

**Beta Version v2 Jan 27, 2009
Still to be Revised!!!**

**SOCIOLOGY 280Y
SOCIOLOGY OF GLOBALIZATION
Spring 2009**

Peter Evans

PEVANS@BERKELEY.EDU

WEBSITE: <http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/evans/index.html>

CLASS MEETINGS:

115 Barrows

Tues. 6-8 PM

OFFICE HOURS:

498 Barrows

Tues. 2:00-4:00 PM [or by appointment]

INTRODUCTION:

“Globalization” is used as a gloss to explain any and every aspect of contemporary political-economy, society and culture. The analysis of globalization is, therefore, easily gets conflated with any effort to analyze the contemporary world. The idea of globalization is also an ideological tool, used in different ways to justify a variety of political projects. Imposing analytic discipline on this mess is a challenge and makes a course on globalization problematic. Nonetheless, the intellectual challenge created by globalization can’t be sidestepped. The world now operates too much as a single, integrated socio-economic system and too little as a collection of separate societies insulated from each other by national boundaries to be confronted without an analysis of globalization.

INTRO [CONT.]

Substantively, the primary focus of this course is late 20th century (and early 21st century) “globalization,” which is to say the emergence of a more organizationally sophisticated and ideologically aggressive form of global capitalism which is reasonably labeled “neo-liberal globalization.” While there will be some attempt to set the contemporary global political economy in the context of earlier perspectives on the world capitalist system, imperialism, and the rise of the self-regulating market as a utopian ideal, contemporary neo-liberal globalization and responses to it remain the principle object of analysis.

The course starts from the assumption that, at the most generic level, globalization is simply the shrinking of geographic space and the porousness of politically defined borders that accelerates and magnifies flows of money, goods, people and culture around the world. At this level, globalization, while certainly not inevitable, is tightly linked to processes of change that few would want to reverse. Technological changes in transportation, communication, and information processing capacity are central, though not the only, drivers of this process. Generic globalization could create any one of a wide variety of concrete “globalized” political economies.

Many analysts treat the one among these many potential globalized political economies that is actually being created –most easily described as “neo-liberal globalization” –as inextricably linked to generic globalization, as its inevitable socio-political consequence. Ideologically, the power of “globalization” is invoked to claim that TINA (“there is no alternative”) rules. In a worldview based on TINA efforts to escape neo-liberal globalization and the local logics of inequality that flow from it are misguided and quixotic

Loosening the link between generic globalization and neo-liberal globalization allows us to look at generic globalization in a different way, not as a handmaiden of neo-liberalism but as a repertoire of tools and resources potentially available to any political project. Seeing generic globalization as a repertoire of tools and resources is fundamental to the idea of “counter-hegemonic globalization” – a globally organized effort to replace the dominant (hegemonic) global regime with one that maximizes democratic political control makes the equitable development of human capabilities and environment stewardship its priorities.

One of the advantages of focusing on “counter-hegemonic globalization” is that it forces us to re-examine the nature of contemporary “hegemony.” Just as looking at oppositional movements at the national level helps us understand the character of national state apparatuses and their relation to private economic power, looking at counter-hegemonic globalization helps us clarify the nature of the global assemblage of power and interests that constitutes neo-liberal globalization. What are the contradictions and commonalities among the agendas and interests of globally powerful institutions like the World Bank, or the Chase Manhattan Bank, the bureaucracies of the European Union or the Chinese Communist party? In some cases (Chase Manhattan Bank) they may be relatively coherent in others (the World Bank) relatively incoherent. To what extent are their agendas (and their very existence) compatible with an emancipatory “counter-hegemonic” agenda?

The possibility of counter-hegemonic globalization depends in the first instance on a contest against a structure of power with a deep vested interest in neo-liberal globalization. Yet, even if we reject any inextricable link between generic globalization and neo-liberal capitalism, the fact remains that increases in the scale of social organization often have an association with concentration of power and diminished openness to diversity. The possibility of that globalization moves toward a progressive increase in coordination and standardization that can “lead the progressive elimination of the alternatives (Grewal, 2008:4).” Advocates an emancipatory counter-hegemonic must be wary of this logic as well as of the power vested interests.

