

Journal of Black Studies

<http://jbs.sagepub.com>

Anti-Globalization Forces, the Politics of Resistance, and Africa: Promises and Perils

E. Osei Kwadwo Prempeh
Journal of Black Studies 2004; 34; 580
DOI: 10.1177/0021934703259074

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://jbs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/34/4/580>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Journal of Black Studies* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jbs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jbs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 10 articles hosted on the
SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://jbs.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/34/4/580>

ANTI-GLOBALIZATION FORCES, THE POLITICS OF RESISTANCE, AND AFRICA Promises and Perils

E. OSEI KWADWO PREMPEH

Carleton University

Globalization, the current restructuring and reshaping of the contemporary global economy, is a powerful transformative process that has acquired hegemonic status as a result of its operative logic and ideological connotation. However, the widening reach and uneven nature of globalization has provoked a counterhegemonic resistance and political counter movements that challenge its exclusionary practices and its silencing of the voices of the people. This article interrogates the grassroots counterhegemonic process of “globalization-from-below,” as captured in the work of Richard Falk, and questions the extent to which this process incorporates the marginalized voices in African civil society.

Keywords: globalization and Africa; Africa and anti-globalization forces

The question for us, therefore, is how to develop a counter-movement to protect all the rights of all people from global trends that threaten to destroy the very fabric of society in many countries. I believe that we need a new paradigm in which “substantive participation”—at local, national and international levels—is the primary goal, not an afterthought. It should integrate the values emerging from the human rights and other social movements that are developing worldwide. It should put back the human being as the subject of history.

—Pierre Sane (1993, p. 2294)

Beginning in the late 1980s and continuing into the new millennium, there has been a dramatic restructuring and reshaping of the

JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, Vol. 34 No. 4, March 2004 580-598

DOI: 10.1177/0021934703259074

© 2004 Sage Publications

580

contemporary global economic system. This restructuring of the contemporary global economy has been captured under the rubric of globalization. A hegemonic process in its own right, globalization has had economic, political, social, cultural, and technological effects and called into question the sustainability of the existing architecture of the contemporary world system. Globalization, thus understood, has become, to borrow Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson's (1996) words, "a fashionable concept in the social sciences, a core dictum in the prescriptions of management gurus, and a catch-phrase for journalists and politicians of every stripe" (p. 1).

This process of globalization is part of an emerging neoliberal hegemonic discourse informed by a strong reliance on the market and in accordance with the logic of capital. A powerful transformative process in its own right, this globalizing logic of the market and capital has acquired hegemonic status as a result of its operative logic and ideological connotation, as well as its widening reach of networks of social activity and power. As Petras and Veltmeyer (2001) point out, globalization

is a key word in not only the dominant theoretical and political discourse but also in everyday language. As both a description of widespread, epoch-defining developments and a prescription for action, it has achieved a virtual hegemony and so is presented with an air of inevitability that disarms the imagination and prevents thought of and action towards a systemic alternative—towards another, more just social and economic order. (p. 8)

However, the widening reach and uneven nature of globalization has provoked resistance and political countermovements aimed at challenging its exclusionary practices, its silencing of the voices of the people, and its undemocratic or even anti-democratic tendencies (Falk, 1999; Gill, 1995).

The aim of this article is to critically examine the discourses and practices of globalization with an emphasis on the counterhegemonic movement as articulated in the work of Richard Falk in his breakthrough study, *Predatory Globalization: A Critique*, published in 1999. Falk's characterization of a grassroots counterhegemonic response of "globalization-from-below" to the top-down

“globalization-from-above” is analyzed to ascertain its true revolutionary and progressive credentials especially as it relates to Africa. In this respect, a major concern of this article is to highlight the extent to which this process of globalization-from-below incorporates African voices, interests, and aspirations. The central argument is that although the political counterhegemonic and resistance movement is a key and much-needed response to the globalizing logic of the market and capital inherent in globalization (“the promise”), there are still unanswered questions about the involvement of marginalized voices in Africa and other parts of the Third World. Unless these questions are adequately addressed and channels opened up for effective participation by these marginalized voices as equal partners in this anti-systemic resistance, this process risks reinforcing and perpetuating the inequities inherent in the globalization-from-above discourse (“the perils”). At issue here, therefore, is the ability of the resistance movement to remain transparent and accountable and to ensure democratic participation of the voiceless in Africa.

