Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies 2010 25 (1-2):49-66

Globalization and Alterglobalization: Global Dialectics and New Contours of Political Analysis?

DOMINIQUE CAOUETTE

ABSTRACT. In the shadow of the nation-state, transnational dynamics and contacts operating from a non-national logic have been always present and are even increasingly so. Nation-state has never completely controlled all kinds of crossborder transactions, whether it be those directed by large international conglomerates, migrants, and refugee flows, or even the variety of illegal activities of transnational criminal organizations, be it pirating, maritime or other, be it slave trade, organ trafficking or even the lucrative drug trade, and others. Today, one cannot work from a single level of abstraction that revolves around nation-states and the "national." Such focus would miss on a wide range of power relations above and beyond states that involve crossborder dynamics. The range of transnational interactions associated with the process of globalization and alterglobalization constitute genuine and important challenge to our understanding of global politics. In this article, I argue, that political analysts need to engage in multiscalar analysis (meaning the coexistence and co-constitution of various spaces—local, national, regional, and global) and that they must also recognize that it is heuristically fruitful to apprehend global processes in a dialectical fashion. In short, to grasp the enigma of globalization and of its antithesis alterglobalization requires exploring innovative conceptual and methodological approaches.

KEYWORDS. globalization · alterglobalizations · multiscalar analysis · identity · transnationalism

Introduction

In February 2003, on the day following peaceful demonstrations held around the world in protest of the American invasion of Iraq, the *New York Times* declared that there were two veritable world powers, one represented by American hegemony, and the other that of global civil society. Five years later, at the time of this writing, hundreds of "alterglobalization"[1] protesters were on the streets of Montreal on January 26 while the political and financial elites were meeting at the

World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. Braving winter chills, these militants participated along with thousands of others around the world at one of over 600 events organized to affirm and proclaim loudly that many forms of globalization are possible, that the ordinary citizen can express an opinion on the issues facing the planet, and that solidarity exists beyond national borders.

How can we comprehend globalization today as well as the different forms of alterglobalist resistance ? Can we build concepts and approaches that can better account for a wide range of global processes (for example, migration, tourism, climate change, agri-business, financial trading, global medias, etc.) that occur sometimes in parallel, beyond, or below the nation-state and international organizations?

If there is a contemporary problematic in political science for which no consensus exists regarding its signification, effects, and analytical implications, it must certainly be globalization (Durand, Martin, Placidi and Törnquist 2006; De Sernaclens 2005; Ghora-Gobin 2006; Scholte 2000) and its antithesis, the alterglobalization (Beck 2003; Dupuis-Deri 2009; Martell 2010). Certain historians, such as Hopkins (2002a), affirm that it is more productive to understand how globalization's processes and flows evolve through time to avoid the conceptual impasse that would result from analyzing it strictly as a function of the nation-state. Such specific political institution is much more recent, since it appears only in the seventeenth century in the flurry of treaties of Westphalia.[2] It has since functioned as a smokescreen or even as analytical diva, occupying the foreground while making us forget that all around the nation-state, a multitude of exchanges and social, cultural, economical, and political processes below and above the state have continued to exist and coexist.

In the shadow of the nation-state, transnational dynamics and contacts operating from a non-national logic have always been present and are even increasingly so.[3] Nation-state has never completely controlled all kinds of crossborder transactions, whether it be those directed by large international conglomerates, migrant and refugee flows, or even the variety of illegal activities of transnational criminal organizations, be it pirating, maritime, or other, be it slave trade, organ trafficking or even the lucrative drug trade.[4] Moreover, for a number of indigenous groups, such as those on the triple border of China, Laos, and Vietnam, the nation-state and its borders do not really make sense. These borders are crossed daily, not only at official border crossings but also across an entire network of exchange points (Michaud 2006;

Michaud and Forsyth 2010). The same is happening in Southern Philippines where Muslim traders cross back and forth the Celebes Sea, bringing a wide range of goods from Borneo to Mindanao and vice-versa. These situations are repeated all around the world, where cultural and community links remain much more meaningful and real than those of nations. In a similar way, more and more individuals are mobilizing across borders around shared values and norms (peace, human rights, sustainable development, social justice, gender equality, etc.) (Della Porta and Tarrow 2005; Dufour, Masson, and Caouette 2010; Tarrow 2005; and Vielajus 2009).

Today, a political scientist cannot work from a single level of abstraction, that would revolve around nation-states and the "national" because such focus would miss on a wide-range of power relations above and beyond states that involve cross-borders dynamics. As suggested by a range of scholars (among others, Cerny 2010; Green Cowles, Caporaso, and Risse 2001; Urry 2000), a multiscalar analysis is now necessary to account for and explain a wide range of transnational practices. Some, including Ulrich Beck (2003), suggest an approach rooted in a methodological cosmopolitanism, which is to say to no longer think of current dynamics in terms of methodological nationalism, but to radically modify the unit of analysis and the methodology used. In fact, the range of transnational interactions associated with the process of globalization and alterglobalization constitutes genuine and important challenge to our understanding of global politics.