Analytically, the study of globalization might be undertaken from a variety of perspectives. Obviously, this course offers a political economy perspective on globalization. Within the broad array of possible political economy perspectives, it takes an institutional approach, i.e. one that emphasizes the centrality of patterns of shared expectations, taken-for-granted assumptions and accepted norms and routines of interaction in shaping the interests and strategies of social actors. The aim is to integrate a logic of interests and power defined as control over resources and the means of violence, which is the heartland of classic political economy with an analysis that assumes that both individual interests and definitions of shared interests and social solidarities are continually constructed and reconstructed using available cultural constraints and resources. A variety of social, cultural, political and economic institutions will be considered. While political and economic power are a central concern, the perspective will be very different than a classic “international relations” perspective that sees the global level primarily as a site for contestation among nation states, or an “international economics” perspective that focuses primarily on the market logic that supposedly determines flows of goods, capital and technology across national boundaries.

Unfortunately, the combination of an institutional perspective and a focus on potential for transformation is still insufficient to delimit a set of literature and arguments amenable to analysis in the course of a semester. The literature has become unmanageable, putting a genuine general introduction beyond reach. Consequently, even within the terms of the perspective that animates the course, it must be admitted that the material covered is an idiosyncratic sampling. Hopefully it is a sampling sufficiently provocative and informative to facilitate the construction of a variety of useful intellectual visions of the contemporary global political economy and the possibilities for its transformation.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

Participation: The Class will meet **2 hours each week in a seminar format.** Active, effective contribution to seminar discussion is the most important requirement of participation in the course. Active, effective contribution does not necessarily mean talking a lot in class. It does mean being attentive enough to the drift of the day's discussion to be able to distinguish an apt intervention in an ongoing argument from an attempt to redirect the discussion to a new topic.

In order to make the most of our class time, and insure that everyone will be asked to post some thoughts to the rest of the class on the "Discussion" section of the **Sociology 280Y B-space site no later than 10PM** the day before class, each week (except on those weeks where "consensus working group statements" are posted [see written work below]). Posts aren't expositions of your positions on the issues; they are just an indication of what issues you found most interesting, most problematic in the week's material or most worth attention during class. You should try to you're your posts to **150 words as the maximum.** Everyone with have much most than this to say, but keeping posts short ensures that everyone will have a chance to read everyone else's posts.

In order to post your thoughts (and to receive other people's posts) you will need to enroll yourself on **Sociology 280Y B-space site** and learn to use the site. If you aren't already familiar with b-space and have luddite tendencies, the people at Educational Technology Services [<http://ets.berkeley.edu/>] can help you out.

B-Space will be an important resource more generally. The course syllabus, announcements, handouts, and the electronically available course readings will all be available under "**Syllabus**" "**Resources**" or "**Assignments**" on the Course **B-space** site.

Written Work:

In addition to your weekly posts, there are two kinds of written work:

1) Working Group Position Statements:

After digesting 2-3 weeks worth of readings, we will devote the entire class period to discussion. In order to organize this discussion, you will be asked, first of all to propose (in the B-Space Discussion area) some specific topics for group reflections. I will then edit and/or expand on the suggestions to create a set of topics. At the end of the class the week prior to the "Reflections" sessions, you will decide which topics are most interesting forming three or four "working groups," usually consisting of 3-5 people apiece.

These groups will get together, develop shared position on an issue central to the substance of that part of the course, and produce a brief (400-600 words) synopsis summarizing the group's **consensus position**. One of the members of the group will then post it on the discussion board – also no later than 10PM the night before class. The synopses will form the basis for the following day's class discussion.

In order to keep the working group essay production from becoming too burdensome and to keep the discussion from being dominated by repetition of the essays themselves, we will split the class into 2 or 3 “Statement teams” and a “Commentator Team” with roughly 2/3rd of the class being members of the working group and 1/3 organizing the commentary on the essays in each session to get the discussion launched. Since there are 5 sessions devoted to working group reflections, you should expect to be participating in the production of essays in three sessions and acting as a commentator in two of them.

In order to give the “Commentator Team” a fair chance to get organized, Working group position papers should be posted by **6PM on the Sunday** before class – i.e. a bit more than a day earlier than normal posts.

2) **Individual Paper:**

The central piece of required written work will be a research paper of about 7,500-8,000 words long (25-30pp). This piece of writing will be the most important single element in your grade in the course. Different kinds of papers are possible.

