



*The George Washington University
Center for the Study of Globalization*



Protesting Globalization:
**WHAT ARE THE
ALTERNATIVES?**



By:

John Forrer

Director, the GW Center for the Study of Globalization

Matthew Wilkins

Master of Arts, Elliott School of International Affairs



June 2003

THE GW CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF GLOBALIZATION

The GW Center for the Study of Globalization (GWCSG) was established to promote research and public education on the various forces that are driving globalization, the implications of globalization for business strategy and government policy, as well as the effects of globalization on people's day-to-day lives.

Contact Us

The GW Center for the Study of Globalization

2033 K Street, NW • Suite 230 • Washington, DC 20052

Phone 202-994-5206 • Fax 202-994-5284

gwcsg@gwu.edu • www.gwu.edu/~gwcsg

Protesting Globalization:
**WHAT ARE THE
ALTERNATIVES?**

Presented by

**The GW Center for the
Study of Globalization**

By:

John Forrer

Director, The GW Center for the Study of Globalization

Matthew Wilkins

Master of Arts, Elliott School of International Affairs

Protesting Globalization: What Are the Alternatives?" is the most recent exploration by the George Washington Center for the Study of Globalization (GWCSG) into why globalization is a topic that continues to draw multitudes of demonstrators to the streets of cities across the world. It is a companion to "Why Are People Protesting Globalization" (2nd edition): <http://www.gwu.edu/~gwcsg/protestglob.PDF>.

This publication refers to these protesters as "anti-globalists." However, we use this term only as a matter of convenience. Many groups campaigning against unfair trade or the policies of the international financial institutions do not consider themselves opposed to globalization.

Rather, groups involved in the protests seek to reform globalization so that it will better serve the interests of the world's impoverished and oppressed and enhance global human security. As a result, many anti-globalization groups have clear policy alternatives to actions that they associate with globalization.

"Protesting Globalization: What Are the Alternatives?" examines the policy alternatives suggested for eight key areas: free trade, rigged markets, the power and policies of the international financial institutions, environmental degradation, multinational corporations, Third World debt, financial speculation, and gender oppression. These eight categories correspond to those identified in "Why Are People Protesting Globalization?"

We do not attempt to provide an exhaustive catalogue of alternative policies, but summarize some of the more visible and interesting suggestions of anti-globalization protesters. It is one thing to protest, it is another to suggest what should be done differently.

It is one thing to protest, it is another to suggest what should be done differently.

Examination of policy alternatives in these eight areas reveals two striking common aspects to the anti-globalization movement. Firstly, the policy alternatives suggested by the movement fragment into two groups – those rejecting any form of globalization altogether, and those seeking to harness its potential and redirect it for more equitable and sustainable development in poor countries.

Secondly, several policy suggestions are ambitious and address a number of these issues at the same time. For instance, many groups propose local production as a remedy for both financial speculation as a means for reduction of environmental destruction.

We present a summary of policy alternatives supported by extensive background materials. And we provide a case study of a specific alternative policy for each of the eight globalization areas that are promoted by elements of the globalization protest movement. Where possible, we have provided web sites with additional information on the alternative policies summarized here.

Fair Trade

The global coffee industry, thanks in large part to the campaigning efforts of groups such as **Oxfam**, is one where "fair trade" regimes have been instituted.

To become "fair trade-certified," importers must pay a minimum of \$1.26 per pound to coffee farmers (as opposed to market prices) and also adhere to strict environmental and health rules. In 2000, Starbucks introduced fair trade coffee to 2,000 North American stores.

Anti-globalists are seeking to reproduce the success of fair trade coffee in the apparel and textile industries.

Whether a product is manufactured under fair trade conditions can be determined if it carries a label of certification. For instance, the Rugmark label guarantees consumers that carpets from South Asia were made without child labor.

Fair trade still has a long way to go before it can rival the WTO as an international system of exchange. Worldwide fair-trade sales today are worth \$400 million annually - that's just 0.01% of all goods exchanged worldwide.

Sources: Oxfam International, <http://www.maketrade4fair.com/>; Global Exchange, "Global Economy: Fair Trade Coffee," and "Fair Trade: Economic Justice in the Marketplace," <http://www.globalexchange.org/stroes/fairtrade.html>; Fair Trade Federation, "Fair Trade Facts," http://www.fairtradefederation.com/a_b_facts.html

Protesters against free trade are the ideological heirs to a long-established anti-capitalist critique. According to this point of view, globalization is merely the latest stage of the worldwide spread of corporate networks in the pursuit of ever higher profits and lower costs. Free trade policies are responsible for the growth of poverty and inequality in the developing world.