In this article, I argue that an explicit and unique focus on the state and multilateral state institutions can be overly reductionist. Such myopic focus is being challenged by new approaches linked to political sociology and international relations (Beck 2003; Robinson 1998; Rosenau 2003) that adopt a transnational and multiscalar analytical lens. This position entails that the contemporary analysts accept to engage in multiscalar analysis (meaning the coexistence and co-constitution of various spaces, local, national, regional, and global) but also recognize that it is heuristically fruitful to apprehend global processes in a dialectical fashion. In short, to grasp the enigma of globalization and of its antithesis, alterglobalization, requires exploring innovative conceptual and methodological approaches.

To do so, I will examine and compare the key elements of the neoliberal globalization in its dominant forms (characterized by modernism, extension, and liberalization of capitalist markets,

concentration of horizontally and vertically integrated of transnational corporations, and of political power) versus its antithesis, alterglobalization (defined by norms of inclusive and participatory decision-making processes, sustainable and ecological development, multiculturalism, and postmodernism) as promoted by loosely defined global social justice movements.[5] From the following discussion, I hope to demonstrate, that it is increasingly necessary to break certain epistemological barriers, which have marked the study of international relations and comparative politics by including contemporary transnational dynamics and multiscalar analysis.[6]

Globalization, Transnational Relations, and Constructivism

The transnationalist perspective and the study of transnational dynamics are not new. Some of these approaches trace their roots in the works of international relations (IR) specialists, including Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (1972), who first argued for the role and importance of nonstate actors, including multinational firms, religious organizations, social movements, unions, NGOs, and even narco-trafficking and other illicit organizations, in the study of world politics.

Following the end of the Cold War and the acceleration of globalization flows, Thomas Risse-Kappen (1995), among others, argued to bring back "transnational relations back in." In making such suggestions, he was not alone but part of a growing movement of dissenting voices within IR and comparative politics that felt that a sole focus on the state (and substates) and international organizations could not account for a growing number of cross-borders dynamics and globalization (Lipschultz 1992; Rosenau 1990). The study of transnational relations, considered by many, including Thomas Risse-Kappen (1995), to be at the intersection of these two "agendas" of research, has rekindled the importance of understanding and explaining the role of nonstate actors and the determining place of norms at the heart of international relations.

These emerging perspectives on transnationalism and globalization—some focusing on global governance (Wilkinson 2005; Hewson and Sinclair 1999), corporate power (Soederberg 2010), or global resistance, transnational activism, and movements against corporate globalizations (Amoore 2005; Tarrow 2005; Juris 2008)—share a common self-awareness and humility in terms of what they aim and are capable of

explaining. Moving away from the classic and general theories of international relation (realism, liberalism, or Marxism), these approaches are more modest in what they claim to explain and account for (Battistella 2009; Éthier 2008). Nonetheless, these intermediate and critical theories (Edkins and Vaughan-Williams 2009; Wapner and Ruiz 2000), as opposed to grand narratives of classic paradigms, allow for original and refreshing understanding of contemporary global processes. In particular, they make space for multiscalar analysis (that implies the study of diverse and interconnected fields of power relations: local, regional, national, transnational, and global), postpositivism (that allows interrogating of the role and effects of ideas, identity, and norms in the construction of social realities), and methodologies that do not posit the nation-state as the central unit of analysis.

Within the corpus of new IR perspectives, constructivism appears to be a particular heuristic approach to understand and interpret transnational flows and the proposed global dialectics. Until the late 1980s, IR theories were largely isolated from the epistemological debates within social sciences. In contrast, constructivist perspectives are today at the heart of theoretical explorations on the meanings and the implications of globalization and alterglobalization. From its early formulations (Kratochwil 1989; Onuf 1989) to those closer to liberal and positivist approaches on an epistemological level (Wendt 1999); or those "farther out," closer to critical theories (Price and Reus-Smit 1998), constructivism appears as the privileged paradigm to unravel the study of globalization (Cameron and Palan 2004) and alterglobalization (De Sousa Santos 2004). On the one hand, the focus on the role of intersubjectivity, that is to say the importance of the co-constitution of reality as a product of social interaction appears to be particularly determinant to an understanding of globalization as object of alterglobalization resistance. On the other hand, constructivist approaches deployed on multiple scales (local, national, regional, global) can assist in identifying and explaining a wide range of alternative practices and norms as constituent parts of this multiform, plural, and fragmented alterglobalist movement. Constructivism is also particularly useful because it recognized that scales and spaces (local, regional, national, global) are products of social interaction. It is through social interaction and shared subjectivity, that an individual, a group, a social movement, or a coalition defines its level/space of contention. The same can be said whether it is the increasing importance

of identity or ideas such as social justice, fair trade, indigenous rights, food sovereignty, or sustainable development, it is essential to recognize that these are discursive and narrative constructions framed as antitheses to the dominant neoliberal globalization.

