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INTRODUCTION

Globalization is the most influential phenomena of the 21th century. After the collapse of the communist states, globalization started to form the frames of international politics and global economy. The exclusive role of nation-states in international relations was gradually complemented by international organizations and transnational corporations. Decision making reached a new transnational level with less sovereignty for the individual states and more influence for other global actors.

Global civil society was conducted by the positive effects of globalization. Transnational communication networks and transportation systems helped isolated, national civil associations to internconnect and form a new global network\(^1\). Before the globalization process, the activities of civil society were limited to national actions and representation because political decisions were also made in national levels. Civil associations had their national institutions and member bases with very few connections to other civil organizations\(^2\). The only exceptions were those traditional international non-governmental organizations, like the International Red Cross, that were originally founded to serve international goals. Transnationalisation of decision making on several social and political issues broadened the activity spectrum of civil society and also provided new means and methods for civil associations to deal with these issues. Therefore global civil society is one of the greatest beneficiaries of the globalization process. On the other hand, the issues that global civil associations and transnational social movements try to represent prove that globalization is not a definitely positive process. Environmental protection, human rights violations or the proliferation of international terrorism are new kind of problems in international relations. Nations-states, international organizations and global decision makers seem to realize that these problems could not be solved in national levels with the institutional background of the cold war era.

The main aim of my thesis is to demonstrate the effects of globalization on civil society. In the first part of my thesis I try to present the change in the definition of civil society over time. From the classic greek philosophers to the great minds of the

\(^1\) ANHEIER, Helmuth, JUERGENSMEYER, Mark- Global civil society in Encyclopedia of Global Studies, SAGE Publications, 2012
Enlightenment every era had its own understanding on civil society depending on their own historical and ideological backgrounds. It took centuries to conduct a definition that could accurately characterize civil society and define its relation to the state and other social institutions. This definition seemed appropriate until the beginning of globalization. However, the internationalization of state relations implemented profound changes that transformed the characteristics of civil society. The end of the first part tries to define this new global civil society using different approaches to the term. It demonstrates the transition from *societas civilis* to the notion of global civil society that became an influential actor in international relations.

The second part focuses on the characteristics of social movements. Within the frames of civil society, social movements were the most visible and successful forms of civil activism and political participation. This chapter uses three main standpoints to characterize social movements and distinguish new, global social movements from classic, national social movements. I try to present the impact of globalization on social movements to show the shift in their activity and institutional background. By placing them in the context of global civil society I try to emphasize their role in global civil activism and social representation. Global social movements are representing those global issues that I mentioned in the first part quite successfully in a transnational level. Therefore their significance in global civil society is inevitable.

Finally, I narrow my focus to a special social movement. The movement of the alter-globalists could demonstrate the emergence of global social movements in the 21st century and the impact of globalization in civil society as well. I chose to study the alter-globalist movement because its significance in international relations is growing dramatically together with the number of its supporters. At first, I try to define and characterize them as a social movement using the standpoints of the previous part. This definition is quite critical because this movement consists of various social movements with different historical, national and cultural backgrounds. This part would also present the different groups and alternative ideas on globalization within the movement to prove its complexity. Although, the characterization of the movement seems quite problematic there are some main issues that could help the identification of the movement. Every organization and activist group within the alter-globalist movements opposes neoliberal

---

3 ESCHLE, Catherine- Constructing ‘the anti-globalization movement’, International Journal of Peace Studies, Volume 9 Number 1, 2004
capitalism and the rule of international finance institutions. Their answers to global problems may be different but they can successfully act together against the representatives of the present global order. By describing the alter-globalist movement I would not like to say that their idea on globalization is the right one. I would like to present their movement to prove that global civil society has different answers to global problems that politicians and nation-states should also consider when they are defining the rules of international relations.

With this work I would like to prove that civil society has successfully developed into a global civil network with the variety of different organizations, movements and individual activists. Their transformation and the impact they have already had in global politics enables them to participate in global decision making. The activity of the alter-globalists showed that there are several global problems that need cooperation and global civil society could contribute to this cooperation with its activist network, professional competence and serious commitment to global social issues.

1. FROM SOCIETAS CIVILIS TO GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY

1.1 Two meanings of civil society

1.1.1 Societas civilis

The ancient Greeks, who invented politics, used the term *politike koinonia* to the "public political-ethical community of free and equal citizens under a legally defined system of rule". This definition distinguished the *polis* and its citizens from the barbarians who lacked any form of political organization and legal system. This was the key element of the classic meaning of civil society: a distinction from barbarians, and later, after the rise of Christianity, from pagans. The term *civil* in this case meant civilized and politically organized while *society* referred to the community of citizens living accordingly to this system of rule.

Plato and Aristotle were the foremost thinkers of societas civilis. They shared the idea that societas civilis, this politically organized community is the universal

---

framework for each and every human interaction within the polis but there were many details where they disagreed. Plato argued that the common good of the polis could be defined through public debate and accomplished by common action and participation. In addition to that, Plato clearly stated that political participation could not be voluntary because politics is a basic need of the human nature so no one should deprive themselves from the opportunity to take part in the decision making and political debates. What he did not see, however was the heterogeneity of citizens within the polis and the difficulties it can cause in common political actions. Aristotle, his follower recognized this paradox between private and public matters and therefore denied Plato’s idea that public interest is above private. He realized that citizens of the polis can hardly work together as a unity towards universally defined common goals because they are not just a number of men (as Plato thought) but different kinds of men with different backgrounds and morals. Aristotle thought difference of the citizens was a strength where different ideas could be discussed and the best and most suitable would serve the public interest the most.

Aside from the different views on public and private interest Plato and Aristotle were both the first influential philosophers of the statist approach of civil society. In their concept of societas civilis the polis as a political authority was essential. Without the governing and legal rule of the polis societas civilis could no longer define social interactions and political participation would be impossible.

1.1.2. Moral and statist theories of civil society

During the 12th century Thomas Aquinas, the most influential theologian and philosopher of the Middle Age rediscovered the ideas of Aristotle about politics and societas civilis. He agreed with Plato and Aristotle in saying that politics is a basic need of human nature but he went a step further with this argument. He stated that since human nature was created by God, political thinking and participation which is a basic human need, could be morally right and acceptable. By saying this he disproved the common Christian idea that politics was subordinate to theology.

---

6 PLATO- The Republic, Oxford University Press, New York, 1977
8 ARISTOTLE- The Politics, Oxford University Press, New York, 1965
9 AQUINAS, Thomas- Commentary on the Politics in LERNER, Ralph- MAHDI, Mushin, eds. –Medieval Political Philosophy, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1963
Leaving religion and morality out of his theory Thomas Hobbes was the first to integrate the territorial state into his theory to further develop the statist approach of civil society. He stated that civil society was constituted by mankind to prevent war and stabilize the state. The constant battle for power between power groups causes war and results instability within the state, meanwhile citizens need peace, stability and security to prosper. Only if there is a common power, or call it *state* is when there can be a functioning civil society, according to Hobbes\(^{10}\). He shared Aristotle’s view that civil society contains both public and private interactions and spheres of life but he took a further step and said that although the state is needed to prevail civil society it is also true that there are aspects of civil society, the private aspects, where the state should not interfere. By saying this he brought the idea of societas civilis closer to its modern definition. That is why Hobbes is considered one of the transitional figures of civil society theory from the classical to the modern approach\(^{11}\).

Thinkers of the early Enlightenment set the basics of the new theory of civil society. John Locke, Adam Ferguson and Immanuel Kant were the representatives of the liberal approach of civil society as well as the first ones to examine the relationship between the state and civil society. All thinkers before Locke made it clear that civil society serves some kind of common good and that is one of the reasons why it was created. Locke questioned the existence of this common good and argued that only particular interests matter when we examine why civil society was created\(^{12}\). In his theory, civil society serves private interests and that’s the statement that modern liberal thinkers use when they say that civil society should work as a complementer to the state and help governments stay free from economic and private matters of the individuals.

### 1.1.3. Modern meanings of civil society

Classic liberal thinkers distinguished state power form civil society and gave a totally new meaning of the phrase. Societas civilis was used to divide the rule of law and political communities from the state of nature. But as states evolved and the absolutistic monarchy developed a highly bureaucratized and centralized form of state power no such distinction was necessary. Civil society was no longer a political condition but gradually became an institution parallel to the central power. The notion

\(^{10}\) HOBSES, Thomas- Leviathan, Penguin, New York, 1985

\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 78.

of „society against the state” and the opposition to privileges and absolutistic power came together in a new theory that Hegel later developed as the modern definition of civil society\textsuperscript{13}.

Hegel stated that civil society was the intermediate between the level of the state and family and by being so is a totally new achievement of the modern world. Civil society was the arena where individuals were socialised and learned to play the game of politics through their voluntary associations and labour organisations. His notion of civil society is called bourgeois civil society because only certain social classes could be parts of it\textsuperscript{14}. Hegel saw civil society as a possible control of the absolutistic state bureaucracy as well as the protector of atomised individuals\textsuperscript{15} and these thoughts made a serious impact on the contemporary activist view of civil society.