The first part of the article briefly surveys the literature on globalization, highlighting the widening reach and highly contested nature of the phenomenon. This is followed by a detailed critique of “predatory globalization” as articulated by Richard Falk. The concluding section considers the ways in which the alternative counterhegemonic critique could itself reinforce the silence of the marginalized in Africa and how best to overcome this.

UNDERSTANDING GLOBALIZATION

Any serious attempt at understanding globalization comes up immediately against the issue of meaning. This is by no means a simple issue because the different dimensions of the processes of globalization have ensured that definitional imprecision and problems of synthesis confront the scholar or reader all at once. As Gary Teeple (2000) perceptively reminds us,

despite the rapidly growing body of literature on the topic of globalization and its implications, there is disagreement about how to con-

ceptualize what is happening. Although the term is widely used to characterize the profound changes unfolding in the world, the nature of these shifts and what they mean remain debated questions. (p. 9)

It is also a phenomenon that has generated a lot of controversy, attested to by this quote by David Held and Anthony McGrew (2000):

Few contemporary phenomena elicit such political and academic controversy as globalization. Some consider it the fundamental dynamic of our epoch, a process of change which is to be promoted, managed or resisted; by contrast, others consider it the great myth of our times, a notion which misrepresents and misconstrues the real forces which shape our lives. In the public sphere especially, the idea of globalization is creating a new political faultline around which politicians and political parties of all persuasions seek to mobilize public opinion. From the “globaphobia” of the radical right to the more adaptive strategies found in Third Way politics, globalization has become the rationale for diverse political projects. In the process, the idea of globalization has often become debased and confused. (p. ix)

To put it in context, what is most revealing is that even some critics accept that globalization, notwithstanding how one conceives or rationalizes it, is a reality (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999).

What then is globalization? To the extent that a core of common understanding and some consensus has emerged on the core of globalization, it can be gleaned from the work of different authors writing from different disciplinary backgrounds. Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, and Perraton (2000) define globalization as “a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions—assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact—generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power” (p. 55).

For Petras and Veltmeyer (2001), “‘globalization’ refers to the widening and deepening of the international flows of trade, capital,

technology and information within a single integrated market" (p. 11). Similarly, the point has been made that "globalization represents the shift of the main venue of capital accumulation from the national to the supranational or global level" (Teepie, 2000, p. 9). This view also finds cogent expression in Kenichi Ohmae (1995) when he adopts the position that "the basic fact of linkage to global flows is a—perhaps, the—central, distinguishing fact of our moment in history" (p. 15).

What these definitions seem to suggest is the long reach of the new globalizing logic of the market and capital. It is viewed as a process(es) that not only is reconstituting and restructuring national economies but is breaking down national borders and integrating the world economy into a single system. This integrative aspect of the process of globalization is captured in Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods's (1995) definition thus:

The term "globalization" is often invoked to describe the process of increasing interdependence and global enmeshment which occurs as money, people, images, values, and ideas flow ever more swiftly and smoothly across national boundaries. It is assumed to be a process driven by technological advance which will lead to a more and more homogenous and interconnected world. In the new globalised world economy, it is argued, states will cooperate more and international institutions will flourish. (pp. 447-448)

Yet, to suggest that globalization is a unidimensional process about the world economy is to miss out on its various facets. Indeed, the evidence suggests the contrary. Rather than a single process, globalization has come to be seen as a multifaceted and multidimensional phenomenon with wide-ranging effect in the political, economic, social, cultural, and technological spheres. It is a process (or processes) that is transforming and restructuring the nature of global, national, and local politics, economies, society, and cultures. This is the nub of Pippa Norris's (2000) claim that "'globalization' is understood as a process that erodes national boundaries, integrating national economies, cultures, technologies, and governance, producing complex relations of mutual interdependence" (p. 155). To buttress this point further, Richard Falk

(1997) refers to this transformation as “a new alignment of forces that is being crystallized by a constellation of market, technological, ideological and civilizational developments” (p. 125).