On a methodological level, the study of globalization and even more so alterglobalization presents a number of challenges. The first is at the level of unity of analysis. Should one favor a systematic approach such as that proposed by world-system theorists, which considers the capitalist world as a whole (Wallerstein 1974, 1980, 1989; Chase-Dunn and Babones 2006; Abu-Lughod 1989) or should we rather privilege a methodological transnationalism where phenomena such as migration, climate change, the international division of labour, food production, or even emerging issues of global health become the objects of analysis? In opting for the latter, one then accepts the existence of a multiplicity of levels of analysis that go from local to global as well as the national and the regional and processes and flows that are at work above and beyond the nation-state (Beck 2003; Cerny 1995; Rosenau 2003).

While arguing for such theoretical and methodological departures, I am not proposing to do away with state-centered analyses of global politics but rather that there is a need to enrich and complement those with more flexible conceptual approaches in order to explain new global phenomena and older ones that were overlooked in the past or understood only through methodological nationalism. To illustrate the relevance of such alternative analytical lenses, I chose to examine the current contours of neoliberal globalization and its antithesis, the "alterglobalization." In doing so, it is an opportunity to reveal that more than one form of globalization is currently at work and also that the idea of global dialectics might provide a creative way to illustrate the interconnectedness of the dominant capitalist globalization and the dissenting alterglobalization. In contrast with globalization where states actors and international organizations are central, alterglobalization is characterized by the importance of nonstate actors (indigenous movements, consumer's organizations, ecological coalitions, and transnational networks), and ideas and norms that informed our understanding of "global politics" and new forms of crossborder collective action. The growing importance of transnational nonstate actors, the diffusion of cosmopolitan ideas, and the diversity of local-global identities (for example, indigenous, ethnic, religious, pacifist, ecologist, ethical consumer) challenge the global governance discourse

that remains rooted in a state-centered perspective (Mittelman 2000; Wilkinson 2005).

Globalization or Globalizations

When we speak of globalization, the first element for reflection is to identify its characteristics since this notion suffers from conceptual elasticity, to the point where we sometimes question ourselves on the heuristic value of this idea or suggest that it might be more precise to speak of globalizations (Ghorra-Gobin 2006). As noted by Arac (2002, 35): "Globalization pluralizes: it opens up every local, national or regional culture to others and thereby produces 'many worlds'."

In the following paragraphs, I examine the dominant (hegemonic) form of globalization, oftentimes referred to as the capitalist neoliberal globalization. What are the elements of such contemporary globalization? A first observation is that the present form distinguishes itself from other historical periods. The compression of time and space underscores this current phase (Held et al. 1999; Scholte 2005). Thus, we are witnessing a major acceleration of change of all kinds (Appadurai 1991), through the Internet, among others, but also through the continuous dissemination of information, the possibility of speculating on international markets at any time of day, the reduced costs of transportation, which allow more and more people to travel around the world, even cultural products that circulate at an accelerated rate (films, music, literature, televised serials, and fast food). This compression of space and time is new and unprecedented in history (Harvey 1991).

Another aspect, certainly the more familiar, is the extension and universalization of capitalist relations, especially trade and financial exchanges. We need only think of the integration of the markets (Soederberg 2010), or look at the food industry (Calame 2008; Clapp and Cohen 2009). We can also look to the growing importance of products from Asia, particularly from China, or of the flow of migrant workers (Castles and Miller 2003). The proliferation of free-trade agreements and zones are surely other signs of the integration of national economies within a global economy. The economy, along with information technologies, specifically the extension of the markets, integration processes, and capitalist relations are certainly areas where the acceleration of time and the compression of space have become most evident. It is not a coincidence if these features are most often associated with the idea of globalization.

A third element of current globalization is the establishment of a normative global discourse organized around so-called universal norms (Hurrell 2007). These are evidently not neutral and many have attributed their origins and links to the West, particularly economic and political liberalism (Mann 1997). Other global norms that come to mind are individual human rights, freedom of the press, private property, free elections, free market economy, competitiveness, etc. (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998). Characteristically, these socially constructed liberal norms are constituted through discourse and a number of cognitive precepts that target atomized individuals, defined as historical subjects, and no longer as a group or a specific collectivity. In the past, major religions have also had and continue to hold universal claims however, these were not necessarily linked to a single mode of political or economic organization. Today, the establishment and construction of these norms and this discourse are perceived by some as a new form of biopower (Hardt and Negri 2000) associated with particular economic (capitalist) and political (liberal democratic) forms of organization.