For some an **Analytically-focused paper** that critically addresses the arguments raised in some subset of the literature will be most appropriate. Simply summarizing what has been said in the literature is not enough for this kind of paper. To write a good paper, you will need to develop a clear argument or point of view in relation to the literature you are reviewing. This kind of paper makes sense if you want to explore one of the topics covered in the course in greater depth without focusing on a particular empirical case. An **Empirically-focused paper** also grows out of an argument with the literature but is built around some case or set of empirical evidence that speaks to a problem or puzzle that the literature is trying to solve. This kind of paper makes sense if you have an empirical case you are working on or interested in and want to confront the globalization literature with your case and vice versa.

Whichever kind of paper you do, you need to get me a 1-2 page proposal outlining what issues you want to address and what kind of literature and evidence you plan to use in addressing them by **Thursday, March 12th**. I will then set up individual appointments to discuss the papers during the next few days (March 13,th 18th and 19th). You will then need to get me a more fully developed prospectus/outline of the paper (5-8 pp) plus the bibliography, by **Monday, March 30th**, after which we may want to set up a second conference. Your final paper should be handed in to my mailbox in 410 Barrows **before 4PM, on MONDAY, MAY 18th**.

READINGS:

Books:

There are four (4) required books, all available at the ASUC bookstore. Plus, one recommended, also available at the ASUC bookstore.

Required:

Grewal, David. 2008. *Network Power: The Social Dynamics of Globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of NeoLiberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Polanyi, Karl. 2001. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. 2nd Beacon Paperback Edition.

Smith, Jackie. 2007. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Recommended:

Roberts, Timmons and Amy Hite (Eds.). 2007. *The Globalization and Development Reader: Perspectives on Development and Global Change*. London: Blackwell.

Articles and Chapters:

Assigned **articles** are listed in the Course outline under the weeks on which they are assigned and will be available on the WEB on the **Sociology 280Y B-Space site** (see discussion above under “Participation”).

COURSE OUTLINE and BIBLIOGRAPHY

January 20th: Introduction:

Readings: If you haven't read Rostow, Huntington, Frank or Cardoso & Falletto, read the excerpts in the Roberts and Hite's book. We won't be dealing with these authors explicitly but they are part of the intellectual backdrop to our discussions.

PART I: GLOBALIZATION AS THE EXPANSION OF CAPITALIST MARKETS:

January 27th: GLOBAL CAPITALISM: THE SELF-REGULATING MARKET AND THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Readings: Polanyi, Karl. 2001. *The Great Transformation*.
pp. 3-34

Wallerstein, "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System"
In Roberts and Hite pp. 95-114.

And/or Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. "The Rise and Demise of the Capitalist World
System" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4)[September]: 387-415

Arrighi, Giovanni. 1990. "The Three Hegemonies of Historical
Capitalism" *Review*. 13(3):365-408.

Grewal, David. *Network Power*, intro, chaps 1,3.

The Great Transformation has become perhaps the most oft used starting point for Sociologists trying to understand neo-liberal globalization. Despite the fact that Polanyi was dead wrong when he wrote in 1944 that "Undoubtedly our age will be credited with having seen the end of the self-regulating market." *The Great Transformation* combines brilliant insight with questionable theoretical assumptions. The challenge of reading it is first of all to separate the former from the latter. Equally important is to avoid getting bogged down in the historical details of English industrialization (some of which are wrong) and focus on extracting the heuristically invaluable theoretical contributions. For Polanyi, the market v.s society is the principle dynamic of contradiction. For Wallerstein and Arrighi, global capitalism has to be understood as the interaction of economic power (as expressed through markets) and state power, which is both the instrument and beneficiary of economic power. Grewal is included here as a heads up – a quite different perspective that we won't really discuss until later in the course, but is worth locating in your pre-conscious early on.

Some Further readings: For reflections on the “Polanyian perspective” and for more on Arrighi’s work – see next week’s suggested readings below. If you want to try to understand the rise and fall of the Gold Standard, see Barry Eichengreen, *Globalizing Capital: A History of the International Monetary System*. (Princeton, 1996) (or take one of his courses). The locus classicus of Wallerstein world-system perspective is *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. (Academic Press, 1974) and subsequent volumes, but Wallerstein continues to be prolific and has shifted his perspective substantially in recent years.

February 3rd: THE DOUBLE-MOVEMENT AND THE HISTORY OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Readings: Silver and Arrighi, “Polanyi’s “Double Movement”: The *Belle Époques* of British and U.S. Hegemony Compared” *Politics and Society* 31: 2 (2003).

