

Conceptualizing Resistance to Globalization

(COAUTHORED WITH CHRISTINE B. N. CHIN)

ASSESSMENTS of resistance to globalization are necessarily influenced by the manner in which one conceptualizes resistance. Too often, this term is used promiscuously, sometimes as a synonym for challenges, protests, intransigence, or even evasions. Hence, we seek to juxtapose alternative explanations of resistance and highlight the complexities of theorizing it. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to explore the question, What is the meaning of resistance in the context of globalization?

One way to approach this issue is with the proposition that a major asymmetry in the globalization trend is between its economic and political levels. Although it would be wrong to concede the neoclassical premise that economics and politics are separable realms, it is clear, at least in analytical terms, that globalization's hegemonic project is neoliberalism and that liberal democracy has not kept pace with its spread. In the space opened by this disjuncture, resistance to globalization is on the rise. But it cannot solely be understood as a political reaction. Rather, in the teeth of globalizing tendencies, resistance movements shape and are constitutive of cultural processes. This is the main thesis to be developed in this chapter.

There is no dearth of culturally laden manifestations of resistance to globalization. Culminating in the election of a Government of National Unity, led by the African National Congress (ANC) in 1994, the worldwide anti-apartheid movement against a racial monopoly of the means of production is one of the foremost examples of a mobilization against globalization from above. This was *a movement from below against globalization from above* in the sense that South Africa was, and is, the site of substantial foreign investment and where many TNCs have touched down; their role in maintaining the white redoubt was successfully contested by large-scale collective action at home, including armed struggle, in conjunction with a transnational network of support groups. The demise of apartheid may also be understood as a *movement from above against globalization from above* inasmuch as it was facilitated by a split in South African capitalism, in which the modernizers and globalizers abandoned an obsolescent capitalism based on an increasingly less

profitable form of racial segregation. Thus in 1985, Gavin W. H. Relly, the retired chairman of the Anglo American Corporation, the largest conglomerate in South Africa, defied official government policy and led a delegation of business leaders to meet privately with the banned ANC in Lusaka, Zambia, where they discussed the transition to a new order. In addition, there are numerous illustrations of more localized resistance, including the Zapatista armed uprising among the Maya Indians against the Mexican government's neoliberal reforms, a struggle in which the rebels quickly turned to modern technologies, including the Internet, to rally transnational support. But it would be facile to conceptualize resistance only as declared organized opposition to institutionalized economic and military power. One must dig deep to excavate the everyday individual and collective activities that fall short of open opposition. To grasp resistance to globalization, one must also examine the subtexts of political and cultural life, the possibilities and potential for structural transformation.

We begin to delve into the constitutive role of power in shaping cultural critiques of economic globalization as well as patterns of struggle by revisiting the works of three master theorists of resistance, even if their writings were not explicitly directed at the contemporary phase of globalization: Antonio Gramsci's concept of counterhegemony, Karl Polanyi's notion of countermovements, and James C. Scott's idea of infrapolitics. For the sake of brevity, our scope is limited to these authors—other conceptualizations would take us too far afield; empirical referents are provided in chapters 10 and 11. We hold that the trilogy of Gramsci-Polanyi-Scott, set forth through a critical evaluation of each author's work in the next three sections of this chapter, offers a sound basis for reconceptualizing resistance. The conclusion then probes the convergence and contrasting emphases within this triad, and also suggests directions for further study and exploratory research.

RESISTANCE AS COUNTERHEGEMONY

Ostensibly, Gramsci's analysis of social change as explicated in *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (1971) could neither have anticipated nor accounted for globalization. The notes were written between 1929 and 1935 while Gramsci, a member of parliament and the general secretary of the Communist Party, was imprisoned by the fascist regime in Italy. In his discussions of state-society relations, Gramsci was concerned particularly with orthodox Marxist and bourgeois liberal theoretical frameworks that privileged economism by reducing transformations in all aspects of social life to economic determinants. His theoretical efforts to transcend econ-

omism are applicable to conceptualizing resistance at the turn of the millennium. To replace economism, Gramsci developed the concept of hegemony, which encompasses whole ways of life. For Gramsci, hegemony is a dynamic lived process in which social identities, relations, organizations, and structures based on asymmetrical distributions of power and influence are constituted by the dominant classes. Hegemony, then, is as much economic as it is “ethico-political” in shaping relations of domination and subordination.