From this perspective, globalization raises key questions and draws attention to issues of economic and technological change, cultural and societal aspects of life, and the political. Recognizing the multidimensional aspects of globalization also allows us to move beyond the confines of economic reductionism and highlights the unprecedented effect of these processes brought under the rubric of globalization.

Perhaps, a template that reinforces the essential aspects of globalization is appropriate at this juncture. This is the core of Arie M. Kacowicz’s (1999) claim that globalization means many different things for different people. Kacowicz articulates such a template to summarize the key points in the existing literature on globalization thus:

- intensification of economic, political, social, and cultural relations across borders
- the historical period (or historical epoch) launched since the end of the Cold War
- the transformation of the world economy epitomized by the anarchy (literally defined) of the financial markets
- the triumph of U.S. values, through the combined agenda of neoliberalism in economics and political democracy
- an ideology and an orthodoxy about the logical and inevitable culmination of the powerful tendencies of the market at work
- a technological revolution, with social implications
- the inability of nation-states to cope with global problems that require global solutions, such as demography, ecology, human rights, and nuclear proliferation (p. 529)

The forces of change unleashed by this restructuring of the contemporary global economy and the attendant economic, cultural, social, and political implications of the hegemonic discourse of globalization have generated widespread debate and disagreement. Advocates of globalization paint a rosy picture and are euphoric about its effects and contributions to global welfare. Critics, on the

other hand, are unimpressed and are quick to point to the debilitating effects, including the effect of globalization with a central focus on the inequalities it engenders and its disempowering consequences.

The orthodox supporters' view is that globalization is a positive process that generates growth and economic efficiency and universalizes the quest for development defined as modernity. As Kevin R. Cox (1997) explains it, this conservative observers' faith in the efficacy and efficiency of globalization is predicated on its ability to subject "workers and state to a new discipline, eliminating waste, reducing the power of the state, and so opening up new vistas of individual freedom and opportunity" (p. 2).

However, the critics are not impressed, seeing globalization as an exploitative phenomenon that sharpens inequality within and between states, increases poverty, and attacks the social welfare foundations of states. M. Cox (1998) refers to its defining elements as its "anarchic and competitive character" (p. 452). For Kevin Cox (1997), "the more dominant interpretation, however, has pointed to the adverse implications of these transformations for democracy, for the nation-state, and for equality" (p. 2). This is also the view reinforced in a collection of articles that the authors see as representing "a second wave of globalization studies." Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs (1996) explain the significance of their work in these terms:

These are characterized by a dissatisfaction with the current state of global play, both theoretical and practical. They reject the universalizing characteristics of much of the discussion about globalization. They are circumspect about its euphoric nature and question the problematics of its roots in particular traditions of thought and structures of power. (p. 1)

The adverse effects of globalization so outlined are what has provoked resistance and political countermovements aimed at challenging its exclusionary practices. The next section addresses the basis of this countermovement as elaborated on by Richard Falk (1999).

PREDATORY GLOBALIZATION CHALLENGED

As indicated in the previous section, globalization has engendered widespread adverse effects on social welfare, the environment, and human rights; has engendered inequalities and widened poverty within and between states; and has unleashed an attack on the welfare state. Indeed, a United Nations Development Program (UNDP) report confirms the widening gap between rich and poor states as well as between peoples in this new globalized economy (UNDP, 1999). Because these critiques serve as the basis for Richard Falk's challenge to globalization, it is worthwhile providing the reader with a detailed sampling of this position.

