Dragica Vujadinović

Faculty of Law, University of Belgrade, Bulevar kralja Aleksandra 67, RS–11000 Belgrade
dragicav@ius.bg.ac.yu

Global Civil Society as Concept and Practice in the Processes of Globalization

Abstract

The latest discussions about civil society have been reconsidering the globalization processes, and the theoretical discourse has been broadened to include the notion of the global civil society.

The notion and the practice of a civil society are being globalized in a way that reflects the empirical processes of inter-connecting societies and of shaping a world society. From the normative-mobilizing perspective, civil society activists and theoreticians stress the need to defend the world society from the global threat of a nuclear war, environmental catastrophes, crime and violence, domination of world powers over the fate of individual countries and societies, i.e. the need to oppose the tendency of "power policy" on the world level, and to defend the autonomy of the (world) society as one compatible primarily with the expansion of policies based on the rule of law worldwide, and incompatible with the policy of force, state reasons, and domination of world power-centers.

The globalization processes result in a conflicting and/or assimilative crossing of civilizations and cultures, as well as controversial tendencies of, on one hand, attempts for the introduction of international political institutions and the adoption of international conventions for human rights' protection, for the defense of democratic values, for combating terrorism and segregation on various grounds, thus leading to a global standardization of the human-rights culture and of democratic political and legal order, and on the other, of rising xenophobia, particularization and ethno nationalism, civil wars, ecological threats, global terrorism, threat of hunger problem, nuclear war, new disease, etc.

Contemporary victory of liberal and democratic values is the positive reach, but followed by the contested issue of sovereignty, urban decay, racism, ethnic cleansing, xenophobia, failing political legitimacy (in the West), and followed at the world scale by: global injustice, poverty, environmental dangers, mass and deadly diseases, oppression of minority groups, relentless growth of population, political and economic power great asymmetries, terrorism at the global scale, threat of a nuclear disaster, etc.

Global civil society has three dimensions: 1) empirical phenomena of globalized social relations, interconnections, 2) mobilizing, formative force of the project/vision, and 3) social actors (movements) at the global/transnational level.

The anti-globalization movement is an effort to counter perceive negative aspects of the current process of globalization. Although adherents of the movement often work in concert, the movement itself is heterogeneous and includes diverse, sometimes opposing, understandings of this process, alternative visions, strategies and tactics. Thus, more nuanced terms include anti-capitalist/anti-corporate alternative globalization. Participants may use the positive terms such as 'global justice' or 'fair trade movement'; or 'Global Justice and Solidarity Movement'; or 'Movement of Movements'; or simply 'The Movement'; or 'anti-corporatist capitalism movement'.

Generally speaking, anti-globalization movement is not so much an opposition to globalization as such than an opposition to the particular way it is taking place – like neoliberal process of globalization. In that sense, many representatives of the Movement prefer to be called altermondialism.

Key words

civil society, global civil society, globalization processes, anti-globalization movement

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

80

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

1. Global Civil Society – Concept and Practice

Global civil society has emerged as a major social force during the final decade of the Second Millennium to resist the assault on life and democracy by the institutions of corporate globalization. Initially, the resistance centered on the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO) as the most visible and powerful of the institutional instruments advancing the neoliberal policy agenda of deregulation, the elimination of economic borders, social safety nets, and the privatization of common property assets. Subsequently, global civil society directs its attention to global corporations and financial markets.[1]

Global civil society has three dimensions: 1) the empirical phenomena of globalized social relations and interconnections; 2) the mobilizing, formative force of the project/vision; and 3) social actors (movements) on the global/transnational level.

There are empirical processes of globalization of social, cultural, economic relations. However, all of these processes and social interrelations cannot be understood as manifestations of a global civil society.

The first two dimensions taken together give the content of an ideal-typical connotation of the category of global civil society. Firstly, it strives to comprise the actual processes related to the expansion of social ties up to a world-wide level, mediated by the internationalization of the economic market, transport, culture, satellite communications, world-wide transparent media, and the Internet. Secondly, the category of global civil society also strives to provide normative content and a mobilizing force, a determination to embody the principle of democratic rule and a democratic way of life world-wide, and to identify criteria for evaluating events in individual countries, as well as in global tendencies, from the perspective of peace, tolerance, autonomy and control of society (societies), and in confrontation with the world centers – either formal or informal – of power and government.[2]

The concept of a global civil society is an ideal-typical one, consisting of empirical-analytical and normative-mobilizing aspects. The globalizing practice of social, economic, cultural, political, legal interconnecting rests upon its empirical aspect, which cannot be recognized as being genuine manifestations of a global civil society without a normative-mobilizing aspect that outlines a normative framework (principles of solidarity, justice, tolerance, peace, non-violence, (etc.) on the global scale. This is to be taken together with the principles of publicity, associativity and autonomous acting of the citizens on a global scale. In other words, the public acting of voluntarily and spontaneously forming associations of autonomous individuals at the transnational level and issues that have a global/transnational importance have been the field of global networking which bears the meaning and manifestations of the global civil society.

Global civil society is related to public acting of associated autonomous individuals and groups organized globally or networked on an international and global level, and mobilized around social, political, economic issues relevant globally or expressed on a global scale, and who are in favor of what is better off for humanity on a global scale.

The normative perspective is important for recognizing and acknowledging what social movements, civic initiatives, and networks on the global scale can be considered as manifestations of a global civil society (and which of them should not be). Global civil society is becoming the new world view, i.e. the

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

81

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

"big idea", concerned with globalization and its discontents, as well as with its capacity ties for the future improvement of a democratic way of life on a global scale.

According to Keane,[3] there are seven reasons for the appearance of the global civil society concept/vision:

"These unfamiliar words 'global civil society' – a neologism of the 1990s – are fast becoming fashionable. They were born at the confluence of seven overlapping streams of concern among publicly-minded intellectuals at the end of the 1980s: the revival of the old language of civil society, especially in central-eastern Europe, after the military crushing of the Prague Spring; a heightening appreciation of the revolutionary effects of the new galaxy of satellite/computer mediated communications (captured in Marshall McLuhan's famous neologism, 'the global village'); the new awareness, stimulated by the peace and ecological movements, of ourselves as a fragile and potentially self-destructive world system; the widespread perception that the implosion of Soviet-type communist systems implied a new global political order; the world-wide growth spurt of neo-liberal economic and market capitalist economies: the disillusionment with the broken and unfulfilled promises of postcolonial states; and the rising concern about the dangerous and misery-producing vacuums opened up by the collapse of empires and states and the outbreak of uncivil wars. Fed by these developments, talk of global civil society has become popular among citizens' campaigners, bankers, diplomats, NGOs and politicians."

1.1. The Anti-Globalization Movement

As above mentioned, global civil society has three dimensions among which social actors – movements at the global/transnational level – play an important role.

The anti-globalization movement[4] is an effort to counter perceive the negative aspects of the current process of globalization. Although adherents of the movement often work in concert, the movement itself is heterogeneous and includes diverse, sometimes opposing, understandings of this process, alternative visions, strategies and tactics. Thus, more nuanced terms include anti-capitalist/anti-corporate alternative globalization. Participants may use the positive terms global justice or fair trade movement; or the Global Justice and Solidarity Movement; or the Movement of Movements; or simply The Movement; or the anti-corporatist capitalism movement.

Generally speaking, the anti-globalization movement is not so much an opposition to globalization as such, but rather an opposition to the particular way it is taking place – like the neoliberal process of globalization. In this sense, many representatives of the Movement prefer for it to be called 'altermondialism'.

"Some factions of the movement reject globalization as such, but the overwhelming majority of its participants are aligned with movements of indigenous people, anarchism, green move-

---

1
See: D. C. Korten, N. Perlas, and V. Shiva, "Global Civil Society – the Path Ahead", http://pcdf.org/civilsociety/default.htm,September 20th, 2008.