The institutions of civil society, such as the church, family, schools, media, and trade unions, give meaning and organization to everyday life so that the need for the application of force is reduced. Hegemony is established when power and control over social life are perceived as emanating from “self-government” (i.e., self-government of individuals embedded in communities) as opposed to an external source(s) such as the state or the dominant strata (Gramsci 1971, 268). Since hegemony is a lived process, different historical contexts will produce different forums of hegemony with different sets of actors, such as the nineteenth-century “passive revolution” of the Risorgimento, in which the bourgeoisie in Italy attained power without fundamental restructuring from below, and the early twentieth-century proletarian revolutionary leadership in Russia.

The processes of establishing hegemony, however, can never be complete because a hegemonic project presumes and requires the participation of subordinate groups. While hegemony is being implemented, maintained, and defended, it can be challenged and resisted in the interlocking realms of civil society, political society, and the state. Different forms and dimensions of resistance to hegemony are subsumed under the rubric of counterhegemony. Implicit in a counterhegemonic project are “wars of movement” and “wars of position,” in which people engage in openly declared collective action against the state. Wars of movement are frontal assaults against the state (e.g., labor strikes or even military action), whereas wars of position can be read as nonviolent resistance, e.g., boycotts that are designed to impede everyday functions of the state (Gramsci 1971, 229–30).¹ The objective of both types of war is to seize control of the state. Wars of movement and position are expressions of counterhegemonic consciousness at the collective level. They represent moments in history when individuals come together in violent and nonviolent confrontations with the state. The question nevertheless arises: Why and how does counterhegemonic consciousness emerge in everyday life, leading to openly declared collective action?

¹ Gramsci (1971, 106–20) also linked wars of position to “passive revolution” of the dominant classes—i.e., revolution from above—that sidesteps the need for fundamental restructuring from below.

Gramsci's discussion of common sense in the development of counterhegemonic consciousness is crucial to explaining historical and/or contemporary forms of resistance. Common sense that is held and practiced in everyday life is neither linear nor unitary; it is the product of an individual's relationship to and position in a variety of social groups:

In acquiring one's conception of the world one always belongs to a particular grouping which is that of all the social elements which share the same mode of thinking and acting. We are all conformists of some conformism or other. . . . *When one's conception of the world is not critical and coherent but disjointed and episodic, one belongs simultaneously to a multiplicity of mass human groups.* . . . The starting-point of critical elaboration is the consciousness of what one really is, and is "knowing thyself" as a product of the historical process to date which has deposited in you an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory. (Gramsci 1971, 324; emphasis added)

Importantly, the coexistence of conformity and resistance in common sense can give rise to inconsistencies between thought and action, which help explain contradictory behavior on the part of a subaltern group which may embrace its "own conception of the world" while still adopting conceptions borrowed from dominant classes (Gramsci 1971, 326–27). By arguing that individuals and groups possess critical consciousness—albeit "in flashes"—of their subordinate positions in society, Gramsci acknowledged the ambiguity of resistance and dismissed the overly deterministic and unidimensional explanation of false consciousness.

Nevertheless, in the discussion of thought and action, Gramsci was careful not to suggest that submission in the face of domination is the simple product of the subaltern's rational calculation of costs and benefits (in the sense that resistance would be futile at best, or would elicit retaliatory action, at worst). The fragmentation of social identity that characterizes and is characterized by simultaneous membership in different groups means that it is possible, if not probable, that the subaltern can be progressive on certain issues and reactionary on others in the same instance.