A fourth element that defines the contours of current globalization is identity. Once again, "national" identity is considered to be one of the foundations of the contemporary nation-state. It is now increasingly contested (Pieterse 2004). The multiplication of identities has become particularly evident since the end of the Cold War and is increasingly present and can be observed with the emergence of localized identities, defined by various criteria (clan, ethnic, linguistic groups, and tribe) but also with the appearance of "trans"-national identities defined outside of national frameworks. It is notably the case of diasporas and their migrants who exert increasingly important political and economic roles both in their country of origins as well as in their host countries (Barou 2007; Simon 2008). These no longer are functions of single national identities but of diverse identities. For example, a neo-Quebecer of Salvadoran origins can participate as much in the debate in Quebec regarding its language policy as well as in supporting and financing a candidate or a political group in El Salvador. Suddenly freed from the constraints of East-West conflict, identity is now more than ever a major aspect of globalization. Contrary to those who would see globalization as a process of identity homogenization, it is in localization and identity diversity that there seems to be much left to understand and also contrary to those who would assume a flattening of hierarchy between classes, ethnic group, or even gender (Friedman

2007), globalization as we experience it often reinforce and fragment levels of exclusion (Choudry 2010).

Alterglobalization: Multitudes, Movement, and Ethics

Confronting dominant discourses on neoliberal globalization, particularly those put forth by defenders of the extension of markets or individual liberal norms, we are witnessing a parallel rise of counterdiscourses and other social practices that are associated with alternative globalizations (Laville and Cattani 2006). Some see in alterglobalization, what Karl Polanyi designated as a double movement, a movement for reform that would force the establishment of adjustment mechanisms and social measures to limit the abuses and excesses of exclusive hyper liberalism (Mittelman 2000). Alterglobalization would thus be a countermovement that would give a human face or at least ensure the continuity of the globalization of markets and the economy (Amoore 2005; Gill 1995).

Others have an altogether different vision of what might be an alterglobalization that would be based on the idea of multitudes, plurality, diversity, participatory democracy, and commonwealth (Hardt and Negri 2004; 2010). Even more difficult to define than globalizations, this alterglobalization would be much more fluid and embodies a variety of social movements and emerging practices (deliberative democracy, local economy, slow food, direct action, and the likes). Thus, the recourse to different terminologies sometimes inspiring, but difficult to grasp or even operationalize or test empirically: a constellation of opposites, multitudes, or even intergalactic resistance (to echo the Zapatista expression).

Whether seen as a countermovement or as a multitude, alterglobalization is evolving. Oftentimes, alterglobalization remains defined by its common stand in opposing neoliberal economic globalization (Bello 2002) rather than by its organizational axes or specific political programs. This dispersion and imprecision explain the ever-increasing fascination, not only of militants of all kinds who claim it, but of political scientists, sociologists, philosophers, and even economists who attempt to understand its ideas and practices as well as the philosophical foundations of the propositions put forward (DeSousa Santos 2004). One element is obvious, alterglobalization aims to be profoundly horizontalist and inclusive (in contrast with the verticalism of the organization of large economic and financial

conglomerates or of parties and organizations associated with the Marxist Left).

Alterglobalization as an Emerging Global Discourse and Praxis

Which historic event or moment marks the emergence and the accelerated growth of alterglobalization? Obviously, it is difficult to find a single one. Since the 1980s, with the emergence of structural adjustment programs and the IMF and World Bank's taking control of managing state macroeconomics, and later with the end of the Cold War, certain general characteristics of alterglobalization practices and discourse emerged: the insistence on inclusion, equity, participation, and direct dissent on the street, and no longer through political parties or state institutions (Graeber 2006). The Zapatista uprising in January of 1994 and its call for a transcontinental resistance to global neoliberalism have also been particularly important. Thereafter, parallel forums at meetings of the World Trade Organization (WTO) became privileged moments of dissident expression. First, in Geneva in 1998 and then during the "Battle in Seattle" in 1999, a multitude of civil society actors have gathered and protested (Doha 2001, Cancun 2003, and Hong Kong in 2005). The G-8 summits, meetings of the IMF and of the World Bank, and lately, gatherings of the G-20 have been important occasions for transnational movements and networks to gather and act collectively in protest against decision-making modes deemed exclusive and nondemocratic. For many participants, the liberalization of commerce and the economy, as put forth by the WTO or as discussed during the annual Davos meetings, constitute global issues which require a reorientation of the neoliberal economy in favor of an economy based on other values such as social justice, equality, and sustainability.

