interest and critical capacity in transforming existing realities. After twenty years sustainable development still creates a radical foundation for constitutional change. The notion of sustainable development aims to define societal issues in a new way regarding what is fair, who is allowed to participate and in which ways. These questions take a perspective on the future and look at how societal relations or ethical issues, for example, become part of a desirable future. Utopian constructions on sustainable development nurture the vagueness of appropriate rules and identifications and open unknown possibilities for institutional change.

Utopias inspire people by creating commonly shared visions of a world that is better than the current one. As societal ideals, they question the starting points of actions in the present society. The values and actions of the future society are not constructed from the assumptions of these starting points, as the future is constructed on the basis of new practices and values. Utopias and societal issues do not go together with what has been and what is strictly limited. They force us to embark on a journey of daydreaming, visioning and uncertainty, and they take us away from what is familiar and safe. They raise passions both on their behalf and against them, as well as hope for a different kind of future. Utopias are necessarily idealistic and lack the constructs and assumptions of reality; because, “For new arrangements to materialize, new conceptions are needed dreams, imaginaries, and experiments that are articulated and make the impossible seem possible”.

According to the view of the Brundtland Commission, sustainable development is not a stable and harmonic condition but a political process directed towards a fair future. Utopias of sustainable development aim to change the present conditions. From the point of view of utopias, development signifies the visioning and creation of another kind of future and society, and sustainability means the temporal limitations and renewal of usable resources. This understanding of combining development and sustainability is a challenge to prevailing logics of the appropriateness of social and political practices.

The views of experts or agendas for a better world formulated in global decision forums are not, therefore, enough if they do not become meaningful in ordinary everyday life and decision making processes. In order to concretize the ideas of sustainable development into practices, they need to be broadly accepted, and government, civil society and different fields of research need to collaborate.

The modern utopia, the welfare state, demonstrates how radical reforms come true if elite self-interest is combined with the mobilization of ordinary citizens and their movements. In order to move people and create passions, the utopia of sustainable development needs to offer a view of how to change issues that are seen as unfair. It is difficult to imagine a political process directed towards a fair future where citizens would be mere bystanders. Governments and research can support the process by creating ideas about possible futures of sustainable development. It is therefore noteworthy that people deem communality a significant force for change in the promotion of sustainable development. Communities empower individuals by offering advice, encouragement, expertise and opportunities to contribute as well as by offering an opportunity to share thoughts and actions with others. In addition to detailed practical solutions, they offer an opportunity to create meaningful discussion spaces.

Communal discussion spaces enable the construction of utopias and commitment to them. Individual sustainable development practices or detailed behavior lists about how to act in accordance with

sustainable development or how to eat in a climate friendly way are useful for those who are committed to the idea of sustainable development but who are lacking information. However, they do not commit those to whom sustainable development is meaningless. Lists of individual practices through which the world will be saved enable an everyday changeless change. A societal utopia that can be commonly shared and which commits people to sustainable development is broader than such lists. A broad vision of the future enables people to commit to societal activity. A meaningful utopia for the future should be constructed from communally shared issues that ignite feelings and passions. It should be directed towards changing the present into something new and different.

3.4 principles of Community mobilization and collective action.

DEFINING COMMUNITY: Community can mean different things in different contexts. Teams doing mobilization activities should take time at the beginning of a program to create a definition that is helpful where they work Some common elements of how Mercy Corps teams define community are:

- Individuals or groups who share a common geographic location;
- Individuals or groups who have common language, culture or values;
- How the groups or individuals interact or have relationships with each other; and
- How members of the community use common resources and make decisions

Community mobilization : is the process of engaging communities to identify community priorities, resources, needs, and solutions in such a way as to promote representative participation, good governance, accountability, and peaceful change.

Sustained mobilization : takes place when communities remain active and empowered after the program ends.

Communities of many countries have often been disempowered for decades due to chronic poverty, bad governance, protracted conflict or instability In other contexts, communities have recently experienced a major shock that overturned social and economic systems and people find themselves in an unfamiliar new reality Involving community members in a way that promotes their ownership over decision-making and builds the knowledge and skills to carry out those decisions is a complex task Yet many' experience leads us to believe that it is an essential component of supporting rapid recovery and lasting change Fostering people to be their own agents of change is the underlying goal of 'community mobilization

. The Vision for Change articulates people's mission of secure, productive and just communities and identifies the principles, relationships, key stakeholders, and external conditions believed to be necessary to realize that mission. These principles, applies to all its work, are central to our community mobilization approach.