2
Commenting on the normative dimension of the ideal-typical category of global civil society, Keane remarks: "The vision of a global civil society is presented as a challenge to the normative silence or confusion within much of the contemporary literature on globalization and global governance. In opposition to mounting fears of terrorism, rising tides of bigotry and nationalism and loose talk of 'anti-globalization', the defense of global civil society mounted here implies the need for a defense of democratic ways of life – and for brand-new democratic thinking about such matters as violence, global markets, and government with a global reach." (Ibid.)

3
J. Keane, *Global Civil Society?*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003, p. 1.

4
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative_globalization_movement, February 2004.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

82

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

ments, and to a minor extent communism. Some activists in the movement have objected not to capitalism or international markets as such but rather to what they claim is the non-transparent and undemocratic mechanisms and consequences of globalization. They are especially opposed to neoliberalism, and international institutions that promote neoliberalism such as the World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) and the World Trade Organization (WTO); neoliberal 'free trade' treaties like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI) and the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS); business alliances like the World Economic Forum (WEF), the Trans Atlantic Business Dialogue (TABD) and the Asia Pacific Economic Forum (APEC); as well as the governments which promote these agreements, institutions, and policies. Still others argue that, if borders are opened to capital, borders should be similarly opened to allow free and legal circulation and choice of residence for migrants and refugees. These activists tend to target organisms such as the International Organization for Migration and the Schengen Information System."[5]

With regard to what is usually referred to anti-globalization movement, it should be stressed that this is a highly contradictory manifestation of what is, a truly global social movement directed against the neo-liberal logic of globalization and against unification of ways of life (Lebenswelt) ("Americanization", "McDonaldization") on a global scale, and yet is – in some places and at times – a violent (and in many ways intolerant and undemocratic) social movement.

It is also worth noting that many nationalist movements, such as the French National Front are also against globalization; they are still usually not considered part of the anti-globalization movement, which tends to adopt left-wing approaches.

According to Mark Raymond,[6] what is now loosely referred to as the "anti-corporate globalization movement" remains a relatively new phenomenon in global politics. Though street protests in Seattle, Washington, Prague, Quebec City and Genoa have attracted considerable media attention, not to mention tens of thousands of protesters, "prior to 1998 these actions rarely involved more than several hundred people at a time". According to him, the most consistently observed characteristic of a global civil society is its pluralism and diversity. He concludes that, indeed, the perceived lack of coordination is such that current conceptions of a global civil society bear more resemblance to social movements than to networks.

1.1.1. Organizational Forms

Global civil society has been primarily presented through counter-summits, world social forums, and single-issued global movements, although there are also some more stabile forms of global networking. Generally speaking, anti-(neo)liberal globalization movements have been mobilized and organized against international events which represent a neoliberal model of globalization.

World counter-summits have been organized as a mass global reaction of the world's citizens against the world's economic, political, financial, military centers of power, represented in the above mentioned international organizations of the G8, WTO, NAFTA, IMF, etc… They have been provoked by the concrete summits of some of these organizations and their world elites representatives. They represent a parallel counter-gathering and acting of the masses, who have been aware of the great risks and negative social, economic, political consequences of neoliberal globalization and its articulation and promotion through its world summits. Their aim is to express a critical point

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

83

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

of view and to mobilize people around global issues and against an image of
the world as designed by those world centers of power. Street protests and
marches in cities where summits have been held are usually followed by con-
ferences, discussion meetings. World social forums have similar inspirations
and aims, and even organizational forms, but they are more focused on critical
discourse, i.e. conferences, debating clubs, and discussion meetings.

Donatella della Porta states about these organizational forms:

"Counter-summits against the official summits of International Governmental Organizations
(especially the G8, World Bank and IMF, WTO, and the EU) represent quite disruptive forms of
protest at the transnational level. Differently from a counter-summit, that is mainly oriented to
public protest, the Social Forum is set up as a space of debate among activists. Although origi-
nally indirectly oriented to 'counter' another summit – the World Social Forum (WSF) was or-
ganized on the same date and in alternative to the World Economic Forum (WEF) held in Davos
(Switzerland) – the WSF presented itself as an independent space for encounters among civil
society organizations and citizens. The first WSF in Porto Alegre in January 2001 was attended
by about 20,000 participants from over 100 countries, among them thousands of delegates of
NGOs and social movement organizations. Its main aim was the discussion of 'Another possible
globalization'. Since then the number of organizers and participants as well as the organizatio-
nal efforts of the following WSFs (in Porto Alegre in 2002 and 2003, than in Mumbay in 2004,
and again in Porto Alegre in 2005) increased exponentially. The WSF also gained a large media
attention. According to the organizers, the WSF in 2002 attracted 3,000 journalists (from 467
newspapers and 304 radio or TV-stations), a figure which doubled to more than 6,800 in 2005.
Notwithstanding some tensions about the decision making process as well as the financing of
the initiatives, the idea of open arenas for discussion, not immediately oriented to action and
decisions, has spread with the global justice movement. Since 2001, social forums were organi-
zed also at macro-regional, national and local level. Panamazzonean Social Forums were held
in Brazil and Venezuela in 2004; African Social Forums in Mali and Ethiopia, Asiatic Social
Forums in India."[7]

Global networks connect national, regional, transnational groups and initia-
tives organized through international NGOs, Internet associations, and *ad hoc*
international initiatives.

Still, some global civil society networks have already been established. The
best example is CIVICUS,[8] which is a global civil society network which
aims to: "… help advance regional, national and international initiatives to
strengthen the capacity of civil society". CIVICUS is an international alliance
aimed at nurturing the foundation, growth and protection of citizen action
throughout the world, especially in areas where participatory democracy and
citizens' freedom of association are threatened. Through its worldwide mem-
bership base, it aims to have a positive impact on civil society organizations'
ability to engage with governments, corporations and international institu-
tions in order to effect broad social, economic and political change. CIVICUS
World Assemblies provide unique opportunities for civil society organiza-
tion and other stakeholders from around the globe to share their experiences,
consider new strategies and consolidate existing ones in advancing a greater
space for citizen participation. It is foremost a forum for dialogue and debate,
creating an opportunity for civil society organizations which normally do not

5
See: Ibid.

6
See: www.utoronto.ca/cis/Mapping.doc.

7
D. della Porta, "The Emergence of European
Movements? Civil Society and the EU", *Eu-

ropean Journal of Law* (EJL), Vol. 1, No. 3,
2008.

8
See: http://www.civicus.org and www.civi-
cusassembly.org.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

84

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

have access to certain important actors nationally, regionally and internationally to engage in dialogue and debate about the future of the planet generally, and the role of civil society specifically. The Assemblies are also aimed at generating a theme which encompasses the broad interests of civil society. (See: ibid.) The CIVICUS World Assembly was recently held (from the 22nd to the 26th of March, 2004), in Gaborone, Botswana under the "message": 'Acting together for a just world' and accenting a vision for global justice.[9]

The organization Move-On was formed in the U.S.A. after September 11th and as a response against actual American politics in which the war against the terrorism has turned into extraordinary military intonations followed by restricting of human rights. Move-On has mobilized (with the help of the Internet) hundreds of thousands of Americans as well as participants from other parts of the world in attempt to criticize, control, fight against the politics of the Bush administration and the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as against the Bush administration's purposefully ignoring environmentalist problems, and imposing a tremendous military budget. The last Move-On campaign in 2004 was centered around the issues of intolerance and discrimination, and especially family and women's issues and aimed to gather together more than a thousand feminist organization – women-s rights, civil rights and health care organizations – in order to take part in the big "March for Women's Lives" in Washington, DC and to fight for the protection of the right to birth control, emergency contraception, abortion, and all reproductive health services. "The March is not just for girls and women who have the option of choice, but also for those who live with the fears and devastation of poverty, war, intolerance and sexual violence that threatens their very being and for the men who care about us". Seven organizations (the American Civil Liberties Union, the Black Women's Health Imperative, the Feminist Majority Foundation, NARAL Pro-Choice America, the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, the National Organization for Women and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America) organized the March on April 25th, 2004, with the motto: "Help us Make History!". Move-On and this March had not only national but also transnational and global purpose and impact.[10]