In parallel, various alternative efforts and propositions (notably, the Tobin tax on international financial transactions, the reform of international institutions and the rules of world commerce, fair-trade, a ban on the patenting of life forms, voluntary simplicity, sustainable development, food self-sufficiency, and the likes) have been put forward and debated with alterglobalization. And since 2001, the World Social Forum (WSF) has acted as a symbolic meeting place for a wide range of alterglobalization activists (Hardt 2002). Initially conceived as a social response to the Davos (World) Economic Forum,

the WSF is now, in the eyes of many, a privileged moment for the expression and the affirmation that "another world is possible" (Waterman 2004). In fact, ever since 2001, on a quasiannual basis, initially at Porto Alegre, then in Mumbai, in Nairobi, and more recently in Belem, thousands of self-professed alterglobalization activists have gathered to share their experiences, their analyses, and their shared convictions that there are alternatives to the current forms of globalization and that it is possible to foresee a heterogeneous ensemble of new social, political, economic, and political practices as belonging to a vast collective of reconceptualization of the world order. Today, the experiment continues.

The WSF has also generated geographic-based and thematic social forums. For example, in September 2007, Quebec held its first social forum just after the one held in Atlanta in the U.S. These experiences were repeated; two years after, there have been dozens of regional and national social forums across the world. Each forum, whether international or local, is a fascinating event, a fertile terrain of reflection and critical discourse regarding globalization. At the same time, many question whether the WSF runs the risk of becoming an "obligatory" ritual. That it would be the few days over the course of the year when another world is imagined and lived, somewhat like large religious gatherings or pilgrimages. Nevertheless, beyond the possibly ritualized character of the exercise, the WSF remains an important place for reflection and exploration of new ideas, practices, and identities.

Alterglobalization implies examining issues of shared identities and values, revealing that transnational solidarity is no longer solely based on a specific cause or problematic as such, but more so on shared plural identities. Certain large social movements, such as the World March of Women (Giraud and Dufour 2010), the movement for food sovereignty (Desmarais 2007), or even the movement for peace function on identity registers other than national or religious. How truly rooted in political and social practices these shared identities and discourses that transcend national identity remains to be seen (Buff 2005).

Global Dialectics? New Contours of Political Analysis

Can we consider globalization and its "antithesis," alterglobalization, as genuine challenges to political analysis organized around an epistemology rooted on nation-states and methodological nationalism? Similarly, how can we develop analytical tools that reconcile, on the

one hand, the possibility that individuals can have impact on a number of scales and their own agency below and above the state (Caouette and Turner 2009), and on the other hand, the possibility that various forms of supranational organizations (treaties, regimes, multilateral organizations, and international norms) structure and condition states' activities and capacities (Held and McGrew 2002)

For James Rosenau (1990), this widening gap between units of analysis outside the state can be best explained by the idea of *fragmegration,* that today we need to simultaneously take into account the processes of localization and fragmentation while considering global processes of integration (economic, political, cultural, and others). It is within this contradictory process that we might begin to see the emergence of the most promising paths to both an original and explanatory understanding of globalization or what he has more recently described as *distant proximities* (Rosenau 2003).

Without wanting to advocate the shelving of the study of interstate relations, an epistemology rooted in multiscalar analysis of plural transnationalism can open the door to a more nuanced understanding of the global flows and processes, such as the dialectics between globalization and alterglobalization. For example, it would be absurd to attempt to explain the functioning and the dynamics of fundamentalist religious networks (terrorist or otherwise) starting from a uniquely state-centric perspective. Just as it would be bizarre to attempt to understand international migration and the importance of diasporas from a single transnational lens that would not take into account the politics of states who trigger and encourage massive migrations of their populations (for example, the Philippines, Indonesia and Mexico) or consider the collective action of migrant workers (Choudry et al. 2009). Rather than speak of the "contamination" of interstate relations by transnational relations (Keohane and Nye 1972), it would seem more productive to acknowledge the interaction of these types of relations. While recognizing the challenges of such a methodological choice, this would allow a certain order to complexity and to bypass the difficulty of circumscribing such nebulous objects of study, such as alterglobalization.

Beyond the methodological and theoretical challenges that are represented by the study of current world processes, one can confirm that identity construction has now become a central dynamic. Just as the press has played an essential role in the construction of the national imaginary (Anderson 1991), today the Internet, low-cost travel, real-

time information, and political and economic integration make the construction of transnational identities more and more possible. For some, it would be possible to imagine the eventuality of a transnational or global citizenship (Fox 2005). Rather than such a transposition, which imposes a certain logic echoing a national model, it would be more productive to anticipate a multiplication of belongings and subjective loyalties. Thus, national identity (for example, that of the Filipinos or Québécois) would be increasingly inscribed within a variety of identities as subjective as they are multiple. Of course, it is too early to claim the existence of a cosmopolitan identity or even that of a cosmopolitical democracy (Held 1995; Kaldor 2003; Archibugi 2003; 2004).