3.4.1 Participation

With community mobilization, participation is about meeting the interests of the whole community. When every member of a community has the chance, directly or through representation, to participate in the design, implementation and monitoring of community-level initiatives, there is a higher likelihood that the program accurately reflects their real needs and interests. The approach takes into consideration the different experiences, needs and capabilities of various groups in a community – women and men, youth and the elderly, persons with disabilities and the able-bodied, ethnic/religious/language minorities and majorities. Participation can take a number of forms

. At one end of the spectrum is “passive participation” in which community members participate by being informed about something that will happen or has already happened. At the other end of the spectrum is “self-mobilization”, when communities organize and take initiative independent of any external actors.

3.4.2 Accountability

Accountability is most basically the process of sharing information about actions or intentions. Groups and individuals in relationships, such as in communities, are accountable to each other when they honor their commitment to communicate plans and are responsible for what they actually do. Accountability is often thought of in terms of government being accountable to citizens. In the context of community mobilization, community members being accountable to each other is as important as government accountability. Those individuals elected to help lead projects are accountable to the wider community, their neighbors who are counting on them to implement projects in the best interest of everyone.

In community mobilization, every community and all citizens have the right to know the procedures, decision-making processes, and financial flows of the programs people implements, as well as the specific community-led projects. Local partner organizations sign contracts, have open selection criteria and processes. For projects, and require documentation and tracking of all information to keep exchange of information open (Structures and Agreements). Transparency helps ensure that decisions that affect the community are made in a socially responsible way – that particular groups, such as ethnic minorities or persons with disabilities, are not excluded from the benefits of projects or activities. Accountability played an important role in a program in Kyrgyzstan. Part of a community mobilization program included local government officials in a training for the community about monitoring corruption. The project found productive community-government interactions significantly increased after the training, including transparency about local government budgeting.

3.5 Collective Action: Definition and Characteristics.

During the last few decades an increasing amount of literature on collective action and natural resources has emerged, with a great emphasis on the conceptualization of collective action and on the analytical framework necessary to study it (Ostrom 1990).

Marshall (1998) defined collective action as ‘the action taken by a group (either directly or on its behalf through an organization) in pursuit of members’ perceived shared interests’. As observed by Meinzen-Dick et al. (2004), the more specific and varied definitions which have been added later have in common the following features: the involvement of a group of people, shared interests, common and voluntary actions to pursue those shared interests.

A very relevant issue to consider when analyzing the dynamics of collective action is what type of organization has developed and/or supported such action. In many cases the outcomes of the collective action are highly dependent on the type of organizations involved, but also to the institutional arrangements which are in place at the local level. In the agricultural realm, for example, it is necessary to distinguish whether the collective action is developed by an organization directly controlled by farmers or if it is controlled and supported by a national/regional governmental authority.

From this perspective, Davies et al. (2004) distinguish two types of collective action: (i) *cooperation*: bottom-up, farmer-to-farmer collective action and (ii) *coordination*: top-down, agency-led collective action. While some bottom-up collective actions may receive government support, others may be carried out without government support. Similarly, some top-down collective actions are promoted by government policies but do not receive any support, while other collective actions receive support by local and/or government (OECD 2013).

This categorization implies the involvement of different levels of government (either central or local), which may provide the most effective support to the different strategies. From this perspective, the literature on collective actions and institutional arrangements for managing common pool resources has increasingly recognized the dynamic dimensions of institutions, which are context dependent and evolve over time. It is therefore necessary to understand how individuals interpret and respond to the different institutional arrangements in different contexts.

More specifically, a very important challenge for the analysis of collective action refers to the understanding of the role of formal and informal organizations that coordinate and support such actions, since in some cases these organizations exist only on paper and collective action occurs spontaneously, while in other cases institutions may play a vital role in creating and coordinating local action for a shared interest (Meinzen-Dick et al. 2004).

Although collective action is often associated with activities carried out by formal organizations, according to Ostrom (2004), more attention should be paid to informal collective action, where local networks or local groups of people organize and coordinate local action in order to achieve specific short-term purposes.