For these protesters, capitalism's traditional flaws have been exacerbated in recent years by the World Trade Organization (WTO). Now considered by many the most powerful international legislative body ever to exist, the WTO is seen to be dominated by the interests of wealthy nations to the detriment of the developing world.

With their demand for a complete halt to World Trade Organization expansion, groups such as **Our World is Not For Sale**¹ and the **International Forum on Globalization** (IFG)² are essentially calling for an end to the incessant global march of free trade.

The WTO is also held accountable for the extension of trade to goods and services that were once shielded from market economics. Anti-trade activists are particularly hostile to the more recent "commodification" of water and seeds. They insist that these are items that should be removed from WTO jurisdiction altogether.

When challenged to provide an alternative to the international trading system that exists today under the auspices of the WTO, anti-globalists such as **Oxfam**, **Global Exchange** and the **Fair Trade Federation** often point to the "fair trade" system.

Under fair trade, purchasers in developed countries ensure that their products are not made under repressive conditions. These purchasers essentially aim to eliminate the business middlemen that they consider responsible for pushing down the incomes and living standards of farmers in poor countries.

¹ Our World Is Not For Sale, "Our World Is Not For Sale: WTO: Shrink or Sink,"

<http://www.ourworldisnotforsale.org/globalstatement.htm>

² The International Forum on Globalization, "A Better World Is Possible: Alternatives to Economic Globalization," <http://www.ifg.org/>

Oxfam's plan for agricultural tariffs and subsidies

According to **Oxfam**, rich countries such as Japan, the United States, and the European Union subsidize their farmers to the tune of US \$1 billion every single day. The result is products that are traded in world food markets below market price, thus squeezing out competing products from farmers in developing countries.

In addition, tariffs produce another huge obstacle to free trade: tariff barriers faced by developing countries are typically four times greater than those encountered by rich countries. These barriers have been estimated to cost poor countries \$100 billion a year – twice what they receive in aid.

If global trading markets were reformed, **Oxfam** estimates that there would be substantial benefits for the developing world. For example, if African, South Asian and Latin American nations increased their share of world exports by just one per cent, this would provide enough income to lift 128 million people out of poverty. And it would pump an extra \$70 billion into Africa annually – five times more than the continent receives in aid each year.

Source: Oxfam International, "Make Trade Fair," <http://www.maketradefair.org/styleheet.asp?file=03042002121618>

Many anti-globalization organizations argue that global trade is actually the best route to development for the world's impoverished regions. However, they also argue that at present global trade is anything but free. Rather, through the imposition of tariffs, subsidies, and other trade by industrialized countries, international trade is rigged in favor of wealthy nations. The global agriculture and textiles markets are cited as two clear cases where such rigged markets exist.

To remedy this situation, the **International Forum on Globalization** (IFG) and other groups demand full democratization of the decision-making procedures of the WTO – although they are dubious whether this is even possible.³ They argue that full democratization will give more weight to the demands of poor nations when establishing the rulings that govern the global economy.

Among the most prominent critics of the unfairness of rigged international trading markets developing countries is **Oxfam International**. Oxfam proposes leveling the playing field of world trade by removing the subsidies and tariffs that are so harmful to the competitiveness of developing nations' exports.⁴

³ International Forum on Globalization, "Statement by Jerry Mander, President of the International Forum on Globalization," <http://www.ifg.org/media.html>

⁴ Oxfam International, "Make Trade Fair: Rigged Rules and Double Standards," <http://www.maketradefair.com>

POWER & POLICIES OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

casestudy

Health and Education Monitoring and Evaluation of World Bank Loans

For **Oxfam**, the World Bank urgently needs to reform the way in which it monitors and evaluates the impact of its policies. In particular, the World Bank should consider the effect that its loans and grants have on the health and education of impoverished populations.

According to anti-globalists, traditionally the World Bank has measured the impact of its loans without fully considering health and education outcomes. For example, health reform loans in the 1990s almost resulted in the dismantling of Zambia's tuberculosis immunization program. It is claimed that this matter was never considered during formal loan evaluations.

Critics want new criteria to be used to evaluate the "success" of financial assistance, such as the percentage of underweight five year olds and the number of girls attending school. For this to be accomplished, the World Bank would be required to significantly increase funding for a comprehensive, uniform system of monitoring and evaluation.