While it is obviously too early to proclaim the end of positivist theories and methodological nationalism, for the moment, the exploration and the renewal of conceptual and methodological lenses to study of contemporary global dynamics and flows whether they be linked more narrowly with globalization or to alterglobalization appear to be productive heuristic approaches. These allow us to leave the "beaten path" without paradigmatic or metatheoretical claims and to move forward with an open mind and an innovative outlook.

Acknowledgements

This article is dedicated to Peter Gillespie, an old friend and former colleague at Inter Pares, a Canada based social justice organization. As this article is being published, Peter is retiring after twenty-five years of transnational activism and crossborder solidarity. In his gentle and wonderful ways, he has been a source of inspiration and much learning. Many of the ideas explored here came out from our conversations, fieldtrips and efforts at looking beyond the surface or the obvious. The article is intentionally provocative and open-ended. It seeks to open a space for conversation on how to develop analytical tools and lenses that can help explain and understand contemporary global politics, in particularly what is being sometime referred as the global South. It builds on a previous paper published in French (Caouette 2008). I would like to thank three anonymous reviewers, the *Kasarinlan* editorial staff, and Joel F. Ariate Jr. for their well-thought remarks, critiques, and suggestions. All shortcomings and points insufficiently elucidated are mine.

Notes

1. I choose here to use the neologism "alterglobalization" because it conveys more precisely the ideas underpinning much of the resistance to the mainstream economic globalization, namely its neoliberal incarnation. This expression also comes closer to the French "altermondialisme," meaning "another globalization" or an alternative to the dominant economic model. It also nicely echoes the motto of the World Social Forum that "another world is possible" (Sen, Anand, Escobar, and Waterman 2004). For a longer discussion on the origins and meanings of "altermondialisme," see Dupuis-Deri (2009).
2. The essays of Hopkins (2002b), Bennison (2002), and Ballantyne (2002) are particularly instructive on how taking a long-term view at globalization allows us to see the nonlinear evolution of global dynamics and how the second half of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first century are marked by a gradual acceleration of these dynamics.
3. An example of this is the fascinating account of Rizal's contacts and exchanges with various strands of the anarchist and liberation movements in Europe in the second half of the nineteenth century by Benedict Anderson (2005). On a different period and a different continent, Castañeda (1993) studies how Latin American revolutionary movements had established various networks and linkages across the continents in the 1960s and 1970s to support different liberation struggles.
4. In terms of Southeast Asia, see for example, Abuza (2003) on militant Islamic networks, Eklöf (2006) on pirates and marauders, Dobson and Chia Siow (1997) on multinational enterprises, and Piper and Uhlin (2004) on transnational activism.
5. A similar conceptual exercise could have been undertaken looking at the "darker" globalization, that is the extension and expansion of illegal and illicit activities, narcotrafficking, piracy, human and organ trafficking, transnational crime, etc. My intuition, since I have not tested it, is that one would encounter again a sort of dialectics between these two.
6. These ideas are not new as political scientists, sociologists, historians, and anthropologists have wrestled with them for quite some time. For a well-organized and excellent overview of the literature on globalization and its debates, see Martell (2010). What I am trying to do here is to suggest that increasingly it has become heuristically fruitful to move beyond nation-state based concepts for global ones because more and more social dynamics involving power relations, inclusion and exclusion, participation, and marginalization are derivative of crossborders and transnational forces. This line of argument echoes a recent work by Philip Cerny (2010) where he suggests the use of a transnational neopluralist approach to apprehend contemporary world politics.