Arrighi, “The Social and Political Economy of Global Turbulence.” New Left Review II/20 (March-April 2003).

Polanyi, Karl. 2001. *The Great Transformation*.
pp. 35-80; 136-228.

Some Further readings: For reflections on the “Polanyian perspective” – see the work of Fred Block. For example, “Karl Polanyi and the Writing of The Great Transformation,” *Theory and Society*, June, 2003 or the much earlier, “Beyond the Economistic Fallacy: The Holistic Social Science of Karl Polanyi,” (with Margaret Somers) in Theda Skocpol, ed., *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984. Also highly recommended is Burawoy’s instant classic, “For a Sociological Marxism: The Complementary Convergence of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Polanyi” *Politics & Society* 31 (2) June 2003 193-261. For a provocative extension of Polanyi’s analysis see For a fully elaborated version of Arrighi and Silver’s view see *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times*. London: Verso, 1994. Arrighi and Silver’s view brings together a “world system” perspective together with a Polanyian one. The locus classicus of Wallerstein world-system perspective is *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. (Academic Press, 1974) and subsequent volumes.

February 10th: INITIAL GROUP REFLECTIONS ON MARKETS, STATES AND THE DOUBLE-MOVEMENT IN CONTEMPORARY GLOBALIZATION.

February 17th: NEO-LIBERALISM AS THE DOMINATION OF GLOBAL CAPITAL.

Readings: Harvey, David. *A Brief History of NeoLiberalism*. 1-119

Robinson, William. "Beyond the Theory of Imperialism: Global Capitalism and the Transnational State" *Societies Without Borders* 2 (2007): 5–26

This week's readings carry on the debate from the previous readings, bringing it up to the present and also representing a more traditional Marxist take on neoliberal globalization, with, in the case of Robinson, a strong "world systems" element. Here again, instead of "society" struggling to free itself from the self-regulating market, the central problematic is the effort of "capital" (and the capitalist class) to extend its domination over the rest of society. For both Robinson and Harvey capitals dominion is highly successful, but Robinson sees success as transcending reliance on the nation state.

Some further readings: From Pierre Bourdieu on down, most people who write about neo-liberalism use the term as a polemical foil for critiquing contemporary global capitalism. Yet the term does have content. One oft-cited effort to define neo-liberalism is Gill, Stephen (1995) 'Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neo-liberalism' *Millennium*, Vol 24, No 3, pp. 399-423. One of the principle benchmarks against which the distinctiveness of neo-liberalism might be judged is the "embedded liberalism" of the post-World War II "golden age of capitalism." See Ruggie's classic statement, "International regimes, transactions and change: embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order," *International Organization*, 36(2)[Spring] 1982. To expand the basis of definition, James Mahoney's look at 19th century liberalism is an excellent lens. See his *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. Wolf 2005. *Why Globalization Works*. (Yale University Press) is the best representative of the position "pro-neo-liberal globalization position of which Jagdish Bhagwati and Tom Friedman are other prominent public representatives. For a vision in which the refusal of policy makers to take the findings of a more sophisticated "modern economic theory" into account is at the root of the irrationalities of neo-liberal globalization see Stiglitz, 2006. *Making Globalization Work*. W.W. Norton. For further exploration of the contradictions between contemporary international economic policy and "modern economic theory" the best place to start is Dani Rodrik's Website <http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~drodrik/>. The general literature on economic globalization is overwhelming. Held, et.al., [*Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford University Press, 2000] provide a decent though now a bit outdated bibliography. For a window into the debate among economists see Dani Rodrik, *Has Globalization Gone Too Far?* Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics 1997, or go to his WEBSITE. Among the more influential sociological perspectives is Gereffi, Gary and Miguel Korzeniewicz (eds). 1994. *Commodity Chains and Global Capitalism*. Westport,CT: Praeger. For a skeptical view of the economic importance of globalization, see Wade, Robert, 1996.

"Globalization & Its Limits: Reports of the Death of the National Economy are Greatly Exaggerated," pp. 60-88 in Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore (eds.), *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

February 27th: GLOBAL NEO-LIBERALISM: VARIANT PERSPECTIVES.

Readings: Ruggie, John. 1982. "International regimes, transactions and change: embedded liberalism in the postwar economic order," *International Organization*, 36(2)[Spring]

Fourcade-Gourinchas, Marion and Sarah Babb. 2002. "The Rebirth of the Liberal Creed: Paths to Neoliberalism in Four Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 108: 533-579.

