

Posted: Feb 7, 2005 9:10 PM

The idea of global civil society, Mary Kaldor

Kaldor argues that the most recent definition of civil society, from the 70's and 80's, is different from previous versions in which civil society was "linked up with the territorial state". The new civil society of the 70's and 80's "represented both a withdrawal from the state and a move toward global rules and institutions." Kaldor argues that an emerging system of global governance challenges the primacy of states. In this new context she defines global civil society as "a platform inhabited by activists (or post-Marxists), NGOs and neoliberals, as well as national and religious groups, where they argue about, campaign for (and against), negotiate about, or lobby for the arrangements that shape global developments." Kaldor sees Bush's war on terror and on Iraq as an attempt to deal with terrorism in a state framework, and a challenge to global governance and global civil society. She calls global civil society emancipatory and says it offers an alternative to American hegemony. She argues that Bush's actions spawn violence, and offers global civil society as the antidote. Given Kaldor's broad definition of civil society it seems optimistic to believe that it will always be a force for good.

Power Shift, Jessica Mathews

Mathews argues that states are not just losing autonomy, but also sharing power with non-state actors, particularly NGOs. The main driver, according to Mathews, is computer and telecommunications advances. The new accessibility of people and information reduces the power of the state, and favor decentralized organization. She suggests that the European Union, and the International Standards Organization, may be examples of organizations that take over some state powers and allegiance. Mathews says the changes could mean "more peace, justice and capacity to manage the burgeoning list of humankind's interconnected problems, or, on the other hand, could "mean more conflict and less problem-solving both within states and among them." I'm not sure what she's talking about when she says that whether the result will be good or bad depends on "whether humanity can launch itself on a course of rapid social innovation, as it did after World War II." Her "needed adaptations" seem like a pretty weak ending to the article.

Civil Society and the Future of the Nation-State, David Rieff

Rieff criticizes those who equate civil society with democratic values. He argues that Radovan Karadzic and Vaclav Havel have equal claim to the civil society mantle. In his view, civil society is represented by unaccountable single-issue groups; an increase in their power is not desirable. He describes advocates of civil society as the "useful idiots of globalization" arguing that, particularly in the area of development aid, investments in civil society have amounted to privatizing democracy-building – and undermine states in their ability to oppose globalization. From his view it would be preferable to put energy into the political struggles of the nation-state. I'm sympathetic to his questions about assuming that civil society is a force for good, as well as concerns about political accountability.

Worlds Apart, Clark

Chapter 5 is kind of a primer on CSO's. Chapter 6 focuses on organizational forms and strategies. Helpful background. I thought the piece about the World Bank was fascinating.

Social Movements and World Politics, Smith et al.

Also a primer, on transnational social movements. Pretty dull stuff. Mostly I wondered why it was assigned. The authors do say that despite rarely achieving

	policy changes, transnational social movements affect political decisions by 1) focusing attention on particular issues 2) providing political education on a topic and 3) increasing government accountability.
--	--