The Italian marxist thinker, Antonio Gramsci was the one who syntetised Hegel’s concept of civil society as a counterbalance of the state and Marx’s idea of overruling capitalism. He wrote his ideas about civil society while he was imprisoned because of his communist thoughts. Gramsci realized what Marx could not, that overcoming capitalism in the West is impossible because of the stable relationship between state, bourgeois civil society and the economic power\textsuperscript{16}. Gramsci therefore suggested that civil society should use every resource independent from the state to overcome capitalism and class system. The most important element of Gramsci’s theory is political activism. He emphasized the role of ideology in changing the capitalist system and overcoming hegemony by actively participating in politics and displace state hegemony from the private aspect of life with civil organizations and movements\textsuperscript{17}. His theory is very important to the contemporary studies of civil society especially to understand the antiglobalist and anti-systemic civil movements and the ideology that drives their activity.

Considering both the classical and the modern meaning and all the theories about civil society scholars are still unable to agree on one official definition for civil society. They agree on the fact that civil society is independent from the state, but they argue about the nature of its relation to the central-state. They tend to think it is a third

\textsuperscript{13} COHEN, Jean L.- ARATO, Andrew- Civil society and Political Theory, MIT Press, Cambridge-Massachusetts, 1994
\textsuperscript{14} HEGEL, G.W.F.- The philosophy of Right, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1967 p. 150.
\textsuperscript{15} KALDOR, Mary- Global civil society: an answer to war, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2003
sector of political relations but its heterogeneity makes it almost impossible to characterize it and that is why many books and working papers use the term non-governmental organizations or non-profit sector to describe civil society. In this thesis I will use the definition of the Encyclopedia of Global Studies which synthesizes several theorists approaches. It says: „civil society is a self-organising, spontaneously created sphere between the state and market to amplify the resonance of social problems in private life and pass it on to the political realm or public sphere”.

1.2. Globalization and its new perspectives

1.2.1 Globalization and the change in the world order

When communist states collapsed many thought that the victory of market capitalism and Western democracy will bring prosperity and welfare to the whole world. Francis Fukuyama called this the end of history but he could not be more wrong. Samuel Huntington suspected that some new kind of conflict will replace the battle of ideologies. He stated that it will be the clash of civilizations where Western democracies will have to face all the other orders in the world and conflicts would not end at all. What very few would have thought, even in academic or political circles is that globalization will replace cold war in creating problems and dividing the world. Globalization seemed to be a process with endless opportunities and multiple benefits both to the developed and the developing parts of the globe.

When state-socialism ended in Eastern Europe and dictatorships went under in Latin America they did not see that globalization will be the next thing they have to deal with. Newly founded parties and their leaders were no longer under the control of the soviet communist party but they soon had to realize that global corporations, economic power groups and the IMF rule world politics instead of secretary generals now. Nation-states were gradually losing their importance to regional integrations and international organizations. Global markets were interconnecting states forcing them to cooperate and discuss their interest in a new, international level.

19 FUKUYAMA, Francis- The end of history and the last man, Simon and Schuster, New York, 2006
20 HUNTINGTON, Samuel- The clash of civilization and the remaking of world order, Simon and Schuster, 2011
Globalization caused a lot of new problem to world politics that can not be handled with the methods and processes of the cold war era. Environmental protection, the matter of human rightst, international terrorism or the problem of uncontrolled global capitalism can not be handled in national levels because the problem itself exists in a global context. States try to protect their national sovereignty against global capitalism and they often see civil society as a threat to their autonomy as well. However, the involvement of civil society to global decision making would be a possible new way to handle global problems. As the next part will show the actors of civil society have all the potential that is needed to help fight the problems of globalization and manage the socio-economic crisis it had caused.

1.2.2. Global networks and the new spheres of civil society

Civil society is one of the biggest beneficaries of globalization. Till the 20th century, boundaries of civil society overlaped the borders of the national state. The issues of civil activism and the activity of civil associations concerned local matters and problems. Associations, movements and activists were isolated and concentrated on specific local matters without any contact with other members of civil society outside their reach. They only had to deal with national governments and public authorities to represent social interests. Globalization opened multiple new fields of civil activism and widened the borders of its activity. The forms and frames of civil associations and movements transformed according to new global challenges. Some of the changes derive from the new functions of these associations while others are the results of systematic and network developments.

Political decisionmaking exceeded national borders and civil society followed this change. As regional integrations like the European Union developed and international organizations became more relevant actors of international politics civil associations found their way to interact with them. Matters of the global order are often discussed in world summits organized by the leaders of world politics. Bureaucrats and diplomats in these assemblies were not elected by the public and citizens have very little understanding and information about these summits and the decisions made during them. Civil society tries to draw attention to the legitimacy problem of these meetings by organizing parallel summits in the same place at the same time with the original assemblies. The purpose of these parallel summits is to protest against formal
delegations and make civil society and its activity visible to world society. They lack any formal contact with the delegations of the official summits but in special cases they try to reach them and present their ideas to the decisionmakers. Owing to these actions and their media presentation politicians and international organizations are forced to take civil suggestion into consideration and cooperate with NGOs about global issues.

Besides the growing influence on international organizations civil associations and different actors of civil society built up diverse and multi-level networks of cooperation within their sphere. One of the main characteristics of national civil associations was that they focused on specific topics and problems. Local civil society fought governments about social benefits, ethnic discrimination or the freedom of religion or belief or even more specifically tried to represent the interests and needs of small social groups. Unlike national civil society global civil associations represent a wide range of social, economic and political issues at the same time. Global issues and social problems are diverse and complex hence associations need to cover wider fields of international problems to develop solutions to them. Fighting for the equality of women for example is impossible without the fight for all minorities and the struggle to solve poverty that deprives women from education and determines their secondary status in society. The global tendency of generalization and diverse issue covering reached the sphere of global civil society and gradually transformed its system.

Parallel to this systematic transformation within civil association totally new and unconventional forms of civil cooperation emerged, owing to the global changes in communication, democratic behavior and social participation. Anti-globalization and anti-systemic movements for example are less organized and official than traditional civil associations but they can reach same effectiveness and visibility. One of the main focus of this thesis is the characteristics and influences of these anti-globalization movements that is why it is essential to understand the background to their uprise. The lack of bureaucracy and official operation is the great advantage of these often radical movements.

---

22 Ibid. p. 254.
23 PIANTA, Mario- A globális civil társadalom párhuzamos csúcstalálkozói in ANHEIER, Helmuth- GLASIUS, Marlies- KALDOR, Mary- Globális civil társadalom I., Civil Szellem, Budapest, 2004
24 ANHEIER, Helmuth- GLASIUS, Marlies- KALDOR, Mary- A globális civil társadalom bemutatása in ANHEIER, Helmuth- GLASIUS, Marlies- KALDOR, Mary- Globális civil társadalom I., Civil Szellem, Budapest, 2004
25 ANHEIER, Helmuth- GLASIUS, Marlies- KALDOR, Mary- A globális civil társadalom bemutatása in ANHEIER, Helmuth- GLASIUS, Marlies- KALDOR, Mary- Globális civil társadalom I., Civil Szellem, Budapest, 2004
and reactive associations because they do not have to go along with official processes to organize and define their reactions or standpoints about particular problems or events. They can use radical methods to communicate their opinion without jeopardizing their finance or alienating their members. Later chapters of this thesis will characterize these new forms of associations in detail and will try to define their part in global civil society.

1.3. Global civil society: modern meanings, different concepts

1.3.1. Why *global* civil society is different?

The first chapter presented the theory of global civil society and its evolution through history. The common point of all the classic theories of civil society was their statist approach. Their definition on civil society derived from their different attitude towards the nation-state. Global civil society can not be defined this way simply because it has outreached the national level. Jens Bartelson therefore sees global civil society as a descriptive of a transition from the old statist approach to a new social reality\(^\text{27}\). It is generally acknowledged between theorists of civil society that one official definition of global civil society is impossible until this transition ends and a totally new set of academic terms evolves to describe the notion.

It is also difficult to place global civil society in the world order. Bartelson states that global civil society ought to be demarcated from both domestic and international political authorities\(^\text{28}\) but this separation does not mean that we should not define its relation to them. As the following parts will prove there are many existing theories about global civil society’s relation to the global order which makes it impossible to create one official statement about it. There are arguments about the part national states or international organizations have in global civil society or the nature of the relationship global civil society should maintain with them. The notion of civil society was only relevant in national levels but global civil society is wider than that even though we can not decide how much wider. Is *global* civil society an adequate term at all? Or should we use *transnational* civil society instead? If civil society exists only between states outside the national level then transnational civil society is the right apellation. Nevertheless, many theorists believe that there are spheres of civil society beyond national levels that can not be understood simply transnational because of their

\(^{27}\) BARTELS\ON, Jens- *Making sense of global civil society*, European Journal of International Relations 2006 12: p. 371.

