

apparent that there was a strong structural asymmetry within the bloc, resulting in the three Northern states of Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela dominating intra-bloc trade with a market share of seventy percent. This distorted trade pattern was not helped by Peru's reluctance to engage fully in the first common external tariff project, persistent border conflicts between Ecuador and Peru, or the recession that struck Bolivia and Peru in the 1980s. The Andean Pact consequently languished as an ineffective integration movement until the increasing pressures of accelerating globalization in the 1990s forced a reaction from the member states. In an effort to cope with the pressures of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) negotiations, the growing strength of Mercosur to the South, and the fragmenting nature of the international economy, the Andean Pact members signed the Protocols of Trujillo and Sucre, which in turn led to the birth of the Andean Community on August 1, 1997. The result is an open regionalist movement with defensive origins that seeks to exploit internal synergies to maximize the possibilities of external economic interaction. Despite the political will that the bloc's presidents have brought to the project, the central challenge that plagued the Andean Pact remains: geography. The member states are stretched along the forbidding terrain of the Andean Cordillera, a situation that is exacerbated by the parlous state of transnational infrastructure linkages. Although the Andean Community is devoting serious effort to improving transportation and energy networks, the combination of a lack of intra-bloc production chains and the distances between national production centers suggests that the bloc will have more importance in the future as a political coordination mechanism than as a dynamic engine for economic growth.

—Sean W. Burges

See also Hemispheric Integration; New Regionalism; Regional Governance; Regionalism

Further Readings and References

Grugel, J. (1996). Latin America and the remaking of the Americas. In A. Gamble & A. Payne (Eds.), *Regionalism and world order*. New York: St. Martin's.

ANTIGLOBALIZATION

The antiglobalization movement is a new social movement that emerged at the turn of the millennium and that questions neoliberal globalization. It can be considered as a reaction to the frictions and stratifications that have been caused by neoliberal globalization.

Looking at definitions of globalization by important social scientists such as Anthony Giddens, David Held and colleagues, and Roland Robertson shows that they concentrate on quite similar aspects. Giddens portrayed globalization in 1990 as intensified worldwide social relations where local events are shaped by distant occurrences. Held and colleagues wrote in 1999 that globalization exemplifies interconnectedness of regions near and far, allowing for enhanced social-activity and power networking. Robertson noted in 1992 that the term *globalization* denotes both a compression of the world and greater consciousness of the world as an entity.

These definitions show that the central aspects of globalization are interconnection, intensification, time-space distancing, deterritorialization, supraterritoriality, time-space compression, action at a distance, and accelerating interdependence. Globalization might be defined as the stretching of social relationships in space and time: A globalizing social system enlarges its border in a way that means social relationships can be maintained across larger spatial and temporal distances. Globalization is based on processes of disembedding, that is, the production of time-space distancing of social relationships. Yet processes of disembedding are accompanied by processes of reembedding—processes that adapt the newly disembedded social relationships to local (temporal and spatial) conditions. Globalization involves the stretching of practices and structures that constitute social systems in time and space; it results in an increase of the intensity, extensity, reach, and velocity of social relationships; that is, there is a faster and wider flow of more artifacts, people, and symbols over networks across space-time. Disembedding and reembedding are interconnected processes that are an

expression of the dialectic of the global and the local. The global is based on the interaction of localities; the local is adapted to local circumstances. Robertson spoke of this with the term *glocalization* in 1994.

The common theme underlying Giddens's concept of disembedding, Manuel Castells's 1996 concepts of timeless time and the space of flows, and David Harvey's 1990 concept of time-space compression is that modern technologies such as the computer both accelerate social relationships and make them more flexible. The history of modern society is a history of globalization and of the technological acceleration of transportation (of data, capital, commodities, people) that makes the world a smaller place: Technologies increasingly mediate social relationships more efficiently so that distances appear to shrink. Technological progress has resulted in an increasing separation of the movement of information from that of its carriers; the movement of information gathered speed on a pace much faster than the travel of bodies. Transportation and communication technologies (railway, telegraph, broadcasting, automobile, television, aviation, digital computer-based communication technology, and most recently digital network technology) especially have increased the speed of global flows of capital, commodities, power, communication, and information. The earth has been increasingly transformed into a global communication network that affects all realms of society. Knowledge is today quite substantially detached from territorial space: It cannot be situated at a fixed and limited territorial location, it operates largely without regard to territorial distance, and it transcends territorial space. New knowledge-based technologies such as the computer facilitate the delocalization and disembedding of communication in the sense of the generation of spatial and temporal distance.