References

Abuza, Zachary. 2003. *Militant Islam in Southeast Asia: Crucible of terror.* Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Abu-Lughod, Janet. 1989. *Before European hegemony: The world system AD 1250–1350.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Amoore, Louise, ed. 2005. *The global resistance reader.* London: Routledge.
Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.*London: Verso.
——. 2005. *Under three flags: Anarchy and the anti-colonial imagination.* London: Verso.
Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization.* Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press.
Arac, Jonathan. 2002. Anglo-globalism. *New Left Review* 16 (July–August): 35-45.
Archibugi, Daniele, ed. 2003. Cosmopolitical democracy. In *Debating cosmopolitics,* 1-15. London:Verso.
——. 2004. Cosmopolitan democracy and its critics: A review. *European Journal of International Relations* 10:437-73.
Ballantyne, Tony. 2002. Empire, knowledge and culture: From proto–globalization to modern globalization. In *Globalization in world history,* ed. A.G. Hopkins, 115-40. London: Pimlico.
Battistella, Dario. 2009. *Théories des relations internationales,* 3rd and exp. ed. Paris: Presses de sciences Po.
Barou, Jacques. 2007. *La planète des migrants: Circulations migratoires et constitutions de diasporas à l'aube du XXIe siècle.* Grenoble: Presses universitaires de Grenoble.
Beck, Ulrich. 2003. *Pouvoir et contrepouvoir à l'ère de la mondialisation.* Paris: Flammarion.
Bello, Walden. 2002. *Deglobalization: Ideas for a new world economy.* London: Zed Books.
Bennison, Amira K. 2002. Muslim universalism and western globalization. In *Globalization in world history,* ed. A.G. Hopkins, 74-97. London: Pimlico.
Buff, Ian. 2005. Making sense of the globalization debate when engaging in political economy analysis. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 7 (2): 261-80.
Calame, Matthieu. 2008. *La tourmente alimentaire: Pour une politique agricole mondiale.* Paris: Charles Léopold Mayer.
Cameron, Angus, and Ronen Palan. 2004. *The imagined economies of globalization.* London: Sage.
Caouette, Dominique. 2008. Mondialisation et altermondialisation: Dialectique ou dialogue. In *La politique en questions, Les professeurs du département de science politique*, 234-42.Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
Caouette, Dominique, and Sarah Turner, eds. 2009. *Agrarian angst and rural resistance in contemporary Southeast Asia.* London: Routledge.
Castañeda, Jorge. 1993. *Utopia unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War.* New York: Vintage Books.
Castles, Stephen, and Mark Miller. 2003. *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world.* 3rd rev. ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Cerny, Philip G. 1995. Globalization and the changing logic of collective action. *International Organization,*49 (4): 595–625
——. 2010. *Rethinking world politics: A theory of transnational neopluralism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Chase-Dunn, Christopher, and Salvatore J. Babones, eds. 2006. *Global social change: Historical and comparative perspectives.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
Choudry, Aziz. 2010. Not-so-flat world? Dominant and alternative accounts of globalization. Review of *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century* by Thomas Friedman. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 24 (3): 382-97.
Choudry, Aziz, Steve Jordan, Eric Shragge, Martha Stiegman, and Jill Hanley. 2009. *Fight back: Workplace justice for immigrants.* Halifax: Fernwood.

Clapp, Jennifer, and Marc J. Cohen, eds. 2009. *The global food crisis: Governance challenges and opportunities.* Waterloo: Center for International Governance Innovation and Wilfrid Laurier University.

De Sernaclens, Pierre. 2005. *La mondialisation: Théories, enjeux et débats.* 3rd ed. Paris: Armand Colin.

De Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2004. The World Social Forum: Toward a counter-hegemonic globalization, part I & II. In *The World Social Forum: Challenging empires,* ed. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar and Peter Waterman. New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation.

Della Porta, Donatella, and Sidney Tarrow, eds. 2005. *Transnational protest and global activism.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Desmarais, Annette Aurélie. 2007. *La via campesina: Globalization and the power of peasants.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Dobson, Wendy, and Chia Siow Yue, eds. 1997. *Multinationals and East Asian integration.* Ottawa: International Development Research Center.

Dufour, Pascale, Dominique Masson and Dominique Caouette, eds. 2010. *Solidarities beyond borders: Transnationalizing women's movements.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Dupuis-Deri, Francis. 2009. *L'altermondialisme.* Montreal: Boréal.

Durand, Marie-Françoise, Benoit Martin, Delphine Placidi, and Marie Törnquist-Chesnier. 2006. *Atlas de la mondialisation: Comprendre l'espace mondial contemporain.* Paris: Presses descience Po.

Edkins, Jenny, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. eds. 2009. *Critical theorists and international relations.* New York: Routledge.

Eklöf, Stefan. 2006. *Pirates in paradise: A modern history of Southeast Asia's maritime marauders.* Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies.

Éthier, Diane. 2006. In collaboration with Marie-Joëlle Zahar. *Introduction aux relations internationales,* 3rd ed. Montréal : Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 2006.

Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization* 52 (4): 887-917.

Fox, Jonathan. 2005. Unpacking "transnational citizenship." *Annual Review of Political Science* 8:171-201.

Friedman, Thomas L. 2007. *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century.* Exp. ed. New York: Picador/Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Ghorra-Gobin, Cynthia, ed. 2006. *Dictionnaire des mondialisations.* Paris: Armand Colin.

Gill, Stephen. 1995. Theorizing the interregnum: The double-movement and the global politics in the 1990s. In *International political economy: Understanding the global disorders,* ed. Bjorn Hettne, 65-99. London: Zed Books.

Giraud, Isabelle, and Pascale Dufour. 2010. *Dix ans de solidarité planétaire : Perspectives sociologiques sur la marche mondiale des femmes.* Montréal:Éditions du remue-ménage.

Graeber, David. 2006. *Pour une anthropologie anarchiste.* Montréal: Lux Éditeur.