Smith, Jackie. 2007. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Chpt. 1,2,4

Grewal, David. *Network Power* chapter on 8-9 (Trade and Neo-liberalism)

March 3rd: GROUP REFLECTIONS ON NEO-LIBERAL GLOBALIZATION

PART II: A LOGIC OF GLOBALIZATION THAT TRANSCENDS TECHNOLOGY AND CAPITALISM?

March 10th "Network Power" as a Logic of Globalization.

Readings: Grewal, David. *Network Power* chapters 4-7, 10

Can we derive the current face of globalization from the simple propositions that "coordinating standards become Critics will suspect first of all that "network power" misses the continual centrality of the exercise of power through hierarchies (e.g. state apparatuses and corporate bureaucracies) and the contradictions of providing redistributive governance simply through networks Not surprisingly, Grewal's provocative thesis gets no blurbs from economists. Where do the sociologists, or for that matter political scientists who have focused on globalization stand on this book? Basically it has been ignored. On the other hand, Michael Hardt, an early user of the "network power" idea in *Empire*, thinks the idea has legs.

Some Further readings: The canonical starting point for “network” approaches to globalization is Manuel Castells’ 3 volume trilogy *The “Information Age” Trilogy* (Blackwells, 1996-1998). Slaughter’s perspective is also surprisingly similar to that of John Meyer. See, for example, his 2001. “Globalization, National Culture, and the Future of the World Polity” Wei Lun Lecture, (delivered at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, November 28th). Meyer and his students have produced a long list of books and articles. See for example, Boli and Thomas, *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations Since 1875*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999. **TBA**

➔ **THURSDAY MARCH 12TH PLANS FOR PAPER PROPOSALS DUE !!**

➔ **INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES ON PLANS FOR PAPER PROPOSALS FRIDAY MARCH 13TH, THURSDAY MARCH 18, TH FRIDAY MARCH 19TH**

March 17th Group Reflections: “Network Power” power or Global Capitalism and what difference does it make?

SPRING BREAK MARCH 21ST – MARCH 29TH

➔ **MONDAY MARCH 30TH PAPER PROPOSALS DUE !!**

PART III: GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: CONTRADICTIONS & POSSIBILITIES

Governance is a vexed issue for global neo-liberalism. First, most economic power is in the hands of private (primarily financial) corporations. Military power and a great deal of economic leverage is controlled by a single hegemonic nation state – the U.S.. Therefore, the powerful actors in the system (hegemonic U.S. politicians, and corporate managers) are generally opposed to global governance in principal, barely willing accept the need for even the governance that they need to prevent “Polanyian collapse”. Second, while neo-liberal ideology privileges “democracy” in theory, democracy in global governance institutions is honored primarily in the breach. Shifting decisions to global institutions undercuts whatever democratic control exists at the level of the nation state. This undermines the legitimacy of global governance among nation states in the global South and non-elites more generally. The weakness and contradictions of global governance are the Achilles heel of globalization. But this is only a starting point for trying to analyze the complex relations of multi-level governance that “rule” or fail to rule neo-liberal globalization.

March 31st: CONTRADICTIONS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: GLOBAL FINANCE, THE BRETTON WOODS INSTITUTIONS AND THE TOBIN TAX?

- Readings:** Tobin, James. 1999. "Financial Globalization" *Proceedings of Amer.Philosophical Society* 143(2)[June]:161-167.
- Kregel, Jan. 1998. "Yes 'It' did happen again! A Minsky Crisis Happened in Asia." Paper presented at the 8th annual Hyman Minsky Conference on Financial Structure.
- Wahl, Peter. 2005. "International Taxation Regulating Globalisation – Financing Development" Working Paper - World Economy, Ecology and Development (WEED) Berlin.
- Woods, Ngaire. 2006. *The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank and their Borrowers*. Cornell University Press. Pp. 39-103.
- Woods, Ngaire [for the Commonwealth Secretariat]. 2008. "A Commonwealth Initiative to Support Reform of the IMF And The World Bank" [HGM-RII(08)3] London: Commonwealth Secretariat [presented at Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting on Reform of International Institutions, London, 9-10 June].
- Babb, Sarah. 2007 *The Banks and the Beltway* Draft of chapt. 9 – Into the New Millenium.