The dominant form of globalization is neoliberal globalization; there is a global hegemony of neoliberalism. Neoliberal policies aim at creating a framework for the economy that makes it possible to raise profits by minimizing the costs of investment, reducing social security, and preaching individualism. All subsystems of society are increasingly dominated and penetrated by economic logic, that is, the logic of

commodities and accumulating finance capital. Aspects of neoliberalism include the following:

- The state withdraws from all areas of social life.
- The welfare state and collective responsibility are destroyed.
- Self-help, self-responsibility of the individual for his or her problems, and the capability of the market to regulate itself without human intervention are preached.
- Growth, productivity, and competition are presented as the only goals of human actions.
- Old ultraliberal ideas are presented as modern and progressive.
- Homogenization of money and finance markets under the dominance of a few nations.
- A kind of new Social Darwinism, which puts across the message that only the strong and remarkable survive in society and on the market.
- A permanent insecurity of wage and living conditions ("flexploitation"), an individualization of work contracts, and state assistance and state subsidies for large corporations are all established and institutionalized.
- Neoliberal ideologies claim that the economy is independent from society, that the market is the best means of organizing production and distribution efficiently and equitably, and that globalization requires the minimization of state spending, especially on social security.
- These developments are presented as something inescapable, self-evident, and without alternatives.
- The neoliberal state creates the legal framework for flexible wages and flexible working times.
- Collective bargaining systems are increasingly superseded by systems at a sectoral, regional, or company level.
- The state tries to facilitate capital investment and technological progress by subsidies, research and development (R&D) programs, funds, and institutional support.
- The state increasingly tries to activate entrepreneurial thinking by creating new forms of self-dependence and self-employment, reducing unemployment benefits and welfare, tightening eligibility criteria, installing sanctions and coercive activation programs (workfare, welfare to work).
- Pensions are increasingly cut and the retirement age lifted; private pension funds are encouraged.
- Universities are considered as enterprises and cooperation between universities and corporations is encouraged.

- Regulation is increasingly important on, and shifted to, the supranational, regional, and local level, and networks or links between cities, regions, and federal states are established (also on a cross-border basis).
- Certain state functions are shifted to civil society (neocorporatism).
- Public enterprises and services are increasingly privatized and commercialized.
- Welfare is increasingly shifted from the private to the corporate level.
- Transnational corporations introduce increasingly flexible ways of producing commodities, and they themselves are organized as globally distributed firms that are political as well as economic actors.
- The nation-state is transformed into a competitive state: There is competition for good conditions of economic investment between nation-states and, hence, nation-states are frequently forced to facilitate privatization, deregulation, and the deterioration of wages, labor legislation, and welfare policies to attract the interest of transnational capital. Whereas capital and transnational corporations operate at a global level, the state is forced to enforce political action at a national level.

There are both Right-wing and Left-wing antiglobalization activists. Extreme Right-wing groups such as the British National Party, the Nationaldemokratische Partei (NPD) in Germany, Front National in France, and the Austrian Freedom Party (FPÖ) see globalization as a threat to national economies and national identity and argue that the economy should be nationally controlled and immigration should be strictly restricted to guarantee national identity. Right-wing antiglobalism tends to argue that globalization is an ideology advanced by Zionism, Marxism, and Liberalism. Globalization is presented as a worldwide conspiracy against national identity, Western culture, or the White man. Such arguments frequently have racist and anti-Semitic implications. For Right-wing exponents of antiglobalism, neoliberal globalization is not the result of the structural logic of capitalism but, rather, the result of a conspirative political plan of powerful elites. These Right-wing exponents of antiglobalism don't argue in favor of an alternative globalization, but suggest nationalism and particularism as cures for the problems caused by the dominant form of globalization.

