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This paper centres around a few things: how does globalization interface with different social movements and the Indian state in recent years? What are the four major myths that the globalization created or constructed over the years? What are the major predicaments that the Indian state faced vis-à-vis the social movements mediating through globalization? What are the ambiguities in the social movements? Finally, how to conceptualize the Indian state in the context of globalization. With this background, that the paper is divided into two parts: the first part deals with the myths that the globalization created, while second part deals with the interface between different forms of social movements, the Indian state and the globalization.
I

Myths and Reality of Globalization

Globalization (Andrew Heywood, 2002, 140-43; David Held, 2001,201; Ray Kiely and Philmarlet,1998) has become a new mantra for a variety of groups and people—from academicians to civil society groups to the political institutions. This is because the globalization has created euphoria and hate, semantic confusion and definitional problems. One confusion arises because of the attachment of multiple terminologies and multiple meanings: Now we have a set of globalizations: “Grass root globalization,” Capitalist globalization (Peter Michael,2002:2), “Corporate Globalization,” “Neo Liberal Globalization,” “Third Wave Globalization,” “Economic Globalization” (Frances Fox Piven,1995,550; Timothy Taylor,2002,24), “Political globalization,” “Technological Globalization” (Peter Marcus, 2000, 24) and, finally, “Globalization from Below” (Ronaldo Munck,2002,18).

Let me begin with four great myths that the globalization has constructed over the last few years. These myths are important for the reasons that they created spaces for larger contestation both from within and without the first myth is that it is a recent phenomenon, which has nothing to do with history. In fact, the beginning of the process needs to be located in the colonial past as it “inaugurated both capitalism and global expansion.”[Samir Amin, 1995,26] It is here one can make two projects of globalization: Colonial Globalization and Post-Colonial Globalization.

Colonial Globalization was concerned with controlling the colonized countries by way of multiple methods: structural changes, enumeration, direct plunder, knowledge about the knowledge of Oriental’s, their race, character, culture, history, tradition, and society (Edward Said, 1998). It was also done by creating stereotyped images that, “Orientals are gullible devoid of energy and initiative, much given to fulsome flattery, intrigues, cunning; they are invertebrate liars, and they are leathen and suspicion.” (Ibid)

Nonetheless, Colonial Globalization was backed by an ideology of laissez-faire, which was meant to reproduce, strengthen, and expand the capitalism at their native countries. Nonetheless the capitalism came to colonized countries in different forms: through raw materials or in finished form or even in the form of financial capital. Even though it is said that, during this period, time and space were being bridged. This bridging, however, conquering both remained a distant dream. In fact, the capital would take months together to reach the colonized countries and even it did not cover all the spaces. Even it was backed by exclusion the of large sections of people from the process of development, the retention of different social formations and spaces for limited markets. The capital that the colonialist introduced was weak, uneven, and largely confined to the industrial sector and, partly, the agrarian sector. The colonial capitalism however did not destroy the other social formations and thereby it retained two or three social formations simultaneously. The most important thing is that the colonial globalization was largely a project of the European Continent—basically it was a state-sponsored project to colonize the countries and that it was backed by states which were most powerful and were popularly called Imperialist powers. More than that their project of “modernity” gave rise to “differential modernities” or “modernity in two languages” (Partha Chatterjee, 1997)—or “multiple modernities” (Eisenstadt, 2000, 1). Further, modernity made the “human beings the centre of the world, the measure of all things, the ‘subject,’ the basis of all knowledge, the necessary point of reference for all that goes on” (Jorge Larraín, 1994, 143) Finally, the Colonial globalization was concerned about culture and showed this by interrogating cultural practices and, in the process created a sense of condemnation of indigenous cultural practices vis-à-vis the western/colonial one. It was a process of creating what Frantz Fanon called “Black Skin with White Mask.” (Frantz Fanon, 1985) Here, colonial globalization was not able to integrate or convert all the indigenous population into a single, homogenous whole—in terms of life style, social relations and everyday practices. Rather, it created a structure of relations, a situation of unevenness, “development of underdevelopment”
and finally created the conditions for "structural incapacies.‖ Here are combined the failure as well as the larger agenda of colonial globalization—the latter is to see that the colonized country remained backward, weak, dependent and socially conservative.

Nonetheless, the post-colonial globalization is largely a project of a set of institutions—WTO, IMF, WTO that are backed by Multinational Corporations and the Western countries principally dominated by the US. This particular phase is also termed as "late capitalism" and, at the same time, the capital takes different form: foreign direct investment, shares, portfolio managements, etc. Most of the time, capital remains as speculative capital that it does not stick to one particular country—it becomes flexible, moves in circular fashion and moves quickly. At the same time the capital is increasingly getting concentrated in a few multinationals. Meanwhile, the main agenda of the global capital is to create a larger market in each and every part of the world. This is backed by introduction of a series of new methods: patenting, packaging, advertising, localizing signs, symbols, images or "cultural industries" such as departmental stores, media, designers Shoppe, etc. All these have given rise to false notions about the homogeneity of lifestyles or market democracies, including myths about the "self."