This week combines two groups of readings one set on the failures of financial regulation more generally (especially as it relates to the interests of the Global South) and the other on the once apparently powerful, now more clearly decrepit institutions of global governance (again with a focus on those more relevant to the Global South. Tobin, Kregel and Wahl help us understand why finance needs global governance. Woods and Babb help us understand why current global governance doesn't work. Too many analyses of global governance become fixated with the question of the role of the nation state and the extent to which is threatened by globalization. There are two problems with this view. First, it overlooks the parallels between the interests and perspectives of national elites and global technocrats, thereby giving national elites in the global south a relatively free ride. Second, it overlooks the huge differences among nation states in terms of the way in which they related to institutions like the bank and the fund. Ngaire Woods provides the best researched analysis of what two apparent pillars of "global governance," the World Bank and the IMF, do in practice, as well as providing one of the clearest pictures of what they think they are doing. Babb offers a nice update.

Some Further readings: For a quick critical introduction to global governance institutions, see Boas, Morten and Desmond McNeill *Multilateral Institutions : A Critical Introduction*. Pluto Press, 2000. For a critical insider's view of the foibles of global governances see, Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents* New York: W.W. Norton, 2002. See also Soros, G. (2002). *On Globalization*. Public Affairs Publishers. For an analysis that locates responsibility

for the failures of neoliberalism firmly in the laps of global technocrats, giving national elites a relative free ride, see Walden Bello, 2002. *Deglobalization: Ideas for a New World Economy*. London: ZED books. A very interesting perspective on global governance, quite different from Woods (and also from Harvey and Robinson), which we won't have time to explore, but which jibes with a sociological focus on "networks" is Anne-Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order*. (Princeton University Press, 2005). The canonical starting point for "network" approach to globalization is Manuel Castells' 3 volume trilogy *The "Information Age" Trilogy* (Blackwells, 1996-1998). Slaughter's perspective is also surprisingly similar to that of John Meyer. See, for example, his 2001. "Globalization, National Culture, and the Future of the World Polity" Wei Lun Lecture, (delivered at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, November 28th). Meyer and his students have produced a long list of books and articles. See for example, Boli and Thomas, *Constructing World Culture: International Nongovernmental Organizations Since 1875*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999. Likewise, Slaughter's vision bears a close relation to the notion of "epistemic communities" see Haas, Peter. 1992. "Banning Chlorofluorocarbons: Epistemic Community Efforts to Protect Stratospheric Ozone." *International Organization*. 46(1)[Winter].

In order to pursue the question of globalization and the welfare state, see Huber and Stephens, *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets*. University of Chicago Press, 2001. For a nice exposition of how a welfare state can survive despite globalization see Castells, Manuel and Pekka Himanen, *The Information Society and the Welfare State: The Finnish Model*. Oxford University Press, 2002. Also worth reading if you are interested in OECD countries is John Campbell, *Institutional Change and Globalization* (Princeton University Press, 2004), which explores the crucial issue of whether globalization has undercut the ability of welfare states to collect taxes.

APRIL 7TH: THE ECLIPSE OF THE STATE AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AS BENEFICENT NETWORKS.

Readings: Evans, "The Eclipse of the State? Reflections on Stateness in an Era of Globalization," *World Politics* 50 (October, 1997): 62-87.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie, *A New World Order*. (Princeton University Press, 2005)
Intro and Chapt 1 (1-64); Chapt. 4 (131-162); Chapt.6 and Conclusion
216-272

Smith, Jackie. 2007. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Chapt 5

The "eclipse of the state" is much less plausible as a general proposition than it might have seemed 10 years ago, but the ideological and structural logic restricting state action on behalf of social protection, redistribution and capability expansion remains. Slaughter puts forward a Grewal-like case for new forms of "network governance"

that she believes can produce a “just and efficient world order.” The question is why we are not convinced by her argument and whether this is her problem or ours.

Suggested Readings: addition to the obvious connections to Grewal, Slaughter’s vision bears a close relation to the notion of “epistemic communities” see Haas, Peter. 1992. “Banning Chlorofluorocarbons: Epistemic Community Efforts to Protect Stratospheric Ozone.” *International Organization*. 46(1)[Winter]. Finally, you might be interested in Held’s more programmatic vision of the positive possibilities for global governance: Held, D. and D. Archibugi. (1995). *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*. London: Polity and Blackwells.