In this respect, a growing body of critical work has sought to establish and illuminate the dangers associated with the processes of globalization. Nana K. Poku's (2000) discourse on the inequalities associated with globalization is illustrative of the critiques of globalization. In clear terms, he presents an analysis that exposes the limits of globalization:

While there is some question as to whether globalization represents the end, or the fulfillment, of a Eurocentric modernization, there is little question about its differential impact on people and societies across the globe. Yet, in the literature, the euphoria over the process has served to disguise the very real social and economic inequalities that are not merely leftovers from the past, but are products of the new developments. Most obviously, poverty, mass unemployment and inequality have grown alongside advancements in technological developments, rapid expansion of trade, investments and commerce. (p. 39)

Continuing on this trend of establishing the limits of globalization through the use of a critical lens, the critics confront the issue of inequalities in unequivocal terms. Thus, Kofman and Youngs (1996) demonstrate that "far from offering positive possibilities to all, globalization signals new forms of oppression for many . . . that globalization represents changes in the operation of global capitalism which, if anything, has expanded its potential for producing inequalities" (p. 4). The subtleties of these analyses are forcefully reinforced and emphasized by what Jan Aart Scholte (1996) refers

to as the “worrying circumstances” of globalization as a prelude to articulating a critical counterresponse:

To date, globalization has often perpetuated poverty, widened material inequalities, increased ecological degradation, sustained militarism, fragmented communities, marginalized subordinated groups, fed intolerance and deepened crises of democracy Across most of the world, pressures of global capitalism have brought a major deterioration in working conditions and social protection. In spite of the impressive rise of transnational feminism, women have borne by far the greater brunt of global restructuring, and global governance has generally been little less patriarchal than sovereign statehood Not only do democratic institutions continue to be quite precarious in many countries, but few mechanisms are in place to ensure participation, representativeness, debate, transparency, constitutionality and accountability. (p. 53)

By exposing the limits of the discourses and processes of globalization, critics are able to set the stage for articulating a new political response. These accounts of the inequalities engendered by globalization are also vital in providing a springboard for Richard Falk’s challenge. According to Falk (1999), “it is the cumulative adverse effects of these moves on human well-being that accounts for the title [of his book] *Predatory Globalization*” (p. 2). In this way, Falk underlies the effect of analyzing globalization in terms of inequality and power.

Falk’s central argument about contesting globalization is cast in terms beyond the state. From his perspective, the exclusionary practices of the process of globalization-from-above need to be located in the grassroots response of globalization-from-below. Here is a sampling of Falk’s (1999) main ideas:

The historical unfolding of economic globalization in recent decades has been accompanied by the ascendancy of a group of ideas associated with the world picture of “neo-liberalism.” This ideological outlook is often somewhat coyly referred to as “the Washington Consensus,” which accurately highlights the “made in the USA” packaging of the neo-liberal scheme of things. This neo-liberal scheme points in the general direction of autonomous markets and facilitative states. (p. 1)

Furthermore, Falk (1999) is at pains to point out that

these ideological and operational aspects of globalization are associated with the way in which transnational market forces dominate the policy scene, including the significant co-optation of state power. This pattern of development is identified here as “globalization-from-above,” a set of forces and legitimating ideas that is in many respects located beyond the effective reach of territorial authority and that has enlisted most governments as tacit partners. (p. 130)

Elsewhere, Falk (1999) begins to lay out the framework for his critique by pointing out thus:

But globalization, so conceived, has generated criticism and resistance, both of a local, grass-roots variety, based on the concreteness of the specifics of time and place—for example, the siting of a dam or a nuclear power plant or the destruction of a forest—and on a transnational basis, involving the linking of knowledge and political action in hundreds of civil initiatives. It is this latter aggregate of phenomena that is described here under the rubric of “globalization-from-below.” (p. 130)

In this way, Falk (1999) reinforces the dynamics of an action-reaction phenomenon by “drawing a basic dividing line between global market forces identified as ‘globalization-from-above’ and a set of oppositional responses in the third system of social activism that is identified as ‘globalization-from-below’” (p. 138).