\(^{28}\) Ibid. p. 374.
global and general nature. The name global civil society therefore expresses the nature of the phenomena more accurately.

Generally we can see that every opinion on the definition of global civil society derives from their theorist approach to world power, global order and transnational society and tries to justify their own argument through the definition on global civil society.²⁹

1.3.2. Descriptive or ‘the neoliberal’ approach

The term ‘descriptive’ is usually used to describe something ‘as it is’ and this remains the same in the case of global civil society. The descriptive theory of global civil society tries to strictly characterize the tendencies within global civil society without any normative presupposition or conclusion.³⁰ Therefore it sometimes seems as the ‘rational’ approach to the term but it can not be justified this simply. This approach sees globalization as the main determinative of global civil society. Globalization forms the frames of civil society and draws its boundaries as well. Civil society therefore must not deny or oppose globalization because its own mere existence would be impossible without it. The descriptive approach offers a supplementary function to civil society in the world order. In terms of the relationship with national states or international political entities global civil society should act in those fields states or economic institutions can not. Humanitarian, voluntary and civilizing missions should be carried on by global civil associations and movements while states and transnational corporations do business and make politics. Global civil society should ease the negative effect of globalization and global capitalism but should not intervene in the decision making or policy making processes. Many finds this role degrading and insufficient but we can find rational reasons behind this approach. As a matter of fact Karl Polanyi’s double movement theory can justify the rationality of this theory. Polanyi proved with historic examples that the social crisis capitalism and market economy caused (first movement) could only be overcome with the help of a powerful state (countermovement).³¹ The emergence of welfare states was often understood as an example to these

³⁰ KEANE, John- Globális civil társadalom? in ANHEIER, Helmuth- GLASIUS, Marlies- KALDOR, Mary- Globális civil társadalom I., Civil Szellel, Budapest, 2004
contermovements and the activity of global civil society can also be a counter-

movement against globalization and global capitalism.

If we look beyond theory and examine the practical operation of civil
associations we can also prove this theory right. Influential, global NGOs and
humanitarian associations voluntarily play this role already by receiving money from
governments and international organizations to their bureaucratic expenses while
playing an advocacy role, distributing aids and operating health and welfare institutions
when states can not or do not want to.

Traditional NGOs seem like they have accepted this substantive role that liberal
theorists gave them while postmodern, unconventional global civil organizations try to
avoid this determination and play differently.

1.3.3. Normative or 'activist' theories

Descriptive theories describe what it is while normative theory defines what
should be. It can be seen as an idealistic view on global civil society’s role and mission
in the world order but recent examples could show that this theory is not as idealistic as
it seems. According to this approach civil society is frequently defined as a focus of
resistance against global concentrations of wealth and power as well as an alternative to
the practices of power politics between and within states. Followers of this theory use
the concept of civil society to legitimize their resistance or opposition to what they think
illegitimate or unfair power.

Antonio Gramsci founded this theory in his letters from prison. Gramsci
understood civil society as a counterpart of national governments and capitalist
economy. In his theory active citizenship, self-organization and political pressure can
influence governments and decisionmakers to take public needs into account. This
normative conception defines global civil society as a third part besides government and
economic actors that can control and balance the negative impact of the first two.
Governments or international organizations represent one level of politics that global
civil society should influence, check and change by active participation and civil
organizations. New forms of civil movements seem to understand this idea and realize

---

32 BARTELSON, Jens- Making sense of global civil society, European Journal of International Relations 2006 12
33 GRAMSCI, Antonio- Selections from the prison notebook, International Publishers, New York, 1971
its potential to define their actions. Anti-globalist movements all praise Gramsci for his idea and use him as justification to their unconventional methods of protest. This activist approach is an important factor in the study of anti-globalist and postmodern civil movement because it can serve as a theoretical background to their activity, organization and protest methods.

Taking both approach into consideration Mary Kaldor’s definition on global civil society appears to be the most accurate. It says that global civil society is the sphere between the family, the state and the market with institutions, organizations, networks and associations operating beyond the borders of national societies, political systems and domestic economies.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{35} ANHEIER, Helmuth, GLASIUS, Marlies, KALDOR, Mary (2004)- A globális civil társadalom bemutatása in ANHEIER, Helmuth, GLASIUS, Marlies, KALDOR, Mary- Globális Civil Társadalom 1., Civil Szellem, Budapest p. 38.
2. SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY

2.1 Social movements and their significance in global civil society

2.1.1 The place of social movements in global civil society

Social movements are in the focus of social sciences for a long time now and there is still no official, generally accepted definition of them. Theorists from different disciplines with diverse ideological backgrounds emphasize different parts or characteristics of social movements which makes it hard to conduct one definition.

Mario Diani tried to synthesize the existing theories to make a new definition. As he finally stated, social movements are not organizations, although organizations can be part of a movement. So ’social movement’ is not a steady notion that scholars and academics can put under the microscope and examine its characteristics. It means more of a process, and ongoing procedure to form something, to work together and act as one.

Social movements played an important role in civil activism as they were the most common examples of active citizenship. Labour organisations and the ongoing struggle of the working class for political and social rights and benefits were the first social movements challenging the state and advocating the needs of a social entity, the working class. During the cold war period, these labour organizations were the prevalent types of social movements overshadowing other, less organized and collectively less supported movements such as the women’s right movement. As welfare states emerged and trade unions and labour organizations became official actors in the policy making process they gradually lost their social movement character. They represented the interests of a well defined social class within organized, legally defined frames and they soon became closely linked to political parties and bureaucratic institutions.

The theory of global civil society became especially relevant after the downfall of communism and that is also the period when new kind of social movements emerged and the old ones transformed significantly. After 1989, ideology could not serve as the resource of suppressing critical voices and the need for change anymore. Social movements, new political parties, NGOs and civil networks have risen at the end of the communist era in Eastern Europe to call for a transition in the political and economic

38 Ibid.
agenda. These were early and only national forms of social movements (like Solidarity in Poland or the ’népi’ or ’urbánus’ movement in Hungary) but they created a new political environment to a functioning civil society in these ideologically oppressed, anti-democratic states.

New kind of international conflicts and social problems appeared with the spread of globalization especially around the millennium. This brought the transnationalisation of these civil movements to deal with the new problems. Demonstrations against global capitalism and international terrorism (or military force in general) interconnected different non-govermental actors from different countries in pursuit of a common goal39. The practical organization of these protests required cooperation and permanent contact between participating organizations and NGOs which practically founded the new movement of social organizations on issues of globalization.

Consequently, local, national social movements formed transnational networks and unofficial cooperations to focus on events with conflictual interactions of world power and their opponents,40 as well as to work on alternative solutions and campaigns to new global issues. They built new links among actors with different profile in civil society, connected them with the representatives of power and international organizations and made international institutional resources available to unofficially organized movements.41

2.1.2. Global social movements

National civil activism before the spread of globalization concerned local, particular goals connected to the politics of national governments. The involvement of social movements and NGOs in protests and demonstrations depended on their institutional backgrounds. Formal, professional movements like trade unions or professional associations tried to connect to governments and state officials to reach their goals by debate. This kind of activism required professionals working for civil associations who knew the legal and governmental background of decisions and also had an overview of public and local needs. Some theorist call these social movements

41 KECK, Margaret E., SIKKINK, Kathyrin: Activists beyon borders, Cornell University Press, 1998
’advocacy networks’ because their aim was to represent deprived, isolated parts of society to the authorities and fight for their claims. Professional representation gradually spilt over to transnational levels and culminated in the INGOs participation in the work of international organizations.

Globalization helped those small, insignificant local social movements who had rather small part in advocating public needs to rise and find a new function. Activists and supporters of social movements state that the mission of social movements today is to reach the individuals and motivate them to take action. Professional NGOs can do the official consultations with governments while social movements should mobilize the public in favour of particular goals, campaign or events. Active citizenship, as the activist approach of global civil society states, can balance the power of the state and give legitimacy to those movements calling for change on national and later on international level. Recent years brought these tendencies to Hungary as well. Street protests, labour demonstrations, petitions and referendums are now official parts of the political repertoire and social movements made this possible. Student organizations, movements for the free press or against the amendments of the constitution could more or less successfully mobilize passive citizens to raise their voice and pressure governments.

This is also an important role of new global social movements. Global social movements, that link together several different associations or civil activist beyond borders and national concerns have a special role in civil society’s actions and events. As the example of the Genoa G8 summit or the battle of Seattle shows, global social movements have absolutely different means and methods to pressure decision makers and promote alternatives than professional NGOs. As we will see in following chapters, institutional and organizational potentials of social movements can not make them the competitors of professional INGOs or advocacy networks in the field of debate or lobby but they do not mean to do so. Mobilizations, intense media presentation and permanent civil activism is what they aim for and what would make them an essential actor of civil activism.

2.2 Special features of the global social movements
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Most of the academics of the social movement theory seem to agree on three main characteristics of social movements. These can be the foundations of a general definition as well as standpoints to compare, contrast and analyse different kinds of social movements.