Source: U.S. Civil Society Coalition, "Responsible Reform of the World Bank," [http://www.bicusa.org/usgovtoversight/Responsible Reform of the World Bank.pdf](http://www.bicusa.org/usgovtoversight/Responsible%20Reform%20of%20the%20World%20Bank.pdf)

The Bretton Woods international financial institutions (IFIs) are lightning rods for the anti-globalization protest movement. In part, this is because of the sheer scale of their influence. **Greenpeace** claims that the World Bank and IMF possess more power over the developing world than any other institutions.

Although their funding comes from member countries, various critics – such as the **Whirled Bank** and the **50 Years is Enough Network** -- argue that the deliberations and policies of the World Bank and the IMF are largely removed from public scrutiny and accountability. In short, the perception is that these powerful organizations are subservient to the control of the wealthiest developed countries.

As a result, the notion that IFIs help the developing world is seen as a myth. Critics argue that the IFIs coerce developing countries into adopting massively harmful, Western-biased economic policies. In support of this claim, they point out that in recent decades many poor countries were encouraged to concentrate on producing just a handful of crops for export – predominant among them coffee. Although this approach paid off in the short-term, in the long-run the international coffee market became flooded and prices collapsed, devastating the livelihoods of small farmers in the developing countries. Today coffee prices are just a quarter of what they were in 1960.

Suggested remedies for the power and policies of the IFIs fall into two broad categories. More radical anti-globalization activists demand their immediate abolition. Others call for dramatic reform of the IMF and World Bank.

Associated with the first category is the **International Forum on Globalization**, which calls for the Bretton Woods institutions to immediately suspend all activities and be replaced by United Nations bodies.

...other organizations call for the decision-making procedures of the World Bank and IMF to be democratized and reflect the interests of developing countries.

Responsibility for management of the global economy should be transferred to the UN's Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).⁵

50 Years Is Enough goes further and calls for full financial compensation to go to those people relocated by dams financed by the World Bank. They argue that the IMF and World Bank should be required to accept financial responsibility for what they view as the disastrous impact of their structural adjustment policies.⁶

Taking another approach, other organizations call for the decision-making procedures of the World Bank and IMF to be democratized and reflect the interests of developing countries, not just the economic powers of the West. If this is not possible, however, then they should be abolished and replaced with more appropriate organizations.

Another frequent proposal from anti-globalists is that the IMF and World Bank revamp the conditions they impose on nations they are assisting in the form of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). Required for debtor nations to qualify for loans, SAPs are accused of ignoring the underlying conditions and cultures of individual nations. Instead, they demand the adoption of privatization policies and free markets: measures that for anti-globalists are synonymous with severe economic hardship for the world's poor.

⁵ The International Forum on Globalization, "A Better World Is Possible: Alternatives to Economic Globalization," <http://www.ifg.org>

⁶ Fifty Years Is Enough Network, <http://www.50years.org/about/platform.html>

ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION

casestudy

Climate Change

For **Friends of the Earth International**, the relationship between globalization and climate change is simple: increased trade in the pursuit of economic growth causes pollution.

In 1990, every \$3,000 increase in world GDP was matched by the emission of one tonne of carbon. The ever increasing levels of carbon emissions in the earth's atmosphere are causing global warming.

The claim is made that the impact of global warming is experienced most strongly in developing countries such as those of Central America, and also island nations. Thanks to extreme meteorological phenomena like El Nino, countries of Western South America have recently suffered ecological catastrophes.

The threats posed by climate change demand revolutionary alternatives to globalization. Given that trade causes pollution, **Friends of the Earth International** calls for all international agreements - such as NAFTA and the EU-Mexico trade agreement - to be terminated immediately.

Furthermore, the environmental impact of globalization on developing countries means that wealthy nations actually owe them an "Ecological Debt." This program would entitle many poor nations to abstain from repaying their own external debts. It is proposed that the funds that they save can be used for domestic problems - such as sustainable local growth.

Source: Friends of the Earth International, "Trade, Climate Change and the Ecological Debt," <http://www.foei.org/publications/climate/debt.html>

Among the most vociferous and well-organized of anti-globalists are environmentalists. They insist that preservation of the world's resources is dependent upon globalization being managed in a drastically different manner than it is now.

For environmental activists, globalization is ecologically unsustainable in a variety of ways. The earth's resources are being depleted, reducing biodiversity and increasing pollution. Environmentalists also criticize the World Bank and WTO for fostering environmental catastrophe through globalization.