1.1.2. Causes within the Movement

There are many different causes championed by movement members, including labour rights, environmentalism, feminism, freedom of migration, preservation of the cultures of indigenous peoples, biodiversity, cultural diversity, food safety, organic farming, opposition to the green revolution and genetic engineering, and ending or reforming capitalism. Movement members see most or all of these goals as complementary to one another, together forming a comprehensive agenda touching on nearly all aspects of life.[11]

Regarding social actors of the movement and their concerns, many of the protesters are veterans of single-issue campaigns, including forest/anti-logging activism, organizing living wage and labour unions, homeless solidarity campouts, urban squatting, urban autonomy, and political secession. However, new generations of protesters in the developed as well as developing countries have stressed global issues and/or global connotations and consequences of the particular issues, and on the fight against economic, financial, military, political – formal and informal – world centers of power.

Some of the movement's agenda is shared by major pro-capitalist economic theorists who argue for much less centralized systems of money supply, debt control, and trade law. These include George Soros, Joseph E. Stieglitz (for-

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

85

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

merly representative of the World Bank), and David Korten. These three in par-
ticular have made strong arguments for drastically improving transparency, for
debt relief, land reform, and restructuring corporate accountability systems.

Concerning the ideology, a leftist political orientation has been dominant, and
rather often connected with some kind of anarchism. More precisely, some
protesters identify themselves as revolutionary anarchists, socialists, or com-
munists; others agree ideologically but don't immediately identify themselves
as such and still others want to reform capitalism, e.g. democratic Greens.

According to Barbara Epstein,[12] many among today's young radical activists,
especially those at the centre of anti-globalization and anti-corporate move-
ments, call themselves anarchists. Yet the intellectual/philosophical perspec-
tive that holds sway in these circles might be better described as an anarchist
sensibility than as anarchism per se. For contemporary young radical activ-
ists, anarchism means a decentralized organizational structure, based on af-
finity groups that work together on an *ad hoc* basis and decision-making by
consensus. It also means egalitarianism; opposition to all hierarchies; sus-
picion of authority, especially to that of the state; and commitment to living
according to one's values. Young radical activists, who regard themselves as
anarchists, are likely to be hostile to not just corporations but to capitalism.
Many envision a stateless society based on small, egalitarian communities.
For some, however, the society of the future remains an open question. For
them, anarchism is important mainly as an organizational structure and as a
commitment to egalitarianism.

There are many in the movement who do not consider themselves anarchists.
These would include some older intellectuals, as well as some younger ac-
tivists with experience in movements with other ideological leanings, such

9

Over 700 citizens from 100 countries world-
wide gathered around the theme of "working
together for a just world". The participants
included civil society activists, practitioners,
researchers, activists, concerned business
leaders, representatives from intergovern-
mental organizations and government repre-
sentatives, all united by a common concern to
work concertedly for greater social, econom-
ic, political and civic justice worldwide.

Kumi Naidoo, Secretary General of CI-
VICUS, in an impassioned opening address,
highlighted the common concern of the actors
in this diverse group of participants: "We are
[all] committed to the ideal that every human
being on this planet has the right and capacity
to shape the form of governance institutions
that make the policies that lead to the delivery
of services and the maintenance of the rule
of law which we hope will one day be based
genuinely on social, economic, political and
civic justice."

"The main ideas in the overall theme for the
Assembly are 'acting together' and 'justice'",
he added, "At the heart of these ideas is the
valuing of human life and working together.
The gross violations of human rights that
stunned the world community on the 11th of
September 2001 […], the tragic situation in
Iraq, and the recent Madrid bombings must

force us to think about the value we place on
human life and how much that shapes what
we do, how we think and how we relate to
each other at the global level. The world is
consumed by 'terror' and the so-called 'war
against terrorism' which itself has become
terrifying, violence against women is on the
rise, millions of people are displaced by war,
and there is the quiet violence of poverty and
starvation."

Naudoo went on to introduce four core themes
of the conference: social, economic, political
and civic justice, and the four cross-cutting
themes of gender equality, HIV/AIDS, youth-
empowerment, capacity-building and mar-
ginalized communities. In the following four
days, the delegates at the Assembly attend a
wide range of events and workshops that will
focus specifically on these themes.

10

See: moveon-help@list.moveon.org and http://
www.marchforwomen.org.

11

See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative
_globalization_movement, p. 2.

12

http://www.monthlyreview.org/0901epstein.
htm.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

86

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

as the international solidarity/anti-imperialist movement, in which anarchism has not been a major influence. There are activists who do not identify with any ideological stance. According to Epstein, anarchism is nevertheless the dominant perspective within the movement. The movement is organized along lines understood as anarchist by movement activists, made up largely of small groups that join forces on an *ad hoc* basis, for particular actions and other projects. Movement activists call this form of organization 'anarchist'. It is supported not only by those who call themselves 'anarchists' but by many who would not do so. This author mentions some anti-globalization activists who described the anarchism of many movement activists as "liberalism on steroids"– what should mean that they are in favour of liberal values, human rights, free speech, diversity – and militantly so.

According to Epstein, the decentralized form of the movement and its commitment to leaving room for a range of perspectives allows for a certain flexibility of perspective. Activists may vacillate between various outlooks, remain ambivalent, or combine elements of anarchism, Marxism, and liberalism. This can lead to ideological creativity. It can also lead to the habit of holding various positions simultaneously which, if more rigorously examined, would prove incompatible.[13]

1.1.3. Violence

The most heated debate within the movement is over the question of violence. The social movements which belong to the civil society should be and have been by definition peaceful ones. However, so-called anti-globalization movements are almost always followed by violent behaviour at least of some of its agents and representative groups.

The debate over violence within the anti-globalization movement concerns violence toward property, and the danger of inciting police violence. In Seattle, groups of black young people, who later identified themselves as the Black Bloc, smashed windows and destroyed property of corporate targets within the downtown area over which protesters and police were fighting for control. These attacks took the organizers of the protest by surprise, and, provoked more police violence against protesters generally. Some non-violent protesters tried to restrain those smashing windows. In the wake of the demonstration some protesters condemned the violence, arguing that it discredited the movement as a whole and that tactics should be decided democratically, not by small groups acting autonomously. Others argued that window smashing, and the police violence that it provoked, had brought the attention of the media and given the demonstration a prominence that it would not have otherwise had. In subsequent demonstrations the Black Bloc and others with similar approaches have become more integrated into the movement and have modulated their actions, while some others have become more willing to accept some violence against property. Demonstrations in Prague and other European cities have included attacks on policemen, and such attacks have come to be expected as a part of any major mobilization of the movement.[14] However, in Prague, only one of the movement's sections acted violently. Special attention should be paid to the fact that two million people in Madrid and Spain marched totally peacefully after the bomb attack on the March 11th, 2004.

1.1.4. Organization of the Movement

Although over the past years more emphasis has been placed on the construction of grassroots alternatives to (capitalist) globalization, the movement's

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

87

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

largest and most visible mode of organizing remains mass decentralized campaigns of direct action and civil disobedience. These often coincide with meetings of organizations they object to. This mode of organizing, primarily under the banner of the Peoples' Global Action network, serves to tie the many disparate causes together into one global struggle. Exposure to the other causes helps create solidarity and slowly lays the groundwork for a consensus process and basis of unity for the movement itself, which may eventually include any, all, or none of the doctrines listed above.