For a nice overview of the changing position of the nation state see O’Riain, “States and Markets in an Era of Globalization” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:187-213 [2000] [Available at <http://soc.annualreviews.org/>]. For two totally different perspectives on governance, see: John Meyer, "The World Polity and the Authority of the Nation State." In Albert Bergesen (ed.) *Studies in the Modern World System*. New York: Academic Press, 1980 and, on the other side Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979). *International Organization*, 36(2)[Spring]. Yet another view can be found in Saskia Sassen’s *Losing Control?: Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. (Columbia U. Press, 1996). There is also, of course, a huge literature on specific institutions like the Bank – see especially the work of Wade and the collection by Fox and Brown. Not to mention the Fund – see, for example, Evans and Finnemore on my WEBSITE. You can return to the Arrighi-Silver perspective in Arrighi, Giovanni & Beverly J. Silver, et al. (1999). *Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

APRIL 14TH: REFLECTIONS ON GLOBAL GOVERNANCE.

PART III: COUNTER-HEGEMONIC GLOBALIZATION (APRIL 21ST - MAY 12TH)

Critics of neo-liberalism like Harvey and Robinson, have surprisingly little to offer in the way of analysis of resistance from below. Panegyrics to transnational social movements are often short on analysis of their effective structural leverage. Better analysis of potential global architectures of social agency capable of transforming

neoliberal globalization is needed. Central to the Polanyian perspective with which we started is the idea of the “double movement” – the efforts to expand the sway of the self-regulating market spontaneously generate “movements for social protection.” Yet, Polanyi is also clear that such movements may be reactionary rather than progressive. Social movements attempting to restructure the global political economy are both products of globalization and use strategies that depend fundamentally on (generic) globalization. In short, they are as much a part of globalization as transnational corporations or the World Bank.

April 21st: COUNTER-HEGEMONIC GLOBALIZATION AS A QUEST FOR DEMOCRATIC MULTILATERALISM.

Readings: Smith, Jackie. 2007. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*.
Chapts. Review prior chapters, read 6-9.

Smith is one of the most prolific sociological analysts of transnational social movements. What is perhaps most distinctive about her perspective is its focus on the UN system as a potential anchoring point for transnational activism. The vision of counter-hegemonic globalization as movement for “democratic multilateralism” complements the idea of using the UN system as an organizational starting point.

Further readings: See readings for following week.

April 28th: COUNTER-HEGEMONIC GLOBALIZATION AS THE GLOBALIZATION OF THE DOUBLE-MOVEMENT.

Readings: Evans, 2008. “Is an Alternative Globalization Possible?” *Politics & Society* 36(2).

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, 2008. “The World Social Forum and the Global Left” *Politics and Society*

Smith, Jackie. 2007. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Chapt. 10.

A mystery article on why “Alter-Globalization” is not the Post-Modern Prince *TBA*

Transnationalized versions of Polanyi’s double movement come in all varieties. Some are regressive, others progressive. They coalesce around a variety issues and constituencies and are braided together in a set of complex alliances. It is not simply about resistance to global power structures – as Thayer’s case illustrates global resources (cultural as well as material) are key tools in upsetting oppressive but deeply rooted local hierarchies. These readings are only a start toward trying to

figure out whether these movements in combination might constitute an architecture of social agency with the potential to realize the progressive potential of generic globalization, but they should at least stimulate some interesting reflections.

The World Social Forum has become a symbol of the possibility that transnational social movements might be able to coalesce into a coherent and effective “movement of movements.” Boaventura de Sousa has been one of the key intellectuals involved in the evolution of the World Social Forum since its inception. The obvious debate is whether the “movement of movements” has attained sufficient coherence to actually make a difference in global cultural and ideology and, more crucial, in global structures of power. If not, are there identifiable possibilities that it might do so, or, must we simply wait to see where the internal dynamics of global neo-liberalism take dominant global institutions?