Significantly, Falk locates this resistance to the adverse effects of the globalizing logic of the market and capital, what he refers to as globalization-from-above, as emanating from civil society. Thus, Falk’s (1999) objective is “to call positive attention to a series of countermoves to neo-liberalism, especially those whose source is situated within civil society” (p. 2). Falk’s goal is to link these countermoves to globalization-from-above at the local, national, and global levels into strong transnational pressures to ameliorate the adverse and detrimental costs of globalization. If fuzziness and incoherence surround the meaning and definition of globalization, clarity and coherence are what Falk (1999) provides the reader in terms of his take on the mission of this countermovement:

At the same time, the historic role of “globalization-from-below” is to challenge and transform the negative features of “globalization-from-above,” both by providing alternative ideological and political space to that currently occupied by market-oriented and statist outlooks and by offering resistance to the excesses and distortions that can be properly attributed to globalization in its current phase. That is, “globalization-from-below” is not dogmatically opposed to “globalization-from-above,” but addresses itself to the avoidance of adverse effects and to providing an overall counterweight to the essentially unchecked influence currently exerted by business and finance on the process of decision at the level of the state and beyond. (p. 139)

Given Falk’s (1999) characterization and understandings of predatory globalization, it is entirely possible for one to get the feeling that he rejects globalization completely. Yet, a careful read reveals his very sophisticated and nuanced approach to the subject with no suggestion that this globalizing logic can be reversed. Thus, we are reminded that “the evolving perspective of social forces associated with ‘globalization-from-below’ is that it remains possible and essential to promote the social agenda while retaining most of the benefits of ‘globalization-from-above’” (p. 140).

In more elaborate terms, Falk (1999) posits that

it is also important to acknowledge the limited undertaking of “globalization-from-below.” It is not able to challenge globalization as such, only to alter the guiding ideas that are shaping its enactment. Globalization is too widely accepted and embedded to be reversible in its essential integrative impact. Recent global trends establish the unchallengeable dominance of markets and their integration. (p. 141)

For Falk (1999), these developments represent an important epoch in the unfolding of the social forces associated with a new politics of resistance and the definition of an effective ideological counterpoint to globalization. However, “the coherent ideological identity of these counter-moves to ‘globalization-from-above’ is in the process of formation and remains difficult to label” (p. 2).

In the final analysis, Falk’s (1999) contribution lies in his effort to rescue globalization from its predatory tendencies that, if left

unchecked, would lead to its unraveling. Hence, one detects that his strategy is to organize effective counterresistance as a way to pressure “those representing ‘globalization-from-above’ to seek accommodation” (p. 135). The questions worth exploring, especially given Falk’s emphasis on the local, national, and global in the politics of resistance, are the implications of his countermovement for Africa. This issue informs the debate in the last section of the article.

AFRICA IN THE NEW POLITICS OF RESISTANCE

Although not explicitly stated by Falk, his position would seem to be consistent with critical theory and its project of emancipation. The challenge or counterweight project of globalization-from-below is one that represents a site of contestation of globalization and that seeks to empower civil society through the articulation of a new politics of resistance and emancipation. The emerging global movement that Falk outlines serves as the basis for forging new transnational alliances that incorporates groups hitherto marginalized by the project of globalization. However, Falk’s contribution is severely limited by the fact that he does not examine in greater detail how or the extent to which the emerging network involved in the new politics of resistance and emancipation is itself representative of all voices. In specific terms, how and to what extent is the constellation of social forces representing globalization-from-below representative of marginalized African voices? How does Falk’s counterproject reflect the emancipatory potential of global civil society?