Far more important in number of activists and public attention than Right-wing antiglobalism has been Left-wing antiglobalism. It has come to public attention through protests such as at the gathering of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle in November 1999, at the gatherings of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank in Washington in April 2000 and in Prague in September 2000, at the G8 (Group of Eight) countries' gathering in Genoa in July 2001, and by annually organizing the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre as a counter event to the meetings of the World Economic Forum.

Capitalist logic has resulted in a global dominance of commodity logic and asymmetrical political power. Global economic and political capital flows and structures of decision making increasingly control the lives of humans. And money and power are considered as estranging and controlling forces. Left-wing antiglobalism can be considered in the terminology of Jürgen Habermas as a reaction to the increasing colonization of the life-world by capital and power. The term *antiglobalization movement* is misleading because the movement is not purely defensive and reactive but, rather, a proactive movement for global democracy and global justice. Hence, it can better be characterized by terms such as movement for an alternative globalization or movement for democratic globalization. The insurgency of the Mexican Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN) against impoverishment, neoliberalism, North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and land expropriation, and for freedom, dignity, justice, human rights, and democracy has resulted in the emergence of a global solidarity movement that uses the Internet. The EZLN has been characterized as the first informational guerrilla, and as the germ cell of the antiglobalization movement.

The movement is a transnational protest movement that is global in character and has a decentralized, networked form of organization that mediates the production of common values, identities, goals, and practices that transcend spatial and temporal boundaries. This movement communicates mainly with the help of the Internet, which is used to organize worldwide protests and online-protests, to discuss strategies, to reflect political events and past protests, and to build identities. Internet-based protest forms

that can be termed cyberprotest or cyberactivism, mailing lists, Web forums, chat rooms, and alternative online media projects such as Indymedia are characteristic of this movement, which has a high degree of openness, accessibility, and globality.

The movement is pluralistic and to a certain extent contradictory. Groups that are involved include traditional and autonomous labor unions, art groups, landless peasants' groups, indigenous groups, socialists, communists, anarchists, autonomous groups, Trotskyists, parts of the ecology movement and the feminist movement, Third World initiatives, civil rights groups, students, religious groups, human rights groups, groups from the unemployment movement, traditional Left-wing parties, critical intellectuals, and so forth from all over the world. This network includes groups from different social movements. It is a global network of networks, a movement of social movements, a universal protest movement, and a coalition of coalitions. It aims at reclaiming the common character of goods and services that are increasingly privatized by agreements such as General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) and Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS).

Michael Hardt and Toni Negri have used the term *multitude* to describe the antiglobalization movement as a whole of singularities that act in common, a decentered authority, a polyphonic dialogue, a constituent cooperative power of a global democracy from below, an open-source society, and a direct democratic government by all for all. The multitude, according to Hardt and Negri, is a wide-open, unrestrained network that promotes working and living in common.

Because of its structure and diversity, the movement is rather undogmatic and decentralized—it can't be controlled and dominated. The unity of this plurality emerges by the common mobilization against the neoliberal intensification of global problems. The different issues and concerns of the involved groups are connected because they all consider problems that have been caused by the logic of capitalistic globalization. The goals and practices of the movement are not homogeneous; there is a large difference between reformist and revolutionary activists and between nonviolent and militant methods of protest. Another difference concerns those parts that argue in favor of

the strengthening of the regulation of capitalism at a national level and those parts that want to put a global democracy in place of national sovereignty.

As a collective actor that is composed of many interconnected non-identical parts, the movement can as a whole be considered as striving for global democracy, global justice, and the global realization of human rights. The movement tries to draw public attention to the lack of democracy of international organizations and puts pressure to support democratization on dominant institutions. This global nonparliamentary opposition acts and thinks globally.