A Gramscian reading of resistance would have to explicate the development of counterhegemonic consciousness that informs wars of movement and position, as well as national-popular actions led by organic intellectuals from all walks of life who can meld theory and praxis to construct and embed a new common sense that binds disparate voices and consciousness into a coherent program of change. In his time, Gramsci called for organic intellectuals to infuse common sense with a philosophy of praxis that encourages subaltern groups' critical understanding of their subordination in society. The objective is a "national-popular" movement constituted by alliances between the leaders (in league with their organic intellectuals) and the led (subaltern). Whereas

wars of movement and position aim to capture the state, the national-popular movement provides the new basis for whole ways of life.

Gramsci did not offer programmatic ways that a philosophy of praxis could transcend the fragmentation of identity and interests. With contemporary globalization, the interpenetration of forces at the local, national, regional, and world levels implies that different peoples enter into alliances that can be and are ever more contradictory: e.g., low-wage female factory workers in EPZs who also are members or supporters of Islamist movements in Southeast Asia. A new common sense has to address effectively or make coherent women's critical understanding of the tensions, limitations, and opportunities inherent in their identities as daughters or wives in the household, as low-wage workers on the factory floor, as citizens, and as Muslims in the local, national, and transnational Islamic communities.

Moreover, globalization begets openly declared forms of resistance that may or may not have the state as a target. Rotating the holders of state power may not alleviate the problems that ignited resistance in the first place. In a context in which liberal, authoritarian, and ex-communist states-in-transition alike are often becoming facilitators for transnational capital, if and when it occurs, the driving force(s) of openly declared resistance against the state must be analyzed within a larger framework. At issue are the contradictory ways in which state structures and policies assume "educative" functions that nurture a new kind of citizenry and civilization commensurate with the requirements of transnational capital, while trying to maintain the legitimacy with which to govern (Chin 1998). In this connection, one can profitably invoke Gramsci's insights into civil society and resistance, about which he offered many pointers, although they are not always congruent with one another. Additionally, Gramsci's concepts can be pushed beyond the domestic realm to world order, and scholars have begun to extend the framework in this manner (especially Cox 1986, 1987, 1999; Augelli and Murphy 1988, 1997).

Although wars of movement and position may still be discerned, sometimes in nascent form, the compression of time and space has created new venues of and for *collective resistance transcending national borders*. Contemporary social movements simultaneously occupy local, national, transnational, and global space as a result of innovations in, and applications of, technologies such as the Internet, facsimile machines, cellular mobile phones, and globalized media, which produce instantaneous communication across traditional frontiers. The Gramscian framework of resistance thus must be stretched to encompass new actors and spaces from which counterhegemonic consciousness is expressed. In the following section, we discuss the possibility of further considering social movements as a form of resistance.

RESISTANCE AS COUNTERMOVEMENTS

A different emphasis in regard to resistance may be found in Polanyi's notion of the double *movement*. To add to what has been said in previous chapters about his notion of how, during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the state-supported drive to install and expand the "self-regulating" market sparked protective measures or countermovements to reassert social control over the market, it is important to bear in mind that Polanyi understood resistance in the form of countermovements as having arisen from, and affecting, different ways of life. Protecting workers from the commodification process implies defending the social relations and institutions of which they are a part:

In disposing of a man's labor power the system would, incidently, dispose of the physical, psychological, and moral entity "man" attached to that tag. Robbed of the protective covering of cultural institutions, human beings would perish from the effects of social exposure; they would die as victims of acute social dislocation through vice, perversion, crime, and starvation. . . . [N]o society could stand the effects of such a system of crude fictions even for the shortest stretch of time unless its human and natural substance as well as its business organization was protected against the ravages of this satanic mill. (Polanyi 1957, 73; emphasis added)

The movement-counter movement framework thus allows one to conceptualize contemporary social movements as a form of resistance since the latter are, in the main, defined as "a form of collective action (a) based on solidarity, (b) carrying on a conflict, (c) breaking the limits of the system in which action occurs" (Melucci 1985, 795). The level of analysis would have to be extended from the national to the transnational and/or global since some contemporary social movements, e.g., those that concern environmental destruction, women's rights, and indigenous peoples' rights, appear to go beyond the state in search of transnational or global solutions.