2.2.1 Networks:

Diani defines social movement as a network of informal interactions between plurality of individuals, groups and different kind of organizations. This is an important statement, because the new type of network organization is one of the things that distinguishes new global social movements from the classic ones. Classic social movements were organized locally, connection only existed between geographically close organizations with more or less the same profile or activist background. The lack of institutions and organizational hierarchy made it impossible to form a network between isolated, heterogenous movements. Connections and partnerships were designed vertically between different levels of the same movement, mostly from the top to the bottom.

Telecommunication revolution, the Internet, social media and cheap public transportation opened new fields of cooperation between social movements. Activist should not necessarily live in the same region or even in the same country to work together or communicate regularly anymore. Supporters should not necessarily go out to the streets to protest, they can sign petitions online or follow protest happenings by live streams. Such cheap and widespread technologies as conference calls, Skype or groups on Facebook help connect and form new, horizontal networks within and between social movements. Critics of this idea emphasize that Internet access or even cell phone connection is still not available in every part of the world, or if it is, it can controlled or monitored by the authorities as in China or certain muslim countries. However, the events of the Musulman Spring in the Middle East would have been impossible without bloggers, internet activists and students within and outside Egypt or Libia.
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On the other hand, network form of activism has an important role in securing the basic democratic, non-hierarchical character of global social movements. In a horizontal network, where different associations, movements and even individual activist join together, the dominancy of one over the others is impossible and unsustainable. Ad hoc leaderships may represent the movement as a whole or organize events in particular cases but in the long run every actor in a global social movement network is equal and has the same rights and possibilities to form the movement. With this form of cooperation every participating actor and movement can keep its autonomy and special character and work on a wider global movement at the same time. This makes them the appealing alternative of classic, hierarchical, bureaucratized movements or formally organized NGOs.

2.2.1 Shared identity:

Social movements consist of different local and regional movements, associations, activists and individuals from all over the world. They have diverse cultural, ethnical and economic background as well as many organizational and institutional form. From little activist communities fighting against indigenous rights in Latin-America to the huge, global network of the LMBTI movement, all kind of civil society actors can be parts of the same social movement.

As we saw in the previous paragraph, online and offline networks of movements are the practical and technological bases of such interconnections. Although, all of this would be useless without an ethical, moral or ideological principle that draws together and converges these different actors in a shared platform. Theorist Alberto Melucci emphasized this identity formation process as a determinative point in a social movement. As he stated, „social movements are ongoing processes to frame a shared identity” which later becomes the foundation of each and every action of the movement. According to Melucci, the permanent struggle to design a shared identity between the plurality of actors is as an important part of a social movement as the
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outcome of the procedure, a common platform, a shared identity. He also studied the different methods and opportunities to design such a common identity and concluded that grassroots politics and informal, local activist meetings whether they are online or offline can define their movements identity most effectively. During the organization of protests and petitions different actors of the movement should discuss which issues or problems they want to focus on, what kind of resources they have to mobilize to persuade the public because that would be the basis of their identity and also the character based on which they would be identified by the public. Media representation and academic arguments about the movements can also contribute to form the identity by placing the movement in the context of civil society and global activism.

We should not forget that different associations that are all parts of the global justice movement for example have their own, individual goals and activities to pursue along with the participation in the anti-globalist movement. Critics state that this is a serious disadvantage of social movements and one of the main reasons why they can never be effective parts of global politics. However, in my opinion this diversity and the independence of different actors serves rather as an advantage because the plurality of associations could reach and mobilize far more people from different communities for the common goal than one huge, homogenous organization alone. To stick to the example from the beginning of the paragraph, bringing landless, poor peasants of Latin-America and the LBTI people of the West together in one movement would be unimaginable without the identity-forming process of global social movements. Cooperation and the struggle to maintain their shared identity and common goals can be difficult but information technology can provide effective resources to manage the problem and activist and academics are constantly working on keeping these global movements together morally and ideologically as well.

2.2.3 Collective action:

Collective actions such as joint protests, parallel summits or shared petitions subserve the identification and self-determination of global social movements. Unlike NGOs or trade unions, social movements have no institutional background to frame an
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official and traditional characterisation and movement building process. As Eschle puts it, social movements are extra-institutional actors of global civil society and this being so their public actions and appearances determine their future role and significance in global politics. Their collective identity is based on their own identification of an opponent against which they try to set their own alternative agenda or call for social change. During the cold war era this opponent was the state and the role of social movements was to pressure governments for social, legislative or political change. Globalization widened the scope of social movement’s opponents. Nation-states remained in the target joined by transnational corporations, international financial and political institutions or military alliances (such as NATO). A well-defined collective opponent not only keeps the heterogenous participants of the same movement together but also targets their protests and collective actions. This proves really important in the 21st century when despite the growing number of alternative media sources mainstream news channels seem to neglect or trivialize the growing importance and influence of global social movements to world politics. A well-attended, highly visible public protest or worldwide petition could grab the attention of those social groups that only gain information through news magazines or traditional newspapers. Most of the neoliberal critics of social movements argue that these extraparliamentary political actions undermine democracy because they encourage the public to question their elected representatives or in global cases the sovereignty of their own country. In addition to that such neoliberal publicists as Thomas Friedmann state that social movements are self-appointed representatives of certain issues without professional or institutional background to act effectively for their purpose. This argument clearly shows that most of the critics of global social movements or the critics and skeptics of global civil society could not realize that the monopoly of parliaments and international institutions to represent public interest is now outdated and there is a clearly visible claim and intention from the public to be more closely involved in political decisions.

52 ESCHLE, Catherine- Constructing ‘the anti-globalization movement’, International Journal of Peace Studies, Volume 9 Number 1, 2004
55 ESCHLE, Catherine- Constructing ‘the anti-globalization movement’, International Journal of Peace Studies, Volume 9 Number 1, 2004
and social changes. Global social movements try to represent these groups of society and the growing number of participants and supporters of global protests gives legitimacy to their existence. Collective action means unconventional ways of protest and representation most of the times because global social movements are now in a period when they have to design their own action repertoires and protest methods. Harmful incidents and radical actions may decrease the popularity or support of these movements but they are unavoidable parts of the movements-formation process. Despite all the critics and the negative side-effects of collective actions they have an important role in the process that Richar Falk calls „globalization from below“ where the actions of civil groups and the needs of society forms the global political agenda instead of transnational corporations or small groups of powerful states.

3. THE MOVEMENT OF THE ALTER-GLOBALISTS

3.1 Introduction to the movement

3.1.1 Names and definitions

The emerging movement of the anti-globalists is often defined as the movement of movements simply because it is a complex social movement network with various participants from every side and level of the civil spectrum with extensive authority and individual goals. The name ‘anti-globalist’ was given to the movement by its critics. Activist and supporters does not like this name because they state that they do not oppose globalization as a whole but some of its aspects, especially neoliberal global economy and monolithic cultural globalization. They use the terms global justice movement or alter-globalization movement which is more accurate to represent their relation to globalization. In further parts of this thesis I will use the name alter-globalization movement to emphasize its commitment to alternative ideas and solutions of global problems.

We have no official name of the movement nor an official organization or association to call if we want to present the alter-globalist movement. This is certainly
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an unique characteristic of the movement, having no leaders, dominant organizations or professionally developed institutional network. Could we even call them a movement, then? The previous chapter drew up three main standpoints: networks, shared identity and collective action to define and characterize a movement. I would use these three main points to decide whether we could call the struggles of the alter-globalists a movement.

First of all, a widespread horizontal network is a key element to a global social movement to help mobilize their members and keep them in connection with the organization. Venter and Swart call the networks of the alter-globalist a *Direct Action Network*[^60] where decentralized, directly democratic decisions are made to manage and organize particular protests and summits against neoliberal capitalism. They do not have a permanent institutional system to operate the actions of the movement instead they use almost every form of telecommunication to instantly mobilize their members and supporters in case of a direct action. This ad hoc mobilization system is given to the movements because it consists mainly of grassroots participants and new social movements with their horizontal organizations and sovereign decisionmaking[^61]. In the case of People’s Global Action for example, which is the coordination network of various anti-WTO and alter-globalist protests (in Prague or Geneva), the dominant role of coordination was given to the organization only to the short time of the protests to mobilize activist groups and represent the movement’s ideas in the media. They elected temporary councils to make practical decisions during the campaigns but their mandate lasted only till the end of the protest[^62]. Naomi Klein, who is often called the spokeswomen of the alter-globalists said that these post-modern political protests methods were not necessarily worse or less effective to fight for an issue just because power politics do not use or can not understand them[^63]. With this argument she answered to the critics of the alter-globalist who questioned the competence and efficiency of a leaderless social movement[^64]. They are right when they state that these
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movements lack any professional organizational form and in some cases legal personality or official membership but they have the support of certain social classes which gives them political and organizational legitimacy to represent their interests.