The Movement manages to successfully organize large protests on a global basis despite a lack of formal coordinating bodies. They are able to do so by using information technology in order to spread information and organize themselves into "affinity groups", typically non-hierarchical groups of people who live close together and share a common goal or political message. Affinity groups then send representatives to planning meetings.

According to Epstein, there are reasons to fear that the anti-globalization movement may not be able to broaden in the way what this would require. A movement capable of transforming structures of power will have to involve alliances, many of which will probably require more stable and lasting forms of organization than now exist within the anti-globalization movement. The absence of such structures is one of the reasons for the reluctance of many people of colour to become involved in the anti-globalization movement. Though it has developed good relations with many trade union activists, it is hard to imagine a firm alliance between labour and the anti-globalization movement without firmer structures of decision-making and accountability than exist now. An alliance among the anti-globalization movement and organizations of colour and labour would require major political shifts within the latter, but it would also probably require some relaxation of anti-bureaucratic and anti-hierarchical principles on the part of activists in the anti-globalization movement.

Concerning the relation between *the Internet and global civil society*, Raymond considers it difficult or almost impossible to separate them, as the emergence of the Internet has coincided with the latest and most startling expansion of global civil society's extensity – both in terms of group numbers and its geographic scope.[15]

---

[13]

Ibid.

[14]

Epstein states: "In the context of the debate about violence in the United States, within which violence against people is excluded, the differences between the advocates of violence and those who are willing to countenance violence under certain circumstances are not clear-cut. In the early eighties activists, especially religious activists, did things like attempting to damage missiles as part of nonviolent direct action. Destruction of property can be part of nonviolent politics. During the Vietnam War, pacifists and former Catholic priests Daniel and Philip Berrigan led raids on draft centers, destroying draft files by pouring blood on them and, in one instance, by the use of homemade napalm. In the eighties the Berrigans and other Christian pacifists, in a series of Ploughshares Actions, invaded arms-producing plants and attacked missiles with hammers and bare hands. It seems to me that the importance of the current debate over violence, in the anti-globalization movement, lies less in whether or not the opponents of violence to property prevail, and more in what kind of ethical guidelines the movement sets for itself. What is important is whether the movement establishes an image of expressing rage for its own sake, or of acting according to an ethical vision." (Ibid.)

[15]

Raymond remarks that, however, this increase in network extensity has not been distributed evenly in geographic terms. Fully 69% of the estimated (Feb. 2001) 400 million Internet users were located in North America and Europe.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

88

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

The Internet has almost certainly facilitated a revolutionary increase in network velocity in that it offers the inexpensive and nearly instantaneous transmission of text, data, voice, still images and even video. According to Naughton, "its most important coordinating function… is not so much tactical, as the traditional mass media assume, but strategic, that is, in enabling participating groups to exchange information, prepare position papers, lobby local legislatures, and generally lay the groundwork for more established forms of political action." Namely, the increase in such network velocity as a consequence of the proliferation of the Internet has enabled the performance of just the type of mobilizing roles attributed to the core group.[16]

Regardless of the controversies concerned with the so-called I-democracy, i.e. the role of the Internet in the processes of democratization of social life and political order on a global scale – there is the uncontested fact that the Internet can and has actually played a mobilizing/organizational role in the anti-globalization movements in the 90s and further on, which used to be played traditionally by core groups in the social movements in the 70s.

1.1.5. Influences

Generally speaking, influences depend on the extensity and intensity of the movement, on its organizational capacity, on financial donors' support, on motivational and mobilizational capacities, on media and internet presentation, on the official types of responses, and on coordination among different organizational forms.

As a paradigm of the optimal possible impact and strength of the anti-globalization movement, the notion given in the New York Times qualified the Movement as "the world's second superpower", when the anti-Iraq war global protest of 10 million or more throughout many cities and places in the world happened on the weekend of February 15th, 2003.

Concerning influences on the developed world, some people claim that the major mobilizations have taken place mainly in the developed world, where there are strong traditions of free speech, police restraint, civil rights, and the rule of law. In these countries, one of the objectives is to demonstrate that the protesters self-govern better than they could ever be controlled by violent force: on March 15th, 2002 in Barcelona, 250,000 people "rioted" four days with no serious injury on either side – far fewer casualties than would be expected in a typical European soccer riot.

By demonstrating general restraint against attacking persons and restricting demonstrative actions to property damage, the mobilizations have acted as an important influence on the developing world. In Argentina during the winter 2002 economic crisis, millions of ordinary citizens took to the streets for days with similar results, forcing several changes in the federal government. From December 19th and 20th 2001, demonstrations (called "cacerolazos") in Buenos Aires forced the resignation of then-president De la Rua; over 32 demonstrators were killed. Since then, Argentine citizens have continued to develop alternative neighbourhood-based economic systems, social structures and systems of autonomous self-government. A popular slogan within the uprising was, "Que se vayan todos! Que no se quede ninguno solo!" meaning, "Everybody out (of the government)! Nobody stays!" indicating protesters' frustration not only with corruption in government but with the entire governmental structure.

The impact of the Movement has been dependent to a great extent on the media, but the biggest media empires have been owned either by state gov-

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

89

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

ernments or by the huge capital, international corporations. Media ignorance plus the denial of freedom of movement and extreme security measures have become the method most common for following up by official/power centers response to huge anti-globalization protests.[17]

The summit in Nice deserves to be remembered for the extreme bias shown by the media. Despite hundreds of hours of coverage the media ignored key issues. The counter summit attended by thousands of people was completely ignored. It finally closed when the police fired tear gas into the venue! Coverage of the demonstrations was laughable – confined to a few images of unexplained "violence". Once more the demonstrators were presented as a handful of violent hooligans without any alternative to capitalist globalization.[18]

1.1.6. Responses to the Anti-globalization Movement

Responses have varied. On the far right, some have attacked the protestors as "proto-terrorists", whose escalating level of violence can only culminate in individual terrorism. Other rightists have strongly supported the anti-globalization movement. They see it as a way to further neo-fascist agendas of stronger national autonomy, economic protectionism, the exclusion of immigrants, and withdrawal from world affairs and so-called world government.

The left has been equally divided in response. The two main left alternatives to capitalist globalization may be defined as the "fix it" and the "nix it" approaches. Arguments and divisions at the World Social Forum at Porto Alegre, Brazil, in January 2001, reflected these two approaches. The "fix it" position advocated the reform of global capitalism and its institutions, such as the IMF, WTO and United Nations. The "fix it" camp believes these institutions can be transformed to defend the interests of labour and the "Third World". Once transformed, they can provide progressive global governance in such forms as the enforcement of social clauses in world trade agreements. The more radical "nix it" position, championed by anarchists and libertarians, stands for the abolition of capitalism and its replacement with a humane, planned, self-managed, stateless, global economy. The "nix it" position argues that the IMF, WTO and other multilateral structures are inherently anti-working class. Hence, it should be confronted and abolished through class struggle.

16

In addition, according to Raymond, the Internet and *The Global Civil Society Yearbook* serve as the great resources for virtual and practical networking, as well as for theoretical surveys.

17

"In Nice, this denial of freedom of movement was not just happening on the borders, it was also happening in France itself. Collectives had formed to demand free trains for the demonstrations to allow unemployed people to attend. But at the stations, where the trains were to leave from, Paris, Dijon, Lyon and Bordeaux, the police were waiting and confrontations occurred. At the worst in Bordeaux, there were several injuries and arrests.