The movement is spontaneous, decentralized, networked, self-organizing, and based on grassroots democracy. The organizational form is an expression of the changing organizational features of society that is increasingly transformed into a flexible, decentralized, transnational, networked system of domination. Capitalist globalization has resulted in the constitution of a worldwide system of domination that is strictly shaped by economic interests. Hardt and Negri call this decentralized, flexible, networked global capitalistic system empire. Empire would be a global system of capitalistic rule; it would be based on a crisis of the sovereignty of nation-states, the deregulation of international markets, an intervening global police force, as well as mobility, decentralization, flexibilization, and the network character of capital and production. The emergence of a decentralized global empire has been challenged by a decentralized global protest movement that calls for global participation and global cooperation and suggests that the degree of democracy, justice, and sustainability of globalization should be increased. The organizing principle of the movement is one of global networked self-organization. For many of the activists, the protests anticipate the form of a future society as a global integrative and participatory democracy. The movement is a yearning for a society in which authorities don't determine the behavior of humans, but humans determine and organize themselves. The movement opposes globalization from above with self-organized forms of globalization from below.

Probably the most well-known antiglobalization group is Association Pour La Taxation Des Transactions Financières Pour L'Aide Aux Citoyens (Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the

Benefit of the People, ATTAC), which exists in more than thirty countries. ATTAC, according to its Web site (www.attac.org), holds that financial globalization leads to a less secure and a less equal playing field for people, favoring instead the interests of global corporations and financial markets. The main demand of ATTAC is the Tobin Tax, a sales tax on currency trades across borders. At this writing, ATTAC claims more than 90,000 members in forty countries.

—Christian Fuchs

See also Competition State; Global Civil Society; Global Governance; Globalization; Global Justice; Global Market; Glocalization; Marxism; Transnational Social Movement

Further Readings and References

- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Cambridge and Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (2004). *The power of identity*. (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2005). *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire*. New York: Hamish Hamilton.
- Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Global theory and global culture*. London: Sage Ltd.
- Robertson, R. (1994). Globalization or glocalization? *Journal of International Communication*, 1(1), 33–52.

ARAB INTEGRATION

The concept of Arab integration broadly refers to efforts aiming to achieve closer cooperation and assimilation between different Arab countries and subregions. Depending on the context in which the concept is used, integration could be meant as political,

economic, or institutional. The term has been used in various frameworks, and its meaning has evolved and shifted over time. Originally employed as part of a larger project aimed at unifying the numerous Arab countries into a single Arab nation, Arab integration has lately been discussed in strictly economic terms, often associated with efforts by Arab countries to liberalize their economies and connect with the global market.

Pan-Arab Conceptions of Arab Integration

Arab integration was first employed within the course of Arab nationalism and parallel to the evolution of the Arab state system in the aftermath of World War II. The Arab nationalist (or Pan-Arab) ideologists posited that the multitude of Arab states represented a coherent historical and political national community and that this nation should be realized within a unified Arab state. Following from that, Arab nationalists argued that the Arab nation is a natural unit that was artificially divided into unsustainable entities and that political and economic development can only be achieved through the rapprochement, cooperation, and, ultimately, the unification of these states. The League of Arab States was founded in 1945 as a tool for the realization of Arab integration and unity, even though in practice it was paralyzed by political divisions and institutional deficiencies. Furthermore, from the 1950s through the 1970s, several attempts were made to unify two or more Arab countries, most of which were discontinued. The most famous of these endeavors was the formation of the United Arab Republic, a political union between Egypt and Syria that lasted from 1958 to 1963. Other attempted unifications occurred between Libya and Egypt, Egypt and Sudan, and Jordan and Iraq.

In the late 1960s, the idea of Arab unity through political fusion was mostly abandoned as an immediate goal and new forms of Arab regional integration were initiated. This included the establishment of institutions promoting inter-Arab trade, cultural exchange, common industrial projects, common educational policies, and military cooperation. In addition, Arab states signed many bilateral agreements and formed