The second important myth is that globalization has shifted the power and thereby opened up the spaces for democratization. It all began with the downfall of the Soviet Union. This was conceptualized as the "triumph of capitalism." More than that globalization is termed as a "liberal project." However, this liberal project is backed by the power of Multinationals/International Institutions and the US. This can be seen in the economic and political clout of the Multinationals. Of the 100 largest economies in the world, for example, 51 are corporations; only 49 are countries (based on a comparison of corporate sales and country GDPs). The Top 200 corporations' combined sales are bigger than the combined economies of all countries minus the biggest 10. In some time the total revenue of the one multinational would be equivalent to the GDP of many countries. For example General Motors is now bigger than Denmark; Daimler Chrysler is bigger than Poland; Royal Dutch/Shell is bigger than Venezuela; IBM is bigger than Singapore; and Sony is bigger than Pakistan. The top 200s combined sales are 18 times the size of the combined annual income of the 1.2 billion people (24 percent of the total world population) living in "severe" poverty (Sarah Anderson and John Cavanagh, 2000,10). Between 1983 and 1999, the profits of the Top 200 firms grew 362.4 percent, while the number of people they employ grew by only 14.4 percent. Secondly, U.S. corporations dominate the Top 200, with 82 slots (41% of the total). Japanese firms are second, with only 41 slots, Germany (20) and France (17)-Canadian and Indian firms are far behind the US companies. In fact these Multinationals are monopolizing our economy too: this can be seen in the way they control the agricultural economy, business, etc. In the former case of agriculture, the top 3-6 companies control 85-90% of wheat production, 60% or sugar, 85-90% coffee, 85% Coca, 80% Tea, 85-90% Cotton, and 90% Forest Production. These companies are also entering into the domain of every day practices through patenting, intellectual property rights, etc. Further, their power has enhanced with the merger, take over or amalgamations. This has stretched to the political domain too. The international institutions such as WTO IMF and World Bank back the companies which do this. More than that it is supported by the G8 countries, in which the US takes the lead. In other parts of the world it has given rise to multiple notions about the state: "retreat" "weak state" withdrawal, "rolling back."

The third important myth is the standardization or homogenization. One of the arguments is that economic integration will lead to institutional or cultural homogenization. Featherstone's argument becomes most important. It saw in cultural homogenization an attempt to introduce American consumer culture, linking it to capital/multinationals. All these have given rise to a symbolic situation of hierarchy, leading ultimately to "display" of American the way of life. To quote
II
Social Movements and an Ambiguous State

These myths are important for the simple reason that they provided spaces for social movements to contest the concerns of the globalization and the Indian state. However, in the Indian context, contestation over globalization derived its strength from the country’s historical experience and memories. Gandhi became the symbol of historical memory and experience. At the same time Gandhi and his Hind Swaraj (Anthony Parel, 1997) symbolized both the nativity and an answer to the Western globalization. Gandhi contested the project of modernity, Western civilization, for its unending consumerism, unethical practices and irrationalism. In the process, Gandhi emerged as a “critical modernist” and “enlightened anarchist.” This memories of Gandhi and his critiques are often appropriated by the social movements in India to enact the historical memories in the form of mimicry (Stig Toft Madsen, 1999) to contemporize the past: “Dandi March,” “Second Satyagraha,” “Salt Satyagraha,” “destroying the properties of the Western capitalist” are some examples for mimicry or what is called a “theatrical form of protest.”

In India in general, contestation over globalization mediated through three levels of discourse: one, level of discourse is the discourse of/ on “Swadeshi.” Here globalization is located in the popular argument of “Vasudaiva Kutumbakam” and thereby located the term in the imagined past. This “Swadeshi” discourse differs from the “communitarians” who belonged to the realm of social movements. The second level of discourse comes from the left or the radicals. Interestingly, in the Indian context, left radicals and Swadeshis come closer in the matter of opposing the globalization. However, both differ in their analysis of the globalization. Radicals/ Marxists saw in globalization a phase of “imperialism” “a phase of “late capitalism” and a tendency to trap India in the “neo colonial design” of Western capitalism and thereby the opposition became a part of the opposition to the Neo Imperialism of Western world. At the same time, the left in the
Indian context cannot be identified with the anarchist of elsewhere.