Shared identity as a fundamental part of a new social movement can be a critical element in the alter-globalization movement. The number of participants within the movement is constantly changing but their diversity is inevitable. Left wing anarchists, far-right radicals and fundamentalists work together with trade unions, environmentalists and human rights activists in the same movement. The basis of their identity is the opposition of corporate capitalist oppression, the rule of neoliberal trade and finance and their supporting international organizations like World Trade Organization or International Monetary Fund. Owing to the heterogeneity of the participants there are issues concerning these oppositions that are unresolved within the movement. They oppose the governing rule of financial institutions in global economy but they do not agree on how to change this. Some moderate reformist groups suggest profound institutional and democratic reform and transformation while anarchists or localists claim the abolition of such international organizations. Or more fundamentally, they have very different approaches to capitalism. Localist and many extreme-left movements deny the monopoly of capitalist economic order while others only want regulations and supervision to keep global capitalism under control. Instead of ideology-based conflicts between different participating movements alter-globalists try to articulate their interests and represent global solidarity with united actions without regards to political or ideological identity. It is also a post-modern characteristics of the alter-globalist movement and also very unprecedented in the existing global political system.

Owing to their resource mobilization capacities and cyber-activist networks collective action is the strength of the alter-globalization movement. As in the street protests of Seattle or Prague they could mobilize thousands of people form all over the world within a short period of time. These grand protests of the alter-globalists are very different from the classic social movement or labour protests of the cold war era. Nowadays, street marches or sitting strikes are just a small part of the action repertoire. From parallel summits like the World Social Forum to radical blocades and street
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‘battles’ alter-globalist could use many form of resistance to raise their voice and increase their visibility in mass media. Although, most of the movements of the alter-globalists considers itself non-violent there are cases when even those protests could radicalize and challenge the authorities\textsuperscript{67}. During the battle of Seattle in 1999 activists and street demonstrations were oppressed by brutal and unnecessary police attacks using tear gas and direct violence against peaceful protesters. Consequently many movement and activist thought that they should radicalize their action against political oppression. Anarchist groups started to attack the shops and headquarters of transnational companies like Nike or Starbucks that they regarded as the representatives of corporate capitalist rule\textsuperscript{68}. Most of the protesters however, remained peaceful not giving the chance to neoliberal politicians to call them vandal rebels or radicals with 60s envy\textsuperscript{69}. They realize that collective action is their greatest strength against corporate power which they should not jeopardize in favour of some spectacular or scandalous protest action that would appear in the six o’clock news.

The alter-globalist movement has a strong horizontal network to mobilize masses, shares a common identity with every member of the movement against neoliberal capitalism and financial institutions and most importantly it has strong capabilities to organize collective actions to promote its goals and visions therefore it could definitely be regarded as a global social movement.

\textbf{3.1.2. History of the movement}

„It did not start in Seattle” says Engler\textsuperscript{70} and he is right because the history of the alter-globalist movement goes back to the beginning of the globalization process. Some academics state that various protests in third world countries against colonialism in the 20th century were the ancestors of the alter-globalist movement because they also opposed the expansion of capitalism and world trade\textsuperscript{71}. However, colonialistic and later
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neocolonialistic traditions were more like state-financed strategies to increase particular states’ power in the world. This colonial approach is questionable also because it does not regard the ideological expansion of communism as a colonialistic tradition although it is now clear that materialistic and economic reasons laid behind the Soviet Union’s ideological expansions for example in the Middle-East (Afghanistan) as well.

The history of the alter-globalization movement started more likely around the end of the cold war era, together with the transition of other social movements. During the cold war, socialdemocratic and neocommunist traditions ruled anti-capitalist protests which could not reach further than the borders of the nation-states. The first turning point however was the collapse of the Bretton Woods economics and finance system in the 1970s. Left-wing social movements and political parties regarded the Bretton Woods institutions as centralized, monolithic global organizations serving corporate and US interests over the rest of the world so they welcomed the changes in the system during Nixon’s presidency.

When the ideological divide of the world ended, new kind of conflicts emerged. Global crises like the one in Argentina in 1992 or later in Russia raised concerns about the existing global capitalism and finance order. South-America „lost” a decade with the failure of the universalistic austerity measures pressured by the IMF and World Bank while social problems proliferated in the region. Along with the negotiations about the North American Free Trade Association a new, half-militant social movement was born in 1994 to fight for the rights of deprived, impoverished indigenous people of Mexico. Zapatistas blamed free trade and corporate capitalism for the growing inequalities and social problems all over Latin-America and claimed radical change and democratic control. Their movement was very different from the protests of students and labour unions from developed countries against the employment policies and working conditions of transnational corporations. The Zapatistas were directly affected by globalization and global capitalism.
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The negotiations about NAFTA launched the protests of the Zapatistas while the global movements of the alter-globalist emerged during the debates about GATT and later the WTO. November 30 in 1999 in Seattle is now a historical date. The ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization was held in the United States to imply new regulations helping the expansion of free trade, free movement of capital and strengthen the legal rules protecting intellectual property rights. These measures could have changed the nature of global capitalism profoundly, that is why so many social movement and activist decided to act and try to prevent a new agreement. The growing interdependencies in global capitalism caused unprecedented inequalities and differences between developing and developed countries. The ideological clash between neoliberals and alter-globalist reached a point where global civil society had to act and form a global resistance network against neoliberalism. The protest of Seattle escalated quickly and the movement that only mobilized about 25 activists in the beginning become a global social movement with 700 participating organizations mobilizing 100,000 activists and protesters.

The success of Seattle showed the movement that it needs development and organization however, it never aimed to be a professional, official movement. Although, participating associations become specialised to different tasks. Some organized workshops and trainings to activist while others worked on fundraising events and professional debates.

In 2001 as an answer to the meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos, alter-globalists organized the first World Social Forum summit in Porto Allegre. This was insofar the biggest meeting of alter-globalist movements with the participation of 100,000 activists of different organizations from all over the world. The summit was a forum on third world debt policies, labour and social conditions, free trade critics and direct protest actions. The World Social Forum is now an annual meeting point of the alter-globalist examining the most recent problems of economic globalization.

The 9/11 terrorist attacks against World Trade Center and Pentagon paused the evolution of the alter-globalist movement. The shock of international terrorism and

religious fundamentalism raised concerns even within activist communities wether they should continue their struggle against corporate capitalism⁷⁹. They did not want to be mixed up with fundamentalist groups although they had some shared issues on global capitalism. Finally the movement decided on continuing their work on protests and parallel summits with the permanent work of organizations on certain global issues such as Jubilee 2000’s struggle to renegotiate third world debts and strenghen local communities agains corporate finance influences.

The latest form of alter-globalist resistance is the Occupy Wall Street movement that started in 2011 in New York. They attack financial institutions and the rule of a small group of corporate businessmen and neoliberal politicians over the vast majority of people. Their motto, “We are the 99%” hints that they also oppose the undemocratic and uncontrolled power of transnational corporations over world politics and global leaders. Occupy Wall Street is a worldwide movement of the alter-globalist with greater influences on power politics that it may seem at first. They maintain a permanent battle against neoliberalism and global capitalism in the especially crucial period of an economic crisis when alternative voices could more easily be heard.

Recently, the alter-globalist movement seems to find its place in global civil society. It reached a clear visibility thanks to social media devices and creative activist campaigngs. G8/G20 summits or global finance meetings are now accompanied with alter-glob protests and parallel summits everywhere. Occupy Wall Street has its own column or online report blog in the pages ot The Guardian and other influential media products. People know that an ongoing struggle against neoliberalism for economic equality exists and they can easily find a way to support these protests. In my oppinion it as a huge achievement in so little time as 20-30 years.

3.2 Issues of the alter-globalists

3.2.1 Free treade and the borders of market

Behind the clash of neoliberals and alter-globalists exists a fundamental desagreement on market and economy. This disagreement has driven the history of economics in the past two centuries and has an effect on the alter-globalists movements

as well. With globalization, the boarders of markets expanded and international capital conquered new territories. Foreign direct investments reached developing countries and had huge effects on their economics structure. The cleavage between neoliberals and alter-globalists lies in the understanding of this process. Neoliberals think that market is a self-governing entity that designs the rules and drives the actors in international economy. Capital flows and direct investments bring welfare and technology to developing countries while as Thomas Friedman writes in his book providing them with education and employment. Therefore free trade and neoliberal self-governing market economy is the best way to handle globalization and fight inequalities. Existing problems of the global economy are the results of the protectionist measures of nation-states as well as the successful lobby activities of anti-globalist groups. They seek new measures abolishing trade barriers to extend liberal marked economy (and in their opinion welfare capitalism) to developing countries.

Alter-globalists question this approach in several points. They see market as an economic institution that needs regulation and supervision just as well as any other economics institutions. Their approach is based on some historical examples when market needed state intervention to survive or prevent a crisis. They share Keynes’ idea on an ideally mixed economy with state regulation and welfare programs. Globalization, on the other hand, is a controversial phenomenon that has negative effects, too. Free trade and international capital flow conquers territories unprepared for capitalist rules and market tendencies. History proves them right in this point as well. The Argentinian or East-Asian financial crises showed the results of the universalised neoliberal economic program of the IMF and World Bank with no regards for national institutional capacities or economics structures. (also known as the Washington Consensus). All in all, alter-globalists blame neoliberal market economy for global economic crises and growing inequalities. Globalization itself has nothing to do with these negative effects that is why it is misleading to call alter-globalists anti-globalists as neoliberals often do.