Meanwhile in Nice, French riot police attacked the thousands of demonstrators who at the end of the demonstration had headed to the train station to show solidarity with the Italians. As the French IMC later reported 'The Schengen Agreement 'guaranteeing' freedom of movement in Europe had been violated, preventing the Italians from going to Nice. Since the Italians were not consumer goods, they did not have the right to cross the border'." (http://flag.blackened.net/revplt/ws/2001/62/nice.html)

18

Ibid.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

90

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

Concerning *criticisms and counter arguments from the inside*, the following could be said: the anti-globalization movement has been heavily criticized on many fronts by politicians, members of right-wing think-tanks, mainstream economists, and other supporters of free trade policies. Participants in the movement dismiss these criticisms as merely coming from a tiny minority who can express their opinions via what they call the corporate media. They claim that the criticisms themselves are self-serving and unrepresentative of any informed popular opinion.

One of the most fundamental criticisms of the movement is simply that it lacks coherent goals, and that the views of different protesters are fundamentally contradictory.[19]

Another piece of criticism is that, although the movement protests things that are widely recognized as serious problems (human rights violations, genocide, global warming), it rarely proposes detailed solutions, and those solutions that have been advocated are often what some people regard as failed variants of socialism.

Some have criticized its claim to be non-violent. Aside from the indisputably violent tactics by a minority of protesters (possibly aggravated by the police), some see a blockade of an event as in and of itself a violent action (although many protesters would counter that blockades are a time-honoured technique of civil disobedience).[20]

2. Theoretical-Methodological Framework –
the Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions
of a Global Civil Society

The classic 20th century bipolar paradigm "civil society-legal state" through which issues of civil society have been considered in the framework of the nation-state has to be modified into the paradigm "global civil society-global democratic order".

In the context of a contemporary state's sovereignty contestation, the main paradigm is under pressure to deal with the certain changes. The conceptualization of nation state-civil society opposition/partnership inside the above mentioned paradigm becomes too simplistic according to the increasing importance of horizontal, transnational identities and linkages, as well as according to the increasing importance of the transnational political governance.

Some kind of analogy with civil society establishment prior to a liberal-democratic state in Central and Eastern Europe could be spoken about. Global civil society functions as the creation process from below, which generates – through constant pressure towards existent world centers of economic, political, military power – further development of the global civil society itself as well as the formation of democratic legal and political institutions on a global scale.

Talk on global civil society implies a political vision of a less violent world founded on legally sanctioned power sharing arrangements among many different and intermingling forms of social life.[21]

The ideal-typical category of global civil society recognizes elements of civil society construction in its horizontal dimension: horizontal networking and social movements on a global scale as well as in its vertical dimension in attempts of the global civil society to control, counter-balance, fight against –

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

91

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

either formally or informally – the world centers of political, economic, and military power. As has already been mentioned, there has to be a differentiated analytical-descriptive and normative-mobilizing dimension of global civil society. Concerning the horizontal context, the descriptive dimension has been related to the processes of widening and deepening interconnections, associations among individual and group actors in a worldwide context, while it also contains normative-mobilizing elements referring to what-ought-to-be the life (plurality of ways of life) of the global community in accordance with the democratic principles. Concerning the vertical context, it is not easy at all either to clear up the second part of the paradigm, i.e. what comes about instead of the nation state, what the (democratic) political order on a global scale is, nor is it easy to clear up the normative framework (i.e. what should it mean to put under control, counter-balance, fighting against that global political power in order to make it in accordance with democratic principles).

In its horizontal dimension, global civil society has been coming into life just through the new logic of globalised life production, and this is similar to what Comaroffs[22] had mentioned about civil societies in liberal democratic states ("We /in the West/ have been living it without noticing it as part of the unremarked fabric of society itself"). Therein, we might paraphrase that the people of the world have been living a global civil society without noticing it as part of the fabric of global society itself, and to add, of global governance, as well.

As mentioned above, a normative perspective is also important for recognizing and acknowledging certain phenomena as the real manifestations of a global civil society in its horizontal dimension – whose social movements, civic initiatives, networks on a global scale could be considered as manifestations of a global civil society (and which should not be). In order that social ties, social actors or individuals be considered as representatives of civil society on a global scale, normative criteria connected with this horizontal dimension presuppose that they have to act as voluntary associations – social movements, networks, NGOs, global initiatives, i.e. different associations of autonomous individuals who consider themselves act as the citizens of the world, and act in accordance with universal human values and principles of a democratic political culture.

19
"It is argued (for instance, as a constant editorial line by *The Economist*), that one of the major causes of poverty amongst third-world farmers are the trade barriers put up by rich nations. The WTO is an organization set up to work towards removing those trade barriers. Therefore, it is argued that people really concerned about the plight of the third world should actually be encouraging free trade, rather than attempting to fight it. Further in this vein, it is argued that the protester's opposition to free trade is really aimed at protecting the interests of Western labor (whose wages and conditions are protected by trade barriers) rather than the interests of the developing world, despite the proclaimed goals of the movement in favor of solidarity and cooperation, not competition, between ordinary farmers and workers *everywhere*. Anti-globalization activists counter that free trade policies create an environment for workers similar to the Prisoner's dilemma, in which workers in different countries are tempted to 'defect' by undercutting standards on wages and work conditions, and reject this argument in favor of a strategy of cooperation for mutual benefit." (Wikipedia, ibid., pp. 6–8)

20
See: ibid.

21
J. Keane, ibid.

22
J. L. Comaroff and J. Comaroff, *Civil Society and the Critical Imagination in Africa: Critical perspectives*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1993.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

92

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

Concerning its vertical dimension, a global civil society has to be related to the notion of global governance, and normatively speaking, to the notion of democratic governance on a global scale. However, global governance, as we know, and if it has already been established – has not been a democratic one. Constitutionalism on a global scale has not been established as of yet – as functional, as workable legal regulation, and as democratic constitutionalism. Its establishment can be treated primarily as project, ideal, and normative criteria. However, theoretically speaking, global civil society is supposed to have also the role of partnership and opposition towards political power in its vertical dimension, but in a more formative way than in classical liberal and liberal democratic states. With an analogy in respect to transitional countries, global civil society pre-terms and determines to a certain extent the formation of democratic political governance on a global scale, whatever political governance as a democratic one should or could mean. So far, the normative dimension of a global civil society has had an extreme importance, much bigger than it's descriptive (though unquestionably existent, non-negligent) dimension. The normative dimension of global civil society related to global governance gives an impetus to normatively conceived/projected (democratic) political governance on a global scale.

There are open questions of comparisons between the classical paradigm "civil society-legal state" and the modified one of "global civil society-global democratic order". Comparison is necessary concerning the horizontal and vertical dimensions of national civil society and global civil society, as well as concerning descriptive and normative connotations of both above mentioned dimensions.

For example, civil society manifestations on the national level, or even transnational, have usually been centred on some particular issue. On the other hand, horizontal lines of global civil society's global "networking" have been multi-issued, pluralist, open and destined to combine a plurality of issues. Speaking about this, Keane states:

"The pluralist ideal of a global civil society openly challenges previous big ideas, all of which were held together by monistic presumptions of one sort or another. The whole image of a global civil society finds monism distasteful. To speak of a global civil society in empirical terms is to emphasize the fact that most people's lives today dangle on ten thousands different global strings."[23]

Global civil society has obviously been deteritorialized, pluralist, centred around many issues and even centred around some particular issues while it affects people on a global scale.

The questions of democratic potential of political order on a global scale, of the relation between globalization and democracy, of the possibility for identification of the citizens globally, i.e. the question of legitimizing the capacity of "the people" on a global level, have all been opened.