On these questions Falk is silent except for some brief moments in *Predatory Globalization*. Commenting on the nature of the oppositional tendencies to globalization, Falk (1999) asserts that

one major uncertainty is whether those supporting the strengthening of global civil society can gain sufficient influence to qualify as a genuine ‘counter-project,’ rather than merely a societal tendency, confined to the margins of policy in the North and of little relevance to the South. (p. 13)

To be fair to Falk, he states clearly in the introduction that his “objective is rather to call positive attention to a series of countermoves to neo-liberalism, especially those whose source is situated within civil society” (p. 2). Yet, any critical discourse attempt to theorize the emerging global civil society alternative to globalization without addressing the standard questions about representation of voices within that movement is bound to be partial and incomplete, at best.

These questions are crucially important given the disproportionate adverse effect as well as effects of globalization on the Third World in general and Africa in particular. In its *Human Development Report 1999*, the UNDP (1999) provides evidence to show that “people living in the highest-income countries had 86% of world GDP—the bottom fifth just 1% The world’s 200 richest people more than doubled their net worth in the four years to 1998, to more than \$1 trillion. The assets of the top three billionaires are more than the combined GNP of all least developed countries and their 600 million people” (p. 3).

In the case of Africa, Rok Ajulu (2001) provides further insights into the effect of globalization on the continent in terms of its “lack of capacity and, possibly, the will to influence the global market” (p. 27) in very stark terms:

Incorporated into the global economy towards the end of the 19th century as a junior partner, and predominantly as a producer of primary products, Africa was largely destined to be a marginal player in the world market Already weakened by the structural adjustment programs (SAPs), it was inevitable that globalization should intensify the marginalization of African economies. It is not surprising, therefore, that African countries are now among the weakest members of the international trading system. As globalization has proceeded, Africa has become further marginalized from the mainstream of the global economic activity Not only has its economic growth lagged behind other economies, its share of global flows of foreign investments has fallen sharply, not to mention the fact that many economies on the continent remain heavily indebted. Yet economies in sub-Saharan Africa are deeply integrated into world trade even if predominantly still as exporters of primary products Africa not only suffers from economic relega-

tion, it is further marginalized from institutions of global governance. (pp. 28-30)

The result of this marginalization is reinforced in Nana K. Poku's (2000) perceptive observation that

it is possible to identify at least two ways in which the process of globalization has contributed to the continent's predicament. First, the process of globalization has impacted adversely on sovereign statehood on the continent, and as a result, states on the continent are weak, fragmented and unrepresentative. Second, because globalization causes inequality, the process is further marginalizing an already marginal continent. (p. 40)

And, Jay Mazur (2000), the president of the Union of Needle-trades, Industrial, and Textile Employees (UNITE) and chair of the AFL-CIO International Affairs Committee in the United States, tellingly says the following:

Increased trade has not resulted in anything near uniform growth. Only 33 countries managed to sustain 3 per cent annual GDP growth on a per capita basis between 1980 and 1996; in 59 countries, per capita GDP declined. Eighty countries have lower per capita incomes today than they did a decade or more ago. And contrary to conventional wisdom, those left behind are often the most integrated into global trade. For example, sub-Saharan Africa has a higher export-to-GDP ratio than Latin America, but its exports are mainly primary commodities, leaving those nations vulnerable to the volatility of those markets . . . Millions of workers are losing out in a global economy that disrupts traditional economies and weakens the ability of their governments to assist them. They are left to fend for themselves within failed states against destitution, famine, and plagues. They are forced to migrate, offer their labor at wages below subsistence, sacrifice their children, and cash in their natural environments and often their personal health—all in a desperate struggle to survive. (pp. 81-82)

Because the politics of emancipation and empowerment that forms the basis of the politics of resistance is predicated on the detrimental effect of globalization on the state and its engendering of deepened inequalities, it is crucially important that we come to

terms with the role African civil society, however conceived, is represented in the global network.

As can be gleaned from the critical discourse of empowerment and emancipation, the new global social forces aligned to articulate a politics of resistance represent a new agenda that purports to represent the new voices, interests, and needs of those excluded and marginalized by the project of globalization. Viewed from this vantage point, the predatory nature of globalization has opened up new possibilities for challenge to the status quo. To be genuinely transformative, however, as opposed to another Northern-initiated discourse and project, this new constellation will have to open up space for new voices from Africa for empowerment and for the politics of resistance.