Opponents of neoliberalism can not be called protectionists or nationalists because they
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do not want to set barriers or build walls against international trade. They question the motives and the nature of the WTO measures because they only seek more profit and investment opportunity to TNCs regardless of the social and political effects of such measures\textsuperscript{85}. What alter-globalists want, for which they organize protests and parallel meetings is to raise attention to the socio-cultural effects of neoliberal capitalism. To pressure WTO and the Bretton Woods twins to consider labour and wage regulations, working condition policies as well as free trade agreements so that globalization and international economy would benefit more than just a small, already developed part of the world.

3.2.2 International institutions and world politics

International institutions are in the focus of the alter-globalist movement because of their political significance. They gain more and more power over global economy while their leaders and decision makers were not elected by the public. They are not accountable, no one knows whom they owe responsibility and they do not represent the interest of the citizens over transnational corporations. Moreover they outrule nation-states and reduce their authority over economic and trade policies.\textsuperscript{86} IMF and World Bank has huge influence on governments and able to force them to change their economic policies according to international corporate interests while states has fewer opportunities to control these international institutions. Counter to their growing influence and power they remain relatively far away from citizens and their supervision. People do not know their leaders, can not follow their meetings and do not understand the effect of their decisions. Those trade agreement that WTO leaders negotiate has huge effects on people’s life and working conditions and yet they have no information about them or influence in the decision making process.\textsuperscript{87} During the Battle of Seattle activists tried to get in to the Opening Ceremony of the WTO ministerial meeting to emphasize that others than corporate leaders and state bureaucrats should be part of the negotiations as well. Police threw them out of the conference room and mainstream media called them vandal, rebel anarchists, although they articulated a general
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democratic claim. This attitude towards the democratic demands of alter-globalists seems quite ironic knowing that the United States and the developed West likes to play the role of the greatest defender and advocate of democracy in the world. As Venter and Swart wrote authorites were willing to restrict basic political rights when business interests were threatened. 88 Alter-globalists criticize these tendencies and question the legitimacies of such organizations that have no democratic control or accountability.

Aside from international finance institutions alter-globalists seek wider democracy and democratic control over international politics and economy in general. They try to set an example by their own organization forms which lack any dominance or official leadership and sticks to basic democratic decisionmaking. They have resilient, radical democratic standards 89 to promote political and ideological diversity. Neoliberal capitalism gained control over almost every aspect of people’s life through consumerism. Gramsci regarded the fascist authoritarian state as the ruler over every part of a citizen’s life and now it is consumer capitalism that penetrates peoples’ private life 90. Alter-globalists therefore try to follow Gramsci’s advice and form not a political party but a civil social movement to promote mass democracy and resistance against capitalist power 91.

Neoliberals state that their way of handling globalization would bring democracy and welfare to everyone by extending the borders of capitalism but they do not understand that corporate capitalism is just another, little less ideological form of oppression if it is not welcomed or naturally developed. The answer of the alter-globalists to their oppression is a whole new repertoire of postmodern resistance from civil disobedience to civil protests and direct actions.

3.2.3. Social and cultural consequences

The alter-globalization movement is a social movement representing the interests and claims of certain social classes. Opposing neoliberal capitalism does not only mean the opposition of free trade agreements or uncontrolled capital investments. It also contains fighting the negative socio-cultural effects of neoliberal global

capitalism. When neoliberals think that their free trade agreements and market-opening project would only bring welfare to developing countries they do not face the possible negative consequences.

Adjustment to market economy without necessary structural and institutional, not to mention, social transition can cause serious damages to a country. New labour conditions without social changes could cause social reproduction crises because people are not ready to face new challenges and conditions given to them by capitalist corporations\textsuperscript{92}. That is why in South-America or in India women, elderly or disabled people face deprivation and discrimination. Social benefits are not given to them anymore but corporate capitalism does not need them either. And this is just one example to the possible negative effects to market capitalism without social solidarity.

Advocates of western democracies and market capitalism state that the western model is the only way of living in welfare and freedom\textsuperscript{93}. Alter-globalists on the other hand support the diversity of ways of life and the right for people and societies to choose this way of life themselves. Forcing democracies to states who are not ready to imply democratic regulations have caused the emergence of terrorist, fundamentalist and radical nationalist groups all over the world already.

Alter-globalists say that globalization created an international order where there can be many forms of democracy as well as many forms of capitalism or economics governance. They claim back the national authorities of the nation-states to decide their own political and economics goals and policies\textsuperscript{94}.

In the social level alter-globalists criticize the mono-cultural, mass media driven cultural pattern that neoliberals often promote. Thomas Friedman may find it remarkable that he could buy the same two dollar McDonald’s hamburger in Cairo and New York but those Muslim employees who are forced to sell and work with pork against their religious regulations are not so enthusiastic about global culture. Alter-globalists welcome globalization’s effect on telecommunication that helped the interaction between cultures and ethnic groups but do not support the universalising tendencies of corporate capitalism.
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3.3 Groups of the alter-globalists

Desai and Said distinguished four different global social movement attitudes towards globalization: isolationist/localist, supporter, reformist and alternative attitudes. Isolationists, reformists and alternatives together form the global justice movement while supporters represent their neoliberal opposition.

Every group has influential representatives from academic and political circles as well as transnational movements and activist networks. They all consider globalization and global capitalism as parallel concepts so they usually do not distinguish the two term. Therefore in the following paragraph globalization and global capitalism work as synonyms.

3.3.1. Supporters:

The first group of civil associations, professional commissions, individuals and international media is the supporters group. They consider globalization and global capitalism a beneficial phenomenon that will bring welfare, democracy and individual freedom to all parts of the world. They emphasize the positive effects of free trade, the free movement of capital and people as powerful incentives of growth. In their opinion international financial and economic organizations such as the International Monetary Fund or the World Trade Organization are indispensable to secure free trade and financial order in the world economy. Journalist Thomas Friedmann wrote a whole book to prove the positive effect of global free trade in which he argued that transnational corporations would bring technology, know-how and political infrastructure to the developing countries while benefitting the economies of the developed world. The International Financial Institution Advisory Commission, also known as the Meltzer Commission advised the US government to call for a reform in the IMF and the WTO to gain wider control and authority to ensure all the necessary conditions to worldwide free trade and capital investment. This group has a powerful influence on decision makers and economic power holders and uses its extended media.
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connection network to promote its idea. As an answer to the negative effects of globalization supporters suggest wider liberalization in governmental institutions, more agreements ensuring free trade and capital investment as well as state’s retreat from economic and welfare measures and regulations\textsuperscript{98}. Altogether they are the representatives of the classic neoliberal economic theory with the support of corporate capitalism and international financial institutions. Just as Francis Fukuyama stated that liberal democracy is the only legitimate political system\textsuperscript{99}, neoliberal supporters argue that there is no successful alternative to corporate capitalism and economic liberalisation. They object any socialdemocratic or reformist approach to globalization and accuse everyone of protectionism who suggests control or regulation over transnational corporations and speculative capital investments. Not only powerful politicians and journalists share this idea about capitalism and global economy but a relevant part of Western society considers themselves neoliberal and supports free trade discussions.

\textbf{3.3.2. Reformists:}

This group is the most heterogenous including movements, organizations, commissions, professional networks as well as individual activists and theoretics. Their idea of globalization is quite popular because they represent a rather moderate ideology. Their main aim is to balance the advantages and disadvantages of globalization and reform the institutions dealing with global issues. Sustainable development, state financed welfare programs and traditional socialdemocratic measures mixed with new concepts of capital investments and trade control form the basics of these movements. Just like the supporters group they also favor international organizations but for an entirely different reason. Their main belief is that global governance and international institutions could control global capitalism and help reduce economic inequalities\textsuperscript{100}. However, they do not believe in \textit{laissez faire} but rather share Keynes idea of a mixed economy with equal participation and control from private and public sides\textsuperscript{101}. As one

\textsuperscript{99} FUKUYAMA, Francis- The end of history and the last man, Simon and Schuster, New York, 2006
\textsuperscript{100} DESAI, Meghnad, SAID, Yahia- The new anti-capitalist movement, money and global civil society in ANHEIER, H, GLASIUS, M., KALDOR, M.- Global civil society yearbook 2001 vol. 1, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001
\textsuperscript{101} KEYNES, John Maynard- The general theory of employment, interests and money, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2011
of the world’s most famous philanthropists, George Soros is also a supporter of the reformist approach. He argued in many of his interviews and university lectures as well as in his book\textsuperscript{102} that uncontrolled capitalism and unlimited fair trade could and already have caused global economic and social crises. Being a powerful businessman himself he clearly not opposes global capitalism as a whole but suggests measures and institutions to control its effects. Having many economists and academists in the movement reformists try to develop practical solutions to particular economic and social problems without using a certain ideology as a justification. The concept of the Tobin tax, for example, imposed on currency transactions could be one of these practical measures. The idea, proposed by James Tobin was to impose a tax to currency transactions and use the income to fight poverty and inequalities\textsuperscript{103}. Reformists call for a global New Deal\textsuperscript{104} to regulate corporations and financial transactions as well as to organize projects and finance investments reducing global inequalities and the lag of the developing countries from western democracies.