The most important contestation came from what are popularly called “New Social Movements: Farmers, Dalits, Women, Tribal, Environmental/ecology, including the separatist movement. This is called “return,” “rebirth” “resurgence” of the civil society (Arato 1981, Neera Chandoke, 1995). These multi-class democratic movements are popularly called New Social Movements for the following reasons:

- These social movements aim at social change by adopting a particular ideology, structure;
- These movements typically have a post-material orientation, “being more concerned with the quality of life and issues” (Andrew Heywood, 2002, 284) or they are non-materialistic-non economic mobilizations (Rajendra Singh, 2001, 196);
- They believe in new “politics”-believing in more innovative and theatrical forms of protest;
- They provide new and rival centres of power and also diffuse power;
- These movements go beyond typical village structure/premises so as to link these up to reach the global level;
- They believe in class collaboration and class harmony and the inclusion of all categories irrespective of any differentiations;
- They believe in throwing up a large number of issues for the debate such as the issues of the Western paradigm of development, capitalist expansion;
- New social movements are not focusing on “problems of distribution but concern the grammar of forms of life;”
- “They are movements of groups that are either ignored as exploited by traditional Marxism (Women, Dalits and Shudras) or who are exploited in ways related to the new process of contemporary capitalism (peasant forced to produce for capital through market exploitation managed by the state, peasants and forest dwellers victimized by the environmental degradation).

Nonetheless, the challenges of the new social movements to globalization are mediating through different ways: one, by a critique of global strategy, particularly strategy to re-colonize the country; two, redefine the notions of rights, identities and cultural loss and thereby constructing boundaries vis-à-vis the globalization and providing alternatives to globalization, three, critiquing the concern of the state and also directly attacking the MNCs operating in India and finally, it also took the form of joining or forming collectives both at the national and international level. This does not mean that there is uniformity in addressing the issues of globalization—some social movements definitely are in favor of globalization.

In the first case of the farmer’s movement, which started off during 1980s in different parts of India such as in Maharashtra (Shetkari Sanghatana), Karnataka (Karnataka Rajya Raitha Sangha), Uttar Pradesh (Bharatiya Kisan Sangh), two phases are apparent: in the first phase, running up to the decade of 1980s, the globalization never became a major issue rather the political institutions, principally the concern of the state came under severe scrutiny. The scrutiny mediated through a series of issues such as remunerative prices, writing off loans, an urban-biased policy, or support to industrial capitalism. The real twist came during the decade of 1990s, when India entered into the phase of globalization. It is here the arguments of environmentalist, bio-technologist and a section of the Farmers’ movement, representing Karnataka and UP cut across each others’ domain or overlap each other. If one section of the Farmers’ movement represented by the Maharashtra movement supported Globalization (Sharad Joshi, 1994, 10) as “it brings to an end the license raj, bureaucratization and Nehruvian Command Economy” the other group vehemently opposed the globalization. The latter analyzed the globalization in terms of the larger strategy of trapping India in the vicious circle of exploitation and converting India into a neo-colony. Further it is argued that globalization while introducing patent regimes transform the identities of categories from socio-cultural specifics to non-descript categories (from
peasant to non-peasant categories); that superimposition of a global culture through the mediation of cultural industries, multinational outlets such as KFCs, Seed Technology such as terminator seeds, patenting the agricultural produce, etc, would create spaces for “cultural loss” and “loss of the self;” that the globalization would bring in issues such as violation of basic human rights to produce, freedom to select and the communitarian identity of the categories. In fact, the debate/or the discourse on patenting on neem plants, Basmati Rice, including the issues of Terminator seed needs to be seen as part of larger concern to protect the rights of the subaltern groups. Meanwhile newer and newer discourses have been employed vis-à-vis the globalization: these discourses are pertaining to the larger strategy, the development paradigm that the globalization was pushing in; the “soft/and weak” nature of the political institutions, particularly the Indian state, the consequences of globalization both on the country concerned and the categories concerned, etc. It is here that the Farmers’ group employed multiple means: protesting in the form of satyagraha to attacking multinationals operating in India—three companies quite often became the target—KFC, Cargil and Monsanto, as they represent the larger strategy of globalization. One more strategy was to join the international collectives such as People’s Global Action and Via Campesina. Here the politics went beyond the national boundaries to the international arena such as Europe, the US or specifically Seattle, Prague, Washington, Geneva etc. Meanwhile Farmers’ group demanded a “strong state,” including the strong political institutions to overcome the crises emanating from the globalization. Finally they came out with alternatives, such as the one “Khadi Curtain” which obviously means rejection of the Western paradigm of development: (Peoples Global Action, 1997,40) “we do not want Western money, technologies, or expertise to impose their development model on us. We are refused to be used as political tools to ask the elites for reforms that were never demanded”

Here, the Indian state faced a dilemma: on the one side it had to extend support to those who were supporting the cause of globalization— which became apparent when protagonists were appointed to the state machinery as its advisors. However, the larger predicament came on four important issues: how to administer the challenges within the framework of the democracy; how to protect and defend the rights of categories vis-à-vis the global capital; how to define these rights whether they belong to the realm of politics, nature, history and/or are limited/confined to geography and finally how to negotiate with the global capital vis-à-vis the rights of the masses without dislocating the identities of communities. Any support or identification with one section of farmers/peasants would have become suicidal to the political institutions, principally the Indian state. It is here an ambiguous state can be visualized.