Sophia Nasstrom analyzes the relation between globalization and democracy and critically remarks that the concept of a cosmopolitan democracy (Held, Habermas) has a tendency to overshadow the gap in the concept of democracy, more precisely, this cosmopolitan democracy should strive to solve the problem of legitimacy with the help of globalization instead of insisting only on the problematic nature of current globalization (because of generating new forms of power asymmetries). This gap is inherent in the concept of democracy, in the sense that

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

93

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

"… democracy always falls back upon a community of citizens who are collectively self-gover-
ning. It requires a 'people'. Without a clear notion of political community, of who the citizens
are, democracy would be inconceivable. It would not be able to fulfil its promise. Considering
this, it is something of a paradox that boundaries of democracy cannot themselves be democrati-
cally legitimated. While 'the people' constitutes the only legitimate source of political authority,
it cannot lend itself the legitimacy it needs to qualify as such. It cannot provide for its own
legitimacy. We have a gap at the heart of democracy in the sense that 'the people' – in order to
constitute the legitimate source of political authority – would have to be prior to itself."[24]

"The gap at the heart of democracy" found its solution at the time of the French
revolution in the concept of nation, that popular sovereignty was framed by
the nation. Namely, "… the appeal to the nation, a pre-political understanding
of the people, provided the means needed to close this gap."[25] As the nation
was the people prior to the foundation of democracy (was the indirect source
of political authority) without possibility to be theoretically or normatively
legitimated (as the right to national self determination) inside of democratic
theory, it has to be considered as a historical given or as an axiom.

"The justification of the people is an impossible but nonetheless necessary feature of democra-
cy. For although the foundation of democracy is a virtual pact – a fiction of the contractualist
tradition – this fiction founds a *real* community. The truth is that without this fiction we would
not be able to distinguish legitimate force from unjustified violence."[26]

However, in the context of globalization an issue of popular sovereignty has
to be reconsidered, because "the marriage of democracy and the nation-state
is under pressure", and there is the need "to rethink the modern notion of
political community".

Nasstrom thinks that the above mentioned gap can be bridged in new contem-
porary circumstances with the concept of globalization, but not in a sense that
globalization can be treated as the pre-political state of affairs, from which the
political community can be constructed and gain legitimacy.

"The problem facing modern political thought is not globalization. It lies rather in the difficulty
of providing a viable response to globalization."[27]

According to this author, there is no direct switch from nation state democracy
towards cosmopolitan democracy. The mediating force is globalization:

"With this in mind, I suggest that we reconsider the role of globalization. Globalization should
no longer be thought of as a problem for modern democratic theory. Rather, the opposite is true.
Globalization *resolves* the problem. In the absence of a democratic resolution to the question
of political community, globalization steps in and brings democracy from here to there, from
the nation-state to the cosmopolitan democracy. It endangers the transformation that democracy
cannot bring forth on its own. In this respect, globalization is not only the functional equivalent
to the nation, but the appeal to globalization in fact picks up where the appeal to nation leaves
off. It takes on a role hitherto assigned to the nation. What happens in between here and there,
in the process of de-nationalization, is nothing but a change in the burden of justification. In
the formative moment of cosmopolitan democracy globalization offers what the nation can no
longer provide: the means needed to close the gap at the foundation of democracy."[28]

23
Ibid.

24
S. Nasstrom , What Globalization Overshad-
ows, *Political Theory*, 2003, p. 808.

25
Ibid., p. 809.

26
Ibid., p. 819.

27
See: ibid., p. 815.

28
Ibid., p. 826.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

94

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

The author also speaks about problematic spots in this analogy between nation and globalization and says that it has to be nuanced in at least two respects:

"To begin with, it should be noted that while globalization and nation both close the gap in the concept of democracy, this closure serves different purposes."

The nation has served for solving the problem of popular sovereignty and its proper interpretation either as a direct or a representative democracy and political status of the people.

"Unlike the nation, however, globalization is not a vision of the people. It is not imagined as pre-political community, a constituent power that is supposed to bestow legitimacy upon the state. Globalization is rather imagined as that which *questions* community… The difference is, I think, that while the nation fills the gap in the concept of democracy, globalization is more of 'a prophecy in quest for self-fulfilment'. Globalization is not a substantial concept – a concept that is supposed to give practical and stable solutions to the underlying problems of popular sovereignty – but a means in search for a new solution. It is an alternative device used by cosmopolitans to bring political community from one place to another. As such, it does not provide any significant guidance on the future status of political community."[29]

The point is that globalization apparently steps in to bridge the gap, not only between non-democracy and democracy but also between two different democratic systems.

The fiction of democratic order, the normative concept of cosmopolitan democracy serves in the context of globalization to differentiate legitimate from illegitimate rule and to establish more of "here and there" seeds of the deterritorialized fiction of cosmopolitan democracy.

"The concern is not how to make all persons within a given political community part of the democratic process. The concern is rather what should count as the relevant political community."[30]

The author concludes:

"Could it be that the response to globalization lies not in a cosmopolitan political community, nor in an affirmation of the already existing nation-state, but in a de-territorialized understanding of legitimacy."[31]

To paraphrase Nasstrom, "Here and There" seeds of a deterritoralized fiction of the cosmopolitan democracy have been followed by deterritoralized, particular "here and theres" of social initiatives and associations, (global) social movements aiming at solving the global problems – either some global problems on a global scale, either particular problems which affect everybody, or global problems on some particular scale. All mentioned above represent the phenomena of the particular and cumulative processes of its establishment. All those processes of global civil society development presuppose social actors, among which anti-globalization movements play an extraordinary role.

"Here and There" seeds of a deterritorialized fiction of cosmopolitan democracy, together with the "here and there" of social initiatives and associations, i.e. global civil society, have together been building the ideal-typical paradigm of a different world, a different globalization, as well as a different world view of globalization. The neoliberal world view of globalization and counter-neoliberal world view of globalization have been counter-opposed.

The neoliberal paradigm of globalization has been focused on centers of power and represents the so-called "elite globalization" and "worldview of empire". In contrast to this, the proposed paradigm "global civil society – democratic world governance" has been focused on the mutually interconnected devel-

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

95

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

opment of both global civil society and more and more democratic forms of global multi-level governance.

In a similar sense, Korten, Perlas, and Shiva[32] speak about the worldview of community versus the worldview of empire. According to them, in the worldview of empire the world is an inherently hostile and competitive place. In the world of empire, the only choice life offers is to be a winner or be a loser, rule or be ruled. This worldview gives rise to authoritarian impulse. Concentration and centralization of power and wealth are essential organizing principles of "elite globalization". In contrast to that, in the worldview of community, the world is a place of creative opportunity best realized through cooperation and the equitable sharing of power and control of resources. This worldview gives rise to the democratic impulse, and is related to both the development of civil society and democratic governance on a global scale. The equitable distribution and decentralization of power and wealth are essential organizing principles of proposed global democratic and just political global governance. Global civil society has been provoked and moved forward with the same principles in its striving towards a more just world and fighting against "elite globalization".

References

Arato, A. 1989. *Civil Society, Constitution, Legitimacy*, Lanham–Boulder–New York–Oxford: Rowman&Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Bachmuller, C. F. 1999. Civil Society and Democracy Reconsidered, in Podunavac, M. & Ćuk, N. (ed.) *Civil Society in the Countries in Transition*, Subotica: Open University Subotica, pp. 21–44.

Cohen, J. and Arato, A. 1992. *Civil Society and Political Theory*, Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Comaroff, J. L. and Comaroff, J. 1993. *Civil Society and the Critical Imagination in Africa: Critical perspectives*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diamond, L. 1994. Rethinking Civil Society: Toward Democratic Consolidation, *Journal of Democracy*, July, Vol. 5, No. 3.

Diamond, L. 1997. Civil Society and Democratic Development: Why the Public Matters?, University of Iowa Lecture series.

Della Porta, D. 2008. The Emergence of European Movements? Civil Society and the EU, *European Journal of Law* (EJL), Vol. 1, No. 3.

Gellner, E. 1994. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and Its Rivals*, London and New York: Penguin Books.