Being largely powered by fossil fuels such as oil and coal, the increased movement of goods and people is also increasing global pollution. **Friends of the Earth International** argues that global trade and environmental sustainability are not incompatible. However, the most environmentally-friendly trade would occur within local communities and regions.⁷

In addition, they argue that globalization is expanding the influence and market power of vast agricultural corporations such as Monsanto and Novartis. These companies destroy global biodiversity by distributing genetically modified crops across the planet - without having fully considered their full consequences. The "green" lobby opposes the release of artificially engineered organisms into the environment, an approach that many environmentalists consider to be "genetic pollution."⁸

For anti-globalists, corporations such as Monsanto and Novartis are aided by the WTO in spreading genetic pollution. The WTO has sanctioned the patenting of seeds. Groups such as **Greenpeace**, the **Third World Network**, and **GRAIN International** are all adamant that seeds should not be patented because they cannot be invented in the same way as machines are.⁹

The **Whirled Bank Group** also holds the World Bank responsible for the loss of global biodiversity. In developing countries such as India and

⁷ Friends of the Earth International, "Trade, Environment and Sustainability," <http://www.foei.org/trade/index.html>

⁸ **Greenpeace**, "Genetic Engineering," <http://www.Greenpeace.org/campaigns/intro?campaign%5fid=3942>

⁹ Ibid

*GRAIN
International argues
that the decision
about which crops to
plant should remain
with farmers in the
developing world.*

Guatemala, World Bank loans have consistently encouraged the transformation of diverse subsistence economies into export-based economies, founded on just one or two crops for the international market.

GRAIN International argues that the decision about which crops to plant should remain with local farmers in the developing world. Otherwise, farmers are robbed not just of genetic diversity, but of agricultural development alternatives.¹⁰

Having funded the construction of several large dams in poor countries, the World Bank is also held responsible for many environmentally unique habitats disappearing altogether under water.

Common to many environmentalists' suggestions for policy alternatives is for the Bretton Woods institutions and the WTO to adopt the "precautionary principle." **Greenpeace** defines this principle as meaning that when an activity may harm human health or the environment, a cautious approach toward it should be taken in advance. Caution should be exercised on the basis of scientific evidence – even when the full extent of harm has not been fully established scientifically.¹¹

¹⁰ GRAIN: "About Us," <http://www.grain.org/about/index.cfm>

¹¹ Greenpeace, "The Precautionary Principle," http://archive.Greenpeace.org/earthsummit/background_precprinciple.html

The UN Global Compact

The Global Compact lays down certain guiding principles for firms to follow when conducting business. These principles cover respect for the environment, labor, and human rights in both their business practices and the public policies they support.

Six of the nine guiding principles of the Global Compact are concerned specifically with labor and human rights. These principles originated with the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and declarations of the International Labor Organization (ILO).

For example, the Global Compact's guiding principles on labor require that companies recognize the right of their workers to the freedom of association and collective bargaining. They also demand that companies eliminate all forms of forced labor, abolish child labor and remove any forms of employment discrimination.

As of 2002, several hundred corporations from all regions of the world have signed on to the Global Compact. These include some multinationals that have recently been accused of human rights violations, such as Nike.

Source: "The Global Compact - Actors," <http://65.214.34.30/un/gc/unweb.nsf/content/actors.htm>

Globalization is often perceived as being dominated by a small clan of large corporations whose market power spans the entire planet. Their size allows them to dominate markets, drive out smaller local competitors, and bargain down the wages and living standards of their employees around the world.

Coca-Cola, Starbucks, McDonalds and other U.S.-based brands habitually draw the ire of anti-globalization protesters. When protests attract the more violent elements of the anti-globalization movement, McDonalds and Starbucks stores are often targeted for attack.

The confectionary, diamond, coffee and apparel industries have all gained notoriety among anti-globalists for their perceived repressive production practices. Throughout the 1990s, groups such as **United Students Against Sweatshops** drew worldwide media attention for protesting against footwear and apparel giants such as Nike and the Gap, who were targeted for using "sweatshop" labor in developing countries.

Manufacturers who contracted with apparel multinationals to assemble garments and footwear have often been found violating their workers' rights by human rights groups. Violations included: physical violence, paying "starvation" wages, hiring child labor, and denial of union rights. Some manufacturers were even found to be using indentured servants.¹²

Many anti-globalists point to the inequality that exists within clothing multinationals. For instance, according to **Global Exchange**, in 2000 the CEO of the Gap earned more than \$43 million. Cambodian garment workers stitching clothing for the Gap, on the other hand, made \$40 a month – less than the amount required for a living wage in their country.