Similar ambiguity is discernible within the Dalit discourse/movement. Not all section support the globalization. Majority of the Dalit politics/movement opposes the globalization for different reasons: cultural displacement, loss of employment, loss of identity and loss of economic life style (Anand Teltumbde, 1996). This is the reason why the discourse centred on the consequences of globalization on the community who are part of state structure, basically working as lower rank employee. And also discourse on globalization centred on the paradigm of development including the larger designs of the globalization. At the same time globalization issue has given rise to the fear of loss—loss of state support, loss of space, loss of communitarian identities. In the context of retreat of the state, Dalit politics is demanding a “soft state” vis-à-vis the Dalits.

However, there is one section, which saw in the Globalization an opportunity to enter into the domain of “post-modernism,” “post-industrialism,” and “post-globalized economy.” (Mogalli Ganeshi, 2000) It was further treated as an opportunity to transgress the cultural loss and thereby retrieve a place in the globalized world. These different discourses have given rise to two different meanings to globalization: one, meaning of “loss” and the other is meaning of “gain.” It is in the
middle of ambiguous position that the Indian state and its various political institutions are confronted with three problems and challenges: one, challenge of protecting and defending the rights of socio-political categories and two, challenge of retaining the identities and finally providing the spaces for the cultural practices of the Dalits. At the same time the state needs to accommodate the discourse/categories favoring the globalization. It is here presence of an ambiguous state is apparent.

The third important issue is the issue of environment/ecology. The demand for protecting these rights has come about with the notion that the globalization is sharpening the relationship between environment and capital and in the process it is appropriating bio-diversity and indigenous knowledge, including the cultural practices and identities of different categories. This has been the major concern of environmentalists, Anti-Technologist including anti mining movement in India. There are a few inbuilt discourses while detailing globalization: that globalization is transforming the identities of categories from socio-cultural specific to non specific categories; that it is creating the same “cultural loss” and the “loss of the self,” that it is bringing in other issues like violation of basic human rights to produce, freedom to select and the communitarian identity of the categories. Nonetheless the strategy that the environmentalist/ecologist adopted varied: joining the larger collectives at the national level to international level; destroying the seeds or the crops of the multinationals. They also tried to sabotage the international negotiations by joining the international collectives. In this context the Indian state and its various institutions faces three challenges from within: how to preserve and defend the rights of the categories vis-à-vis the global capital; second how to define these rights-are they belonged to nature, or are they limited/confined to geography? And finally how to negotiate with globalization on the issue of rights-communitarian/natural–without losing or surrendering to the global capital. In fact, the recent passage of the Bio-diversity Bill by the Parliament is a part of protecting the rights of the people at the grassroots level. In this context once again an ambiguous state can be comprehended.

The fourth important issue is the issue of women. Women’s issues became all the more important with globalization translating the cultural specific of body and self into the cultural specific of global capital. A large number of cultural industries like departmental stores, the media, beauty parlours, or Designer’s Shoppe, etc., are not only legitimizing cultural transgression but also the identities of categories as “modern” and “post modern.” In fact, cultural industries have segmented the body into two basic categories: internal and external. The internal body refers to preserving or covering up the body to conceal the signs of decay and disease. The external body refers to (Mike Featherstone,1987) “appearance as well as the movement and control of body with social space.” Globalization is slowly and steadily conjoining the inner body to boost the outer appearance. Body in this context is becoming a reference point of pleasure, of life, of defining point of social interaction and identity. This notion is not only counter to the classical notion of body and self but that this has given rise to a subtle challenge to global capital. This challenge, for the first time expressed when ABCL [Amitabh Bacchan Corporation Ltd] hosted the Miss World Contest. The challenge, on a later date, brought into focus the different discourses such as the discourse on the larger design to create markets and thereby trap the country in the vicious cycle of exploitation; it also brought the discourse on the commodification of the body, cultural displacement, shifting identities of women as cultural specifics to non-descript identities. It is in this discourse that the issues of rights are inherently linked: “women have been deprived of even the fundamental inaccessible right on their bodies by making them a mere selling products in the consumer market.” Interestingly, the Indian state did not face the larger threat coming from the women’s movement, especially on the issues of globalization. However, the Indian state faced the problem of protecting the rights of the