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. 2001. *Empire*, London: Harvard University Press.

Held, D. 1990. *Modeli demokracije*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Heller, A. 1982. *Everyday Life, Rationality of Reason, Rationality of Intellect*, manuscript.

Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory Ed. 2002, (*R)evolution and Order*, Belgrade.

29
Ibid., p. 827.

30
Ibid.

31
Ibid., p. 829.

32
See: D. Korten, N. Perlas and V. Shiva, Global Civil Society – The Path Ahead (discussion paper), http://www.pcdf.org/civilsociety/default.htm, September 20th, 2008.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

96

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

Keane, J. (ed.) 1998. *Civil Society and the State*, London: The University of Westminster Press.

Keane, J. 1998. *Civil Society – Old Images, New Perspectives*, London: Polity Press.

Keane, J. 2003. *Global Civil Society?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Korten, D., Perlas, N., and Shiva, V. 2008. Global Civil Society – The Path Ahead (discussion paper), http://www.pcdf.org/civilsociety/default.htm, September 20th, 2008.

Lewis, D. 2001. *Civil Society in Non-Western Contexts: Reflections on the "Usefulness" of a Concept* (manuscript).

Nasstrom, S. 2003. What Globalization overshadows, *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No. 6, December 2003.

Pavlović, V. (ed.) 1996. *Potisnuto civilno društvo* (*Suppressed Civil Society*), Beograd: EKOcentar.

Perez-Diaz, V. M. 1998. *The Return of Civil Society*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Podunavac, M. & Ćuk, N. (ed.) 1999. *Civil Society in the Countries in Transition*, Subotica: Open University Subotica.

Putnam, R. D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Raymond, M. 2002. *Finding the Centre? Mapping the Anti-Corporate Globalization Movement*, www.utoronto.ca/cis/Mapping.doc.

Salamon, L. and Anheier, H. 1997. The Civil Society Sector, *Society,* No. 34.

Shills, E. 2001. The Virtue of Civil Society, *Government and Oppositions*, No. 26.

Van Rooy, A. 1998. *Civil Society and the Aid Industry*, London: Earthscan.

Vujadinović, D., Veljak, L., Goati, V., Pavićević, V. (eds.) 2003. *Between Authoritarianism and Democracy*: *Serbia, Montenegro, Croatia – Institutional Framework*, Belgrade: CEDET.

Vujadinović, D., Veljak, L., Goati, V., Pavićević, V. (eds.) 2005. *Between Authoritarianism and Democracy*: *Serbia, Montenegro, Croatia – Civil Society and Political Culture*, Belgrade: CEDET.

Dragica Vujadinović

Globalno civilno društvo kao koncept i praksa u procesima globalizacije

Sažetak

Najnovije rasprave o civilnom društvu razmatrale su procese globalizacije čime je proširen teorijski diskurs kako bi se obuhvatio pojam globalnoga civilnog društva.

Pojam i praksa civilnog društva globalizirali su se na način koji odražava empirijske procese međupovezivanja društava i oblikovanja svjetskog društva. Iz normativno mobilizirajuće perspektive, aktivisti i teoretičari civilnoga društva ističu potrebu za obranom svjetskog društva od globalne prijetnje nuklearnim ratom, ekoloških katastrofa, zločina i nasilja, dominacije svjetskih sila nad sudbinom pojedinih zemalja i društava, tj. potrebu da se ono suprotstavi tendenciji »politike moći« na svjetskoj razini i da obrani autonomiju (svjetskog) društva kao onoga koje je primarno uskladivo s ekspanzijom politika koje su zasnovane na vladavini zakona diljem svijeta, a neuskladivo s politikom sile, državnih razloga i dominacijom svjetskih središta moći.

Procesi globalizacije rezultiraju sukobljavanjem i/ili asimilativnim prelaženjem civilizacija i kultura, kao i kontroverznim tendencijama: s jedne strane, pokušaja uvođenja međunarodnih

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

97

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

političkih institucija i usvajanja međunarodnih konvencija za zaštitu ljudskih prava, za zaštitu demokratskih vrijednosti, za borbu protiv terorizma i segregacije prema različitim osnovama, vodeći time prema globalnoj standardizaciji kulture ljudskih prava i demokratskog političkog i pravnog poretka, a s druge strane, rastom ksenofobije, partikularizacije i etnonacionalizma, građanskih ratova, ekoloških prijetnji, globalnog terorizma, prijetnjom problema gladi, nuklearnog rata, novim bolestima itd.

Suvremena pobjeda liberalnih i demokratskih vrijednosti pozitivni je doseg, no praćen osporavanim pitanjem suvereniteta, propadanjem urbanog, rasizmom, etničkim čišćenjem, ksenofobijom, neuspjelim političkim legitimacijama (na Zapadu), a na globalnoj razini praćen je: globalnom nepravdom, siromaštvom, ekološkim opasnostima, masovnim i smrtonosnim bolestima, ugnjetavanjem manjinskih skupina, nezaustavljivim rastom stanovništva, velikim nesrazmjerima političke i ekonomske moći, terorizmom na globalnoj razini, prijetnjom nuklearnom katastrofom itd.

Globalno civilno društvo ima tri dimenzije: 1.) empirijski fenomen globaliziranih društvenih relacija, međupovezanosti, 2.) mobiliziranje, formativnu silu projekta/vizije i 3.) društvene čimbenike (pokrete) na globalnoj/transnacionalnoj razini.

Antiglobalizacijski pokret je pokušaj djelovanja nasuprot uočenim negativnim aspektima tekućih procesa globalizacije. Iako pristaše tog pokreta često djeluju uigrano, sam je pokret heterogen i obuhvaća raznolika, povremeno suprotstavljena, shvaćanja tog procesa, alternativna viđenja, strategije i taktike. Prema tome, iznijansirani pojmovi obuhvaćaju antikapitalističku/ antikorporativnu alternativnu globalizaciju. Njegovi sudionici mogu koristiti pozitivne izraze poput 'globalna pravda' ili 'pokret za poštenu trgovinu'; ili 'pokret za Globalnu Pravednost i Solidarnost'; ili 'Pokret svih Pokreta'; ili jednostavno 'Pokret'; ili 'antikorporativni kapitalistički pokret'.

Općenito govoreći, antiglobalizacijski pokret kao takav nije u velikoj mjeri suprotnost globalizaciji nego je oporba određenom načinu na koji se ona odvija – kao što je to neoliberalni proces globalizacije. U tom smislu, mnogi predstavnici Pokreta više vole da ih se naziva altermondijalizmom.

Ključne riječi

civilno društvo, globalno civilno društvo, globalizacijski procesi, antiglobalizacijski pokret

Dragica Vujadinović

Globale Zivilgesellschaft als Konzept und Praxis
in Globalisierungsprozessen

Zusammenfassung

Die jüngsten Diskussionen zur Zivilgesellschaft greifen das Thema des Globalisierungsprozesses auf und erweitern solchermaßen den theoretischen Diskurs, um den Begriff der globalen Zivilgesellschaft umfassend zu untersuchen.

Der Begriff und die Praxis der Zivilgesellschaft sind insofern global geworden, als sie die empirischen Prozesse im Beziehungsgeflecht zwischen den Gesellschaften und die Ausbildung der globalen Zivilgesellschaft widerspiegeln. Aus normativ mobilisierender Perspektive betonen Aktivisten und Theoretiker der Zivilgesellschaft, dass die Weltgesellschaft vor der globalen Gefahr eines Atomkriegs, vor Umweltkatastrophen, Verbrechen und Gewalt sowie vor der Domination der Weltmächte gegenüber dem Schicksal bestimmter Länder und ihrer Gesellschaften verteidigt werden müsse, d.h., die Weltgesellschaft müsse sich auf globaler Ebene der Tendenz der „Machtpolitik" widersetzen und die Autonomie der (globalen) Gesellschaft verteidigen; diese sei primär vereinbar mit einer Ausweitung von auf Rechtsherrschaft beruhenden Politiken, jedoch unvereinbar mit einer Politik der Gewalt, der Staatsräson und der Domination internationaler Machtzentren.