United Students Against Sweatshops, Global Exchange and other anti-sweatshop activists claim that multinationals can easily afford to eliminate child labor and improve the pay and conditions of sweatshop

¹² BBC News, "South Korea accused of using slave labour," Thursday 27 September 2001, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/1566971.stm>

workers without reducing their profitability. For example, **United Students Against Sweatshops** contend that the wages of all of the millions of workers in the Bangladeshi garment industry could easily be doubled without significantly affecting the profits of their employers.¹³

Amnesty International is also an ardent defender of workers' rights in poor countries. It calls for multinationals to adopt the universal labor and workers' human rights standards outlined in the United Nations' Global Compact.¹⁴

¹³ United Students Against sweatshops, "Sweatshop Myths," <http://www.umich.edu/~sole/myths.html>

¹⁴ Amnesty International Economic Relations http://web.amnesty.org/web/web.nsf/pages/ec_briefings

People's conditionality

Global Exchange advocates the idea of "debt for democracy" swaps to promote "people's conditionality."

Under this scheme, debtor governments would deposit the money that they owe to Western governments and banks into a local fund. The fund would be democratically controlled by a board representing local civil society. The board would then use this money to issue loans for development on the micro-enterprise model used by organizations such as the Grameen Bank. For all local currency deposited into this fund by political leaders, foreign debt would then be written off for an equivalent amount of hard currency.

Source: Global Exchange, "A New Approach to the Third World Debt Crisis," <http://www.globalexchange.org/economy/alternatives/debtCrisis.html>

W

althy governments, their banks and the IFIs have for many years been attacked for the debt that they are owed by developing countries.

Although developed countries have written off many billions of dollars of Third World debt, outstanding loans continue to cripple national economies – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. The debts of the Republic of the Congo, for example, are equivalent to 50 percent of its export earnings, according to **Global Exchange**.¹⁵ Many poor countries must forego health and education expenditures in order to make debt repayments.

Suggestions for what to do about Third World debt from the anti-globalization movement fall into two categories. Some groups demand that all debt immediately be canceled and loans perpetually replaced by grants. For many anti-globalists, support for this position comes from the fact that the majority of Third World debt was accumulated by corrupt and undemocratic leaders who long ago left office.

Most protesters, however, suggest that simple cancellation is not enough because it does not require Third World leaders to reform their governments or improve their societies. Instead, organizations such as **Oxfam** and **Global Exchange** recommend that a requirement for government reform be attached to the progressive cancellation of the debts of Third World nations.

The East African nation of Uganda is seen by advocates of responsible debt relief as a positive role model for other poor nations. Uganda was granted approximately \$50 million per year of debt relief in the 1990s. Once relief was granted, the Ugandan government consulted extensively with civil society groups such as local non-government organizations (NGOs). Consensus was reached around raising the incomes and living standards of the poor, and money was channeled into health and education projects – not the pockets of corrupt politicians.

¹⁵ Global Exchange, "A New Approach to the Third World Debt Crisis," <http://www.globalexchange.org/economy/alternatives/debtCrisis.html>

Tobin tax

One remedy for the dangers of financial speculation commonly proposed by anti-globalization groups is the adoption of the Tobin tax: a tariff is imposed on every single currency transaction that crosses national boundaries. The idea for the tax was originated by James Tobin, winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics in 1981.

The **CEED** suggests that the tax be set at a rate between 0.1 and 0.25 percent of volume of a currency transaction. For example, a currency transaction of US\$100 would incur a 'Tobin tax' of 10 to 25 cents.

Introducing a Tobin tax would discourage speculative short-term currency trades by cutting profit margins. Short-term currency speculation tends to have very low profit margins. Long-term investments would be less affected. The Tobin tax would shrink currency speculation and restore a degree of economic autonomy to sovereign nations.

The Tobin tax also has the potential to be a substantial revenue raiser. Some groups estimate that the tax could produce annual worldwide revenue of between \$100 and \$300 billion.

The **CEED** suggests that this revenue should go to finance urgent international priorities – such as Third World development.

Full implementation of the Tobin tax would require the political will necessary for international multilateral cooperation.

For anti-globalists, one of the most insidious aspects of the deepening of global capital market integration is currency speculation. According to **War on Want**, \$1.2 trillion is exchanged on world currency markets daily. Other anti-globalization groups, such as the **Center for Environmental Economic Development (CEED)**, put the figure even higher – at \$1.8 trillion daily, 90 percent of which is speculative.