The greatest result of this movements is that they could bring together several alternative approaches to globalization without radical claims or actions. In realist representatives of power it already generated trust and sympathy for these ideas which could mean that they would influence international decisionmakers in the future.

3.3.3. Isolationists/localists:

This next movement represents a much more radical approach to globalization than reformists’. They oppose international capitalism and free trade as a whole and try to isolate themselves from the effects of global capitalism.\textsuperscript{105} One of the world’s most influential academist, Noam Chomsky, who is often considered as a supporter of the localist movement stated in an interview that free trade has no benefits to any countries wether it is a developed or a third world country and free movement of people or capital

\textsuperscript{102}Soros, George- The crisis of global capitalism, Public Affaires, 1999
\textsuperscript{153-159}.
has obvious moral obstacles that neoliberals seem to ignore. Following Chomsky’s argument, isolationists suggest localization and protectionist measures instead of international free trade, foreign investments or development projects. It is important to know that this does not mean old-fashioned protectionism but rather an alternative approach where developing countries try to use their own given natural and human resources instead of importing FDI and transnational capital.

Their understanding of globalization does not only include its economic dimensions but studies its cultural and social effects as well. Localists or isolationists oppose global consumer culture and cultural uniformisation as the evident effects of corporate capitalism and uncontrolled international trade. In his book, Colin Hines argues that competitiveness is the most important goal of a developing country and suggests alternative ideas to gain local self-sufficiency without engaging in debts and serving corporate interests. Isolationists believe that structural reforms in international organizations are not going to solve the problem of poverty and inequalities therefore they suggest the abolition of such organizations as IMF or WTO. They argue that basic democracy and subsidiarity serves public interests the most effective way therefore they firmly reject reformists’ idea about global governance and international institutions. In their approach, self-sufficient production and protectionist economic policies could protect the states from the negative effect of globalization and in the meantime they can serve the revival of local communities and cultural traditions. This movement is evidently the less visible of the four because they often oppose to those telecommunication and internet resources that other anti-globalization movements successfully use to promote their ideas. Although localist have less influence on global politics, such advocates as Noam Chomsky or Walden Bello can promote their ideology in mainstream forums.

3.3.4. Alternatives:

Seattle, Washington, Prague, Porto Alegre. These are the cities where alternatives protested against global capitalism and the power of economics superstates.

---


This movement is the hardest to characterize having no clear leaders, orgnaizational forms or mutual ideology\textsuperscript{109}. They oppose every form of corporate capitalism and global political power but not necessarily willing to work on alternative solutions. Underground networks, activist communities and military movements form the core of the alternative group with ad hoc protests and intense social media representation. Just like localists they also try to protect cultural diversity and political autonomy from the uniformizing effect of globalization. Their activists succesfully use popular culture and mass media to present the negative effects of a monolitic, uniformised global economic and social order.\textsuperscript{110} Provocative posters, graffitis, protest songs or performances criticizing transnational corporations try to raise attention to the topic of cultural globalization and consumerism. Alternatives rarely have visions or professional ideas to solve global problems but they use mass media and new telecommunication networks most successfully to reach people with their ideology. Owing to their postmodern protest repertoires young people from developing countries and university students from the corporate West both support their protests and share their visions. We can find alternatives on the meetings of the World Social Forum as well as out in the streets protesting with labour organizations or reformist groups. Neoliberals criticize them most of the times calling them ’flat-Earthers’\textsuperscript{111} or naive hippies of ’68 because they do not demand one exclusive solution or favour a specific ideology. They criticize the nature of globalization and try to raise people’s attention to it.

CONCLUSION

Civil society has gone through a serious transformation in the last four centuries. From a legally conducted civil political entity it has gradually became a counterpart of the state and the forum of civil participation and political activism. The bureaucratic traditions of the absolutistic states of the 19th century contributed to this transformation as well as the authoritarian regimes in the 20th century. By the end of this transformation civil society became a third force counter to the state and the market to

balance and control their authority over social relations. I detailed the major thoughts on the theory of civil society in order to demonstrate the transition of it. By describing the theories of political philosophers from different historical periods I wanted to emphasize the effects of historical contexts and social structures on the prevailing notions of civil society.

Globalization overdrawn the borders and structures of civil society therefore a new definition was needed on global civil society. Although there are still serious disagreements over the nature of global civil society or its relation to other authorities it became clear that civil society sucessfully integrated into the new global order. We settled that globalization transformed the sturctures and network relations in civil society and not only internationalized its activity but also conducted a new global level to its organizations. Parallel to the systematic transformation global civil society found new issues to represent in a transnational level. These issues and problems could not be solved with national resources therefore global civil society organized transnational networks and movements to represent them. Environmental protection, the protection of human rights or the opposition of neoliberal capitalism have their own social movements and non-governmental organizations to pressure governments and international organizations to work on these problems.

As powerful and influential parts of civil society, social movements also transformed gradually alongside with globalization. Classic social movements of the nation-states represented different social groups and had entirely different action repertoires to reach their aims. Thes classic movements transformed into non-governmental organizations or, like labour organizations, became the official parts of policy making. However, new social movements emerged with changed structures and characteristics. Vertical networks and hierarchies of the classic social movements were replaced by horizontal transnational networks without hierarchies and leadership. The collective identity of these new movements where not conducted by the social class whom interests it represented but rather by the opponent they wanted to fight (for example transnational corporations or authoritarian dictatorships). The greatest change happened in the field of the collective action of these new social movements. Owing to the telecommunication revolution and the emergence of social media they had new resources to mobilize and reach their activists and supporters. Altogether
globalization widened the boarders of civil activity and helped them to reach new, sometimes isolated and invisible parts of global society.

Despite its positive effect on the systematic structures of civil society globalization remained a controversial phenomena for civil movements. The movement of the alter-globalists opposes the present nature of globalization and the neoliberal ideology that drives it. I tried to emphasize that the movement of the alter-globalists does not oppose globalization as a whole. That is the reason why I used the term *alter-globalist* instead of the more popular *anti-globalist*. My main aim was to show that there are several alternative vision on globalization that should be considered promoted by influential academists, journalists, economists of civil activists.

The goal of this thesis was to demonstrate the effects of globalization on civil society. I presented the milestones of the transition that globalization caused on civil society and social movements. It became clear that civil society has undergone the same transnationalizing processes that many other social and political institutions have, as well. is the result of transnationalizing By presenting the alter-globalist movement I wanted to show how many alternatives civil society has on globalization and how sucessfully it could promote them. The protests and parallel summits of the alter-globalists and their constant struggle against neoliberal supporters of global capitalism proves that global civil society has a more complex idea on globalization that consideres its social, cultural and systematic effects as well. I did not intend to take sides with them on condemning global capitalism or international institutions but the power of their movement and their unique fresh protest repertoires made them worhty of analisys.
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Szakdolgozatom elsősorban a globális civil társadalom kialakulását, a civil keretek között kifejlődőt és nemzetközi méretűvé erősödött társadalmai mozgalmak és ezeken belül is az alter-globalista mozgalmak kialakulását és jellemzőit vizsgálja. Legfőképpen arra keresi a választ, hogy miért vált ki olyan heves ellenállást és intenzív civil társadalmi reakciókat a globalizáció jelenlegi alakulása és hogyan képzelik el a globalizációt a civil társadalom szereplői.

A szakdolgozat első része azt vizsgálja meg, hogyan alakult át a klasszikus görög societas civilis fogalma a globális szinten működő nem kormányzati szereplők tevékenységét meghatározó terminussá. A civil társadalom fogalmának klasszikus megfelelője egy olyan politikai közösséget jelentett, amelynek tagjai politikailag aktívak és tevékenységüket, társadalmi és gazdasági életüket közösen meghatározott szabályok alkotják. Az ókori görög filozófia nagyjai, Platón és Arisztotelész nagyjából hasonlóan gondolkodtak a civil társadalom eszméjéről, amely főként arra szolgált, hogy megkülönböztesse a polisz civilizált lakóit más barbár népektől. A fogalomnak a nemzetállamok kialakulása és a kereszténység, mint meghatározó és befolyásos ideológia visszaszorulása adott új megközelítést. A felvilágosodás nagyjai, mint Locke vagy Kant a civil társadalmat mint a nemzetállamon belüli önszerveződő állampolgári közeget határozták meg, megalapozva ezzel egy máig jelenlévő iskolát, a civil társadalom államközpontú megközelítését.