Die Folgen der Globalisierungsprozesse sind Konfrontationen und/oder assimilierende Verschmelzungen von Zivilisationen und Kulturen sowie kontroverse Tendenzen: Einerseits versucht man, internationale politische Einrichtungen zu gründen und international gültige Abkommen zu schließen, die den Schutz von Menschenrechten und demokratischen Errungenschaften zum Gegenstand haben, die den Kampf gegen den Terrorismus und verschiedene Formen der Segregation unterstützen sollen und somit das Ziel verfolgen, eine Kultur der Menschenrechte sowie der demokratischen politischen und Rechtsordnung zum global verbindlichen Standardprogramm zu machen; andererseits jedoch wachsen Fremdenhass, Partikularisierung und

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

98

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

Ethnonationalismus, wüten Bürgerkriege, drohen Umweltkatastrophen, globaler Terrorismus, weltweite Hungersnot, Krankheiten und Seuchen, droht die Gefahr eines Atomkriegs usw.

Der zeitgenössische Siegeszug liberaler und demokratischer Werte ist eine positive Errungenschaft, deren Tragweite jedoch angezweifelt und geschmälert wird hinsichtlich der Frage ihrer Souveränität und angesichts des Verfalls urbaner Lebeskultur, angesichts von Rassismus, ethnischer Säuberung, Fremdenhass, gescheiterten politischen Legitimierungen (im Westen); auf globaler Ebene wiederum ist diese Errungenschaft begleitet von globaler Ungerechtigkeit, Armut, Umweltgefahren, Epidemien und tödlichen Seuchen, der Unterdrückung von Minderheiten, unaufhörlichem Bevölkerungszuwachs, großen Missverhältnissen zwischen politischer und wirtschaftlicher Macht, globalem Terrorismus, der Gefahr eines Atomkriegs usw.

Für die globale Zivilgesellschaft sind drei Dimensionen kennzeichnend: 1) das empirische Phänomen globaler gesellschaftlicher Verhältnisse – Interrelationen, 2) die Mobilmachung, Gestaltung von Projekten/Visionen und 3) gesellschaftliche Faktoren (Bewegungen) auf globaler/transnationaler Ebene.

Die Antiglobalisierungsbewegung ist ein Versuch, wahrgenommenen negativen Aspekten aktueller Globalisierungsprozesse entgegenzuwirken. Trotz des Anscheins, dass die Anhänger dieser Bewegung meist gut aufeinander eingespielt sind, ist der Antiglobalismus eine heterogene Bewegung und umfasst unterschiedliche, mitunter auch gegensätzliche Auffassungen, alternative Sichtweisen, Strategien und Taktiken. Ihre Vertreter führen demnach Begriffe wie alternative, antikapitalistische/antikorporative bzw. antikorporative kapitalistische Globalisierung ins Feld, ebenso aber positive Termini wie ‚globales Recht’ oder ‚Bewegung für fairen Handel’, ‚Bewegung für globale Gerechtigkeit und Solidarität’, ‚Bewegung aller Bewegungen’ oder einfach ‚Bewegung’.

Allgemein formuliert, ist die Antiglobalisierungsbewegung als solche keine umfassende Gegenposition zur Globalisierung, sondern eine Opposition, die bestimmte Modi des Globalisierungsablaufs bekämpft – so etwa den neoliberalen Globalisierungsprozess. Insofern bevorzugen viele Vertreter der Bewegung den Begriff Altermondialismus.

Schlüsselwörter

Zivilgesellschaft, globale Zivilgesellschaft, Globalisierungsprozesse, Antiglobalisierungsbewegung

Dragica Vujadinović

**La société civile mondiale comme concept et pratique
dans les processus de mondialisation**

Résumé

De récents débats ont reconsidéré les processus de mondialisation, élargissant le discours théorique afin d’étendre la notion de société civile mondiale.

La notion et la pratique de société civile ont été mondialisées de façon à refléter les processus empiriques d’inter-connexion des sociétés et de formation d’une société mondiale. D’un point de vue normatif et mobilisateur, les militants et les théoriciens de la société civile soulignent le besoin de défendre la société mondiale de la menace d’une guerre nucléaire mondiale, des catastrophes écologiques, du crime et de la violence, puis de la domination des grands pouvoirs sur le sort de certains pays et sociétés, c’est-à-dire le besoin de s’opposer à une « politique du pouvoir » à l’échelle mondiale et de défendre l’autonomie d’une société (mondiale) compatible avec l’expansion des politiques fondées sur le règne de la loi mais incompatible avec des politiques de la force, des raisons d’État et de domination des pôles de pouvoir.

Les processus de mondialisation mènent à la confrontation et/ou au métissage assimilateur de civilisations et de cultures, ainsi qu’à des tendances controversées : d’une part, à des tentatives d’instauration d’institutions politiques internationales et d’adoption des conventions internationales en matière de droits de l’homme, de protection des valeurs démocratiques, de lutte contre le terrorisme et de différentes formes de ségrégation, avançant vers une standardisation mondiale de la culture des droits de l’homme et de l’ordre politique et juridique démocratique ; d’autre part, à la hausse de la xénophobie, des particularismes, de l’ethnonationalisme, des guerres civiles, des menaces écologiques, du terrorisme à l’échelle mondiale, de la menace de la famine, de la menace nucléaire, de nouvelles maladies etc.

La victoire contemporaine des valeurs libérales et démocratiques est un aboutissement positif, mais elle s’accompagne de la question controversée de souveraineté, de délabrement urbain, de racisme, de nettoyage ethnique, de xénophobie, de défaut de légitimité politique (à l’Occident).

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
47 (1/2009) pp. (79–99)

99

D. Vujadinović, Global Civil Society as
Concept and Practice in the Processes …

À l'échelle mondiale, cet aboutissement s'accompagne d'une injustice globale, de pauvreté, de dangers écologiques, d'épidémies mortelles, d'oppression des minorités, d'une croissance non maîtrisée de la population, de déséquilibre de pouvoir politique et économique, de terrorisme à l'échelle mondiale, de la menace nucléaire etc.

La société civile mondiale comporte trois dimensions : 1.) phénomène empirique de relations sociales et d'interconnexions ; 2.) mobilisation, une force structurante du projet/vision ; 3.) acteurs sociaux (mouvements) au niveau mondial/transnational.

L'anti-mondialisation est un mouvement qui tente d'agir à l'encontre des aspects négatifs de la mondialisation. Même si les adeptes de ce mouvement agissent souvent de concert, le mouvement en soi est hétérogène et englobe des visions, des stratégies et des tactiques diverses et parfois opposées. Ainsi, des termes plus nuancés impliquent une mondialisation alternative, anti-capitaliste/anti-corporatiste. Ses acteurs peuvent utiliser des expressions positives telles que la 'justice mondiale', le 'mouvement pour un commerce équitable', le 'mouvement pour la Justice et la Solidarité Mondiale', le 'Mouvement des Mouvements', ou simplement 'Le mouvement', ou encore le 'mouvement anti-corporatiste capitaliste'.

De manière générale, le mouvement anti-mondialiste n'est pas une opposition à la mondialisation en soi mais à une certaine façon dont cette mondialisation se déroule, à savoir le processus de mondialisation néo-libéral. Dans ce sens, nombre de représentants du Mouvement préfèrent être appelés alter-mondialistes.

Mots-clés

société civile, société civile mondiale, processus de mondialisation, mouvement anti-mondialisation