The fear of threats posed to the developing world by currency speculation is illustrated by events linked to the 1997 Asian financial crisis. For example, Thailand's and Indonesia's currencies collapsed within a matter of weeks. The lost value of their savings plunged millions of people into poverty. However, these dramatic downturns in economic values were to the advantage of traders in the West, who benefited from the reduction of prices for imports from East Asian countries.

Some anti-globalization groups contend that currency speculation is so harmful to developing countries that it is necessary for communities to avoid international financing altogether through the adoption of local currency schemes.

The claim is made that local currencies would create more caring communities and encourage mutually beneficial social and economic relationships. One of the most prominent of local currencies is the 'Toronto dollar'. Local use of this currency generates funds, ten per cent of which are invested in community projects.¹⁶

¹⁶ Toronto Dollar, <http://www.torontodollar.com/about/description.php>

Human Trafficking

Communications and transportation networks connecting the planet have expanded in recent years. These networks have many positive uses, but they have also facilitated an explosion in illegal human trafficking.

Figures from **Anti-Slavery International** suggest that between 700,000 and two million women and children were trafficked internationally in 2000 alone.

Common points of origin include China, Vietnam, West Africa and the former Communist countries of Eastern Europe. Common destinations are wealthy countries in North America and Western Europe. However, many Asian victims are trafficked to Pacific Islands, where they are reportedly indentured into sweatshops. Many women and children find themselves sold into lives of sexual slavery.

Anti-Slavery International recommends that legal regulation and inspection of goods and people crossing international boundaries be more strictly enforced. Western countries also need to reform their laws so that people who have been trafficked are treated as victims of human rights violations, not as illegal immigrants. This will, in turn, provide a better legal basis for prosecuting traffickers.

Source: Anti-Slavery International, "Trafficking," <http://www.antislavery.org/homepage/antislavery/trafficking.htm>

Anti-globalists believe that global economic integration causes increased oppression of women. Globalization results in females in developing nations working in sweatshops and suffering other increased hardships. It is also causing an unprecedented increase in trafficking of women and girls for sexual slavery.¹⁷

Many women's anti-globalization groups, such as the Feminist Majority Foundation, consider sweatshops a feminist issue. Ninety percent of sweatshop workers in the world are women. Additionally, many abuses reported to occur in sweatshops appear specifically designed to demean female workers. Cases of sexual impropriety are reported to be common, as are attempts to prevent female workers from marrying or becoming pregnant.

Groups such as the **Feminist Majority Foundation** are not opposed to multinationals locating production facilities in developing countries, but they do oppose sweatshop conditions. The only way to abolish sweatshops is to pay workers higher wages, and also ensure that standards for workplace conditions set by the United Nations' International Labor Organization (ILO) are rigorously enforced.

¹⁷ Asia Times, "Globalization leads to slavery," August 23 2001, <http://www.atimes.com/c-asia/CH23Ag03.html>

Media coverage of the anti-globalization movement has been dominated by the most visible participants in protests such as that against the World Trade Organization in Seattle in the fall of 1999. As a result, there is a tendency to ignore the concrete proposals that emanate from many non-governmental organizations. Many groups have developed sophisticated policy alternatives designed to substantially improve the status quo of the global economy.

These policy proposals encompass a range of issues, including international trade, multinational corporations, and international financial institutions. Oxfam, for example, campaigns extensively to remove tariffs on agricultural products imposed by wealthy nations upon developing nations. It also seeks reform of the evaluation system that the World Bank uses to monitor the health and education impact of its policies. Friends of the Earth believes that international trade agreements such as NAFTA need to be abolished because the increased transportation of products that they encourage contributes to global warming. Several other groups call for multinational corporations to act more ethically by adopting codes of conduct such as the UN's Global Compact. Another frequent target of protesters is Third World debt. Organizations such as Global Exchange recommend that abolition of debt be conditional upon government reform in debtor nations, which are often corrupt and undemocratic.

While it is convenient to portray the current battle of ideas over globalization as one between "globalists" and "anti-globalists," it is also misleading. This brief review of the policies of NGOs with a global outlook demonstrates that the battle of ideas is actually most intense over what it is to be done with global integration. These NGOs campaign for the forces of globalization to be harnessed for the alleviation of poverty and inequality in the developing world. ■



THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON DC