This is not trivial if one considers Scholte's (1996) point that "rural Africa hardly has a voice in global intergovernmental agencies, for example, and global civil society, inasmuch as one has developed, has tended so far to be drawn disproportionately from urban, Northern, white, (computer) literate, propertied classes" (p. 54). This is also a point made poignantly by Mary Kaldor (2000) in her assessment of the implications of the "Battle in Seattle" between November 30 and December 3, 1999: "Furthermore, the NGOs that were present at Seattle were predominantly white. Third World civil society was underrepresented; the new methods of mobilization do not, as yet, reach out to the poorest people. Those who have access to electronic communications or can travel are inevitably part of the elite" (p. 111).

Notwithstanding the promise of the critical discourse of globalization-from-below and the role of a global civil society in its formative stage, care must be taken not to overemphasize its truly critical and revolutionary credentials. If it fails to incorporate African and other marginalized voices, this emerging global civil society in opposition to globalization risks reinforcing the same dynamics of disempowerment, inequality, and despair it is at the forefront of fighting. At the core, this new counterhegemonic project needs to open up new possibilities for genuine, substantive democracy, the ability of African citizens to participate in the decision-making process. This would necessarily entail the participation and repre-

sentation of African and Third World voices, a necessary condition for an inclusive global civil society. Such commitment to substantive democracy would ensure greater receptiveness to local concerns as represented by marginalized voices in Africa.

The core of the argument here is for global civil society to realize the kind of substantive participation at the local, national, and international levels that Pierre Sane's earlier quote refers to. For this to happen, the global civil society in formation needs to take seriously the importance of building resistance to globalization from the local, grassroots level and link it to the national and transnational levels. An excessive focus on the global has the potential risk of ignoring African participation in the politics of resistance. More ominously, such a narrow focus on the global can be used as a new language and legitimacy for disempowering and marginalizing African political agency. On the other hand, legitimizing African voices in the new politics of resistance creates authentic autonomous spaces for Africans to define and articulate their own experiences, interests, aspirations, and realities in this era of globalization.

In other words, the transformative politics of resistance and emancipation can only serve as a new form of resistance to the status quo hegemonic project of globalization if it is a system built on the need to validate and engage marginalized voices in new modes of political participation. These African voices will be genuine and authentic to Africa and based on "the everyday experiences and consciousness of Africans themselves so that hegemonic thought and politics is more effectively 'de-colonized'" (Mohan, 1996, p. 300).

In other words, Falk's change agents, a global civil society that serves as the ideological counterweight and engages and scrutinizes the power of globalization-from-above, face some of the same dilemmas of disempowerment and marginalization of African voices. To fulfill its grand objectives, global civil society must be inclusive and serve as a site for emancipation and empowerment of all voices. This global civil society must also develop genuinely grassroots, transparent, representative, and participatory systems of decision making in developing ideological coherence for its programs of action. This is the way to express a genuine and legitimate

radical alternative politics of resistance to the prevailing disempowering globalized order. In other words, there is an urgent need to address the democratic deficit in global civil society. Failure to do so carries the potential risk of the global being defined so as to co-opt and redefine the local. Hence, the need exists to create space in the dominant discourse for Third World and African local voices, issues, and interests to be expressed and concretely articulated in the new politics of resistance championed by global civil society.

CONCLUSION

The widening reach of the processes of globalization and its inegalitarian tendencies has provoked a politics of resistance captured by Falk under the rubric of globalization-from-below. This grassroots resistance located in global civil society seeks to challenge the exclusionary practices of globalization-from-above and its tendency to silence the voices of the people most affected by this process. The article has argued that although this critical discourse of globalization-from-below holds much promise, it is important that we do not overemphasize its revolutionary and emancipatory credentials. This is because it has not yet demonstrated that it represents the voices, interests, and aspirations of marginalized and excluded groups in Africa. Unless the counterresistance movement incorporates African and other marginalized voices and becomes more inclusive, it risks reinforcing the dynamics of disempowerment, marginalization, exclusion, and inequality that inform the prevailing hegemonic order informed by the globalizing logic of markets and finance. This will call into question the legitimacy of the whole counterproject.