Green Cowles, Maria, James Caporaso, and Thomas Risse, eds. 2001. *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and domestic change.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Hardt, Michael. 2002. Porto Alegre: Today's Bandung? *New Left Review* 14 (March-April): 112–118.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

——. 2004. *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire.* New York: The Penguin Press.

Harvey, David. 1991. *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Held, David, and Anthony McGrew. 2002. *Globalization/anti-globalization.* Cambridge, UK : Polity ; Malden, MA : Blackwell Publishers.

Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt, and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Hewson, Martin, and Timothy J. Sinclair, eds. 1999. *Approaches to global governance theory.* New York: State University of New York.

Hopkins, A.G., ed. 2002a. *Globalization in world history.* London: Pimlico.

——. 2002b. The history of globalization and the globalization of history? In *Globalization in world history,* 11–46. London: Pimlico.

Hurrell, Andrew. 2007. *On global order: Power, values, and the constitution of international society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Juris, Jeffrey S. 2008. *Networking futures: The movements against corporate globalization.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Kaldor, Mary. 2003. *Global civil society: An answer to war.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Keohane, Robert, and Joseph Nye. 1972. Transnational relations and world politics: An introduction. *International Organization* 25 (3): 329–349.

Kratochwil, Friedrich. 1989. *Rules, norms, and decisions: On the conditions of practical and legal reasoning in international relations and domestic society.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Laville, Jean-Louis, and Antonio-David Cattani, eds. 2006. *Dictionnaire de l'autre économie.* Paris: Gallimard.

Lipschultz, Ronnie D. 1992. Reconstructing world politics: The emergence of global civil society. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 21 (3): 389-420.

Mann, Michael. 1997. Has globalization ended the rise of the nation-state? *Review of International Political Economy* 4 (3): 472-496.

Martell, Luke. 2010. *The sociology of globalization.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Michaud, Jean. 2006. *Historical dictionary of the peoples of the Southeast Asian massif.* Lanham: Scarecrow Press.

Michaud, Jean, and Tim Forsyth, eds. 2010. *Moving mountains: Ethnicity and livelihoods in highland China, Vietnam and Laos.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Mittelman, James H. 2000. *The globalization syndrome: Transformation and resistance.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Onuf, Nicholas G. 1989. *World of our making: Rules and rule in social theory and international relations.* Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2004. *Globalization and culture: Global mélange.* Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Piper, Nicola, and Anders Uhlin, eds. 2004. *Transnational activism in Asia: Problems of power and democracy.* London: Routledge.

Price, Richard, and Christian Reus-Smit. 1998. Dangerous liaisons? Critical international theory and constructivism. *European Journal of International Relations* 4 (3): 259-94.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas, ed. 1995. *Bringing transnational relations back in: Non-state actors, domestic structures and international institutions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, William. 1998. Beyond nation-state paradigms: Globalization, sociology, and the challenge of transnational studies. *Sociological Forum* 13:561-94.

Rosenau, James N. 1990. *Turbulence in world politics: A theory of change and continuity.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——. 2003. *Distant proximities: Dynamics beyond globalization.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A critical introduction.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

——. 2005. *Globalization: A critical introduction.* 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sen, Jai, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar, and Peter Waterman, eds. 2004. *The World Social Forum: Challenging empires.* New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation.

Simon, Gildas. 2008. *La planète migratoire dans la mondialisation.* Paris: Armand Colin.

Soederberg, Susanne. 2010. *Corporate power and ownership in contemporary capitalism: The politics of resistance and domination.* London: Routledge.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2005. *The new transnational activism.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Urry, John. 2000. *Sociology beyond societies: Mobilities for the twenty-first century.* London: Routledge.

Vielajus, Martin, ed. 2009. *La société civile mondiale à l'épreuve du réel.* With the assistance of Mohamed Larbi Bouguera. Paris: Charles Léopold Mayer.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The modern world-system I: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century.* London: Academic Press.

——. 1980. *The modern world-system II: Mercantilism and the consolidation of the European world economy, 1600–1750.* New York: Academic Press.

——. 1989. *The modern world-system III: The second era of great expansion of the capitalist world economy, 1730s–1840s.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Wapner, Paul Kevin, and Lester Edwin J. Ruiz. eds. 2000. *Principled world politics: The challenge of normative international relations.* Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Waterman, Peter. 2004. Backgrounder. In *The World Social Forum: Challenging empires,* ed. Jai Sen, Anita Anand, Arturo Escobar and Peter Waterman, 55-66. New Delhi: The Viveka Foundation.

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social theory of international politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilkinson, Rorden, ed. 2005. *The global governance reader.* London: Routledge.

DOMINIQUE CAOUETTE is associate professor at the Department of Political Science, University of Montreal. Send correspondence to the author at dominique.caouette@umontreal.ca.