Some Further readings: There is now a massive literature on transnational social movements, which we are not even sampling. The canonical text on the organization of transnational advocacy networks is Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. For a recent effort to systematize the literature see Tarrow, Sidney. *The New Transnational Activism* (Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics) Cambridge University Press, 2005. For two contrasting case studies see Ancelovici, M. 2002. Organizing against globalization: The case of ATTAC in France. *Politics & Society* 30 (3):427-463 and Doran, Michael. 2002. “The Pragmatic Fanaticism of al Qaeda: An Anatomy of Extremism in Middle Eastern Politics” *Political Science Quarterly* 117 [2]:177- 190. For more on formal global norms re: women’s right like CEDAW, can be useful tools in local battles. See for example, Elizabeth Heger Boyle and Dongxiao Liu “Making the Case: The Womens Convention and Gender Discrimination in Japan,” 2001. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 42:389-404. For a very nice set of statements by intellectuals and activists involved in the global justice movement see Mertes, Tom. *A Movement of Movements: Is Another World Really Possible?* Verso, 2004. For a nice empirical analysis (albeit a Eurocentric one) of social movements and globalization, see della Porta, Donatella, Hanspeter Kriesi and Dieter Rucht, (eds.) *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*. (Houndsmills: Macmillan Press,1999) Donatella della Porta, et. al. *Globalization from Below: Transnational Activists and Political Networks* (Minnesota, 2006). For connections between local movements and global campaigns, see the iconic case of Cochabamba as in, Oilvera, Oscar, *Cochabamba: Water War in Bolivia*. South End Press, 2004. See also, Edelman, Marc. 1999. *Peasants Against Globalization: Rural Social Movements in Costa Rica*. Stanford: Stanford University Press; Epstein, Barbara. 2001. “Anachism and the Anti-Globalization Movement”, in *Monthly Review*. 53(4):1-14. For some optimistic views on the possibility of global civil society see: Florini, Ann, M., ed. 2000. *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*. Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Endowment. Keane, John. 2003. *Global Civil Society?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Lipschutz, Ronnie D., and Judith Mayer. 1996. *Global civil society and global environmental governance : the politics of nature from place to planet*, [SUNY series in international environmental policy and theory.] Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press. Wapner, P. 1996. *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. For a start on the globalization of the labor movement see Silver, Beverly J. 2003. *Forces of Labor: Workers Movements and Globalization since 1870*. Cambridge University Press. For a perspective on more contemporary

evolution, M. Gordon and L. Turner (eds). 2000. *Transnational Cooperation Among Trade Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. For more on global structures and local contestation in the trade union movement see: Bezudienhout, Andries. 2000. "Towards Global Social Movement Unionism? Trade Union Responses to Globalization in South Africa," Discussion Paper 115-2000, ILO, International Institute for Labour Studies, Labour and Society Program. (40pp); Jon Erik Dolvik, *An Emerging Island: ETUC, Social Dialogue and The Trade Unions in the 1990's*. Brussels, 1999. For a critical analysis of international labor solidarity see Kjeld A Jakobsen.2001. Rethinking the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and its Inter-American Regional Organization *Antipode* 33 (3) Page 363 – July. For the potential for connections between the labor movement and other movements see D. Eade and A. Leather (eds.) *Development NGOs and Labor Unions: Terms of Engagement..* Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, 2005. For an interesting example of a shared labor movement/women's movement agenda see Thayer, Millie. "Transnational Feminism: Reading Joan Scott in the Brazilian *Sertão*." *Ethnography* 2, no. 2 (2001b): 243-271 or Thayer, 2000. "Negotiating the Global: Rural Brazilian Women and Transnational Feminisms." Pp. 158-178 in *Rethinking Feminisms in the Americas*, edited by Debra Castillo *et al*, (Ithaca: Cornell University. For a classic statement of why the labor movement needs governance institutions to play off against see Tilly, Charles. 1995. "Globalization Threatens Labor's Rights." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 47:1-23. For a more recent versions see: Seidman, Gay, "Labor's Dilemmas: Union Responses to Globalization in Brazil and South Africa" unpublished ms. 1998, or Kim Moody, *Workers in a Lean World: Unions in the International Economy*. London: Verso, 1997. For a perspective on how global governance stimulates labor transnationalism, see Kay, Tamara. 2005. "Labor Transnationalism and Global Governance: The Impact of NAFTA on Transnational Labor Relationships in North America." *American Journal of Sociology*. For another perspective on governance and labor transnationalism at the national level see Anner, Mark. 2003. "Industrial Structure, the State, and Ideology: Shaping Labor Transnationalism in the Brazilian Auto Industry" *Social Science History*. 27(4):603-634.

**MAY 5TH: REFLECTIONS ON COUNTER-HEGEMONIC GLOBALIZATION.
[AND THE COURSE IN GENERAL]**

**SATURDAY MAY 9TH INFORMAL COURSE REUNION
7:00 PM AT 3434 DWIGHT WAY**

➔ MONDAY MAY 18TH : PAPERS DUE BY 4:00PM IN 410 BARROWS! [AND ELECTRONICALLY]