REFERENCES

- Ajulu, R. (2001). Thabo Mbeki's African renaissance in a globalising world economy: The struggle for the soul of the continent. *Review of African Political Economy*, 87, 27-42.
- Cox, K. R. (1997). Introduction: Globalization and its politics in question. In K. R. Cox (Ed.), *Spaces of globalization: Reasserting the power of the local* (pp. 1-18). New York and London: Guilford.

- Cox, M. (1998). Rebels without a cause? Radical theorists and the world system after the Cold War. *New Political Economy*, 3(3), 445-460.
- Falk, R. (1997). State of siege: Will globalization win out? *International Affairs*, 73(1), 123-136.
- Falk, R. (1999). *Predatory globalization: A critique*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Gill, S. (1995). Globalization, market civilization and disciplinary neoliberalism. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 24(3), 399-423.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2000). *The global transformation reader: An introduction to the globalization debate*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (2000). Rethinking globalization. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 1-45). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1996). *Globalization in question: The international economy and the possibilities of governance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Hurrell, A., & Woods, N. (1995). Globalization and inequality. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 24(3), 447-470.
- Kacowicz, A. M. (1999). Regionalization, globalization, and nationalism: Convergent, divergent or overlapping? *Alternatives*, 24(4), 527-555.
- Kaldor, M. (2000). "Civilising" globalization? The implications of the "Battle in Seattle." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 29(1), 105-114.
- Kofman, E., & Youngs, G. (1996). Introduction: Globalization—the second wave. In E. Kofman & G. Youngs (Eds.), *Globalization: Theory and practice* (pp. 1-8). London: Pinter.
- Mazur, J. (2000). Labor's new internationalism. *Foreign Affairs*, 79(1), 79-93.
- Mohan, G. (1996). Globalization and governance: The paradoxes of adjustment in sub-Saharan Africa. In E. Kofman & G. Youngs (Eds.), *Globalization: Theory and practice* (pp. 289-303). London: Pinter.
- Norris, P. (2000). Global governance and cosmopolitan citizens. In J. S. Nye Jr., & J. D. Donahue (Eds.), *Governance in a globalizing world* (pp. 155-177). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Ohmae, K. (1995). *The end of the nation-state: The rise of regional economies*. New York: Free Press.
- Petras, J., & Veltmeyer, H. (2001). *Globalization unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st century*. Halifax and London: Fernwood Publishing and Zed Books.
- Poku, N. A. (2000). Poverty, AIDS and the politics of response in Africa. *International Relations*, 15(3), 39-52.
- Sane, P. (1993, December 20). Human rights: An agenda for action. *West Africa*, 3978, p. 2294.
- Scholte, J. A. (1996). Beyond the buzzword: Toward a critical theory of globalization. In E. Kofman & G. Youngs (Eds.), *Globalization: Theory and practice* (pp. 43-57). London: Pinter.
- Tepple, G. (2000). What is globalization? In S. McBride & J. Wiseman (Eds.), *Globalization and its discontents* (pp. 9-23). New York: St. Martin's.
- United Nations Development Program. (1999). *Globalization with a human face: Human development report 1999*. New York: Oxford University Press.

E. Osei Kwadwo Prempeh received his Ph.D. in political science from Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada. He is an assistant professor of political science, sociology, and anthropology and is the chair of the African Studies Committee at Carleton University. He specializes in alternative forms of democracy and governance, African political thought, indigenous conflict analysis and resolution, indigenous capacity building, decentralization, international organizations, identity politics, and civic education. His current research highlights the dynamic relationship between economic liberalization, globalization, and democracy in the Third World in general and Africa in particular.