Azt a modern meghatározást, amelyet később a globális civil társadalom teoretikusai is használtak Hegel és Gramsci alkották meg. Előbbi az abszolutista államhatalommal, míg utóbbi a fasiszta autoritárius állammal szembeni hatékony ellenállás zálogát látta a civil társadalomban. Ezzel a megközelítésükkel új, az állami és a gazdasági hatalommal párhuzamosan jelen lévő, azt ellensúlyozni hivatott erőtérként határozták meg a civil társadalmat. Olyan entitásként tekintettek rá, mely a család mikorközege és az állam valamint a piac erői között elhelyezkedő és azoktól független szervezeteket, intézményeket, közösségeket foglalja magába, és amely önkéntes
alapon, társadalmi érdekek érvényesítésére szerveződik. A globalizáció kialakulásáig és elterjedéséig ez a fogalom határozta meg a civil társadalom elméletét és a gyakorlatban is ezen elméletek mentén szerveződtek olyan klasszikus nem kormányzati szervezetek és társadalmi mozgalmak mint például a Nemzetközi Vöröskeresztt vagy a különböző szakszervezetek.

A globalizáció azonban a civil társadalom elméletét is átalakította. Mivel az államhatárok jelentőssége nagymértékben lecsökkent és a civil társadalom által képviselt társadalmi kérdések és követelések is globálissá váltak (emberi jogok, globális szegénység, nemzetközi terrorizmus) az államhoz viszonyuló meghatározás is túlhaladottá vált. A civil társadalom szereplői, melyek eddig nemzetállami szinten szerveződtek egy-egy konkrét cél elérsére vagy úgy képviseltetére, transznacionális hálózatokat kezdtek alkotni és tevékenységi körük is egyre komplexebbé vált. Ezért szükségessé vált kialakítani a globális civil társadalom definícióját, mely már nem az államhoz és annak intézményeihez viszonyítja magát, hanem a globális politikai rendszer része és a nemzetközi szinten felmerülő társadalmi kérdések felkarolása és képviselése a feladata. A definíció kialakítása nem alkotott egységes folyamatot, hiszen minden teoretikus vagy elméleti iskola a saját ideológiai-politikai beállítottságának megfelelően próbálta kialakítani a globális civil társadalom meghatározását. Létezik egyfelől a fogalom neoliberális, úgynevezett deskriptív megközelítése, amely a globális civil társadalomnak egy a nemzetközi szervezetek és döntéshozók tevékenységét kiegészítő, komplementer szerepet szán, elsősorban humanitárius célokra. A megközelítés nem enged teret azoknak az elképzeléseknak, melyek szívesen látnak a globális civil társadalom szereplőit a nemzetközi politikai döntéshozók sorában. A normatív vagy aktivista megközelítés ezzel szemben visszanyúlik a gramsciánus hagyományokhoz és sokkal aktívvabb szerepet szán a civil szervezeteknek és társadalmi mozgalmaknak a globális viszonyok alakításában. Haonlóan a klasszikus hegelianus állásponthoz, a normatív nézet szerint a globális civil társadalomnak a nemzetközi politikai és gazdasági élet szereplőinek ellensúlyaként kell működnie. Mivel ez a megközelítés áll közelebb a globális civil társadalom szereplőinek saját magukról alkotott elképzeléséhez, a szakdolgozat további részeiben én is ezt a megközelítést használok a civil társadalom bemutatására.

A következő nagy fejezet a társadalmi mozgalmak globális civil társadalmon belül betöltött szerepét vizsgálja. A társadalmi mozgalmak már a globalizáció előtt is fontos és jól látható részét képeztek a civil társadalomnak, gondoljunk csak a nemzeti szakszervezetek munkás érdekképviseletek szerepére a Nyugat-Európai jóléti rendszerek kialakításában. A globalizáció az ő szerepüket és intézményi struktúrájukat is átalakította. A nem-kormányzati szervezetek professzionális intézményei mellett nagy hangsúlyt kaptak a lazábban szerveződő, komplexebb kérdésekkel foglalkozó új globális társadalmi mozgalmak. A fejezet három, a későbbiek folyamán is használatos szempontot állít fel a társadalmi mozgalmak jellemzőinek vizsgálatára. A nemzetközi kapcsolatrendszer kialakítása és horizontálissá válása alapvető jellegzetessége a globális társadalmi mozgalmaknak, szemben a klasszikus civil mozgalmak hierarchizált, lokális kapcsolati hálóival. Ezek az új típusú hálózatok nélkülözhetetlen szerepet töltenek be a globális társadalmi mozgalmak heterogenizálódott és a világban szétszórtan elhelyezkedő tagságának mobilizálásában és egysége tömörítésében. Az egységesítést és a mobilizáció hatékonysságát segíti a következő jellemző, a közös identitás kialakítása is. Ez azért kulcsfontosságú, mert a modern társadalmi mozgalmakat különböző profilul, eltérő jellegzetességekkel bíró nemzeti, regionális és egészen kicsi, lokális közösségek, szervezetek és aktivista hálózatok alkotják. Az ő közös mozgósításuk csak úgy érhető el, ha világosan meghatározott a közös cél, amely érdekében fellépnek illetve azok a közös értékek és eszmék amelyek a tevékenységüket meghatározzák. Csak ez a két jellemző, a kapcsolati hálózat és a közös identitás megléte garantálhatja a közös akciók, kampányok sikerét, amely lényegében a társadalmi mozgalmak érdemi tevékenységét alkotja. A fejezet végére világossá válik, hogy a globális társadalmi mozgalmak sok mindenben eltérnek a klasszikus civil mozgalmaktól és ezeknek az eltéréseknél a kialakulásában a globalizáció és főként a globális kommunikációs hálózatok kialakulása komoly szerepet játszott.

Az utolsó nagy fejezet az alter-globalisták társadalmi mozgalmát vizsgálja. A globális civil társadalmon belül ők rendelkeznek a legkiterjedtebb és legátfogóbb hálózattal és ők képviselik leginkább azokat az ügyeket amely a globalizáció negatív következményeként jelentkeztek. Az előző fejezetben használt három szempont, a kapcsolati háló, a kollektív identitás és a közös akciók, segítségével sikerül bebizonyatni, hogy az alter-globalisták mozgalama valóban egy létező és elméletileg is megalapozott társadalmi mozgalom. A mozgalom történetének vizsgálata rámutat arra,
hogy milyen rövid idő, gyakorlatilag 20-30 éve leforgás alatt, izolált aktivisták tüntetéseiből egy jól szervezett, komoly, bár nem hivatalos tagállag és meghatározó mobilizációs képességekkel rendelkező mozgalom alakult ki, mely nem csak a G8/G20 tárgyalásokat kísérő tüntetéseken aktív, hanem olyan önálló rendezvényeket is sikerrel rendez meg mint az éves Szociális Világfórum. Az is jól meghatározható, hogy milyen célokért közdenek a mozgalomban részt vevő különöző szervezetek, egyesületek és aktivista csoportok. A mozgalom fontos törekvése a neoliberális eszmék visszaszorítása a globális gazdasági és pénzügyi életben valamint a Világkereskedelmi Szervezet (WTO) tevékenységének és intézkedéseinek felülvizsgálata. Emellett sürgetik a nemzetközi pénzügyi, gazdasági és politikai intézmények (pl IMF, Világbank) reformját és olyan szolidárissabb szemlélet meghonosítását, mely a gazdasági szempontok mellett a globális kapitalizmus társadalmi következményeire is tekintettel van. Az alterglobálisták egyes csoportjai emellett fontosnak tartják felhívni a figyelmet a globalizáció és az egyre elterjedtebbé váló fogyasztói kultúra negatív társadalmi, szociális és kulturális következményeire, melyek nem csak a fejlődő országok társadalmi struktúrájára lehetnek befolyással, de olyan veszélyes eszmék terjedését is elősegíthetik mint a vallási fanatizmus és fundamentalizmus. A fejezet azt is bemutatja, hogy bár egy globális társadalmi mozgalmat alkotnak, az alter-globalisták között is többféle megközelítés és alternatív globalizációs elképzelés is teret kap, kezdve a teljesen kapitalizmus-párti támogatók csoportjától a lokalisták vagy éppen az alternatívok csoportjaitól.

Végereedményben elmondható, hogy a globális civil társadalom nem jöhetett volna létre és erősödhetett volna világméretű politikai szereplővé a globalizáció hatásai nélkül, ahogy a társadalmi mozgalmak sem tudták volna kitágítani határaikat a telekommunikáció forradalma vagy a közösségi média előretörése nélkül. Azonban épp a civil társadalom az, amely fel tudja hivni a figyelmet a globalizáció és különösen a neoliberális kapitalizmus veszélyeire és visszásságaira. Az alter-globalisták jól szervezett és egyre népszerűbb mozgalmat pedig a bizonyíték lehet arra, hogy nem csak egyféleképpen alakítható a globális világrend és a szegénység, hátrányos megkülönböztetés, kízsákmányolás vagy épp a vallási fundamentalizmus sem szükségszerű velejárói a globalizálódó világrendnek.