There are two implicit problems in the counter/social movement framework. Collectivity is assumed in the notion "movement" and this has the effect of constructing counter/social movements as united fronts in and of themselves. In the past decade or so, the fragmented nature of the feminist movement is evidenced in the internal conflict and domination generated from differences of race, religion, class, and nationality in spite of, and because of, attempts to address national and global patriarchy (Hooks 1981, 1984; Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991).

Also imputed in counter/social movements is the presence of organizational structure. This may be the case with some social movements (e.g.,

Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth in the environmental realm), but “submerged networks” with no clearly defined organizational structure too have formed in an era of globalization. Participants in submerged networks live their everyday lives mostly without engaging in openly declared contestations: “They question definition of codes, nomination of reality. They don’t ask, they offer. They offer by their own existence other ways of defining the meaning of individual and collective action. They act as new media: they enlighten what every system doesn’t say of itself, the amount of silence, violence, irrationality which is always hidden in dominant codes” (Melucci 1985, 812).

The presence of submerged networks gives new meaning to resistance. Even though participants can mobilize to protest state policies, open engagement or confrontation with the state or even TNCs is not the immediate, or even ultimate, objective. In the absence of openly declared collective action, resistance has to be read as the ways in which peoples live their everyday lives. Submerged networks affirm that even though resistance can be manifestly political and economic, it is shaped by and shapes ways of life. In advanced industrialized societies, examples of submerged networks are those in which families and their friends make it a point—in their consumption habits—to refuse to buy tuna fish caught using methods that destroy entire dolphin populations, or to purchase consumer products only from companies that actively practice environmental conservationism. Such acts have economic consequences in the corporate world, and political consequences for policy makers. Significantly, submerged networks are sites of emerging alternative values and life styles.

In Egypt, for example, submerged networks exist in the popular quarters and among the common people, known as the *sha‘b*.² Networks radiate from the family—the basic unit of social organization in the *sha‘b*—to include ties that transcend class, occupation, and kin. The “familial ethos” governs the allocation and distribution of material and symbolic resources in the *sha‘b*. In the present unspoken pact between the Egyptian state and the *sha‘b*, state legitimacy is maintained by the distribution of basic goods and services to the *sha‘b* in return for political acquiescence. Participants of the *sha‘b* acquiesce to, as much as they engage in, resistance against the state. Members of the Islamist movement, who also are members of the *sha‘b*, have been known to and can draw on submerged network ties to smuggle arms and, on occasion, to mobilize and organize mass protests against the state.

The notion of the Polanyian double movement thus has a distinct advantage of neatly encapsulating openly declared demands on the na-

² “While the noun, the *sha‘b*, refers to a collective people, populace, or folk and has an implicit collective connotation to it, as an adjective *sha‘bi* demarcates a wide range of indignant practices, tastes, and patterns in everyday life” (Singerman 1995, 10–11).

tional, transnational, and global levels for protective measures against various dimensions in the implementation and expansion of the self-regulating market. As discussed, however, the movement-counter movement framework neither advances analysis of differences within counter movements nor adequately anticipates undeclared forms of resistance, both of which have emerged and must be addressed in conceptualizing collective resistance to globalization.

RESISTANCE AS INFRAPOLITICS

In 1990, James C. Scott introduced the idea of “infrapolitics” as everyday forms of resistance conducted singularly and collectively, but which fall short of openly declared contestations. What began as his attempt to understand the conditions for peasant rebellions in Southeast Asia and the absence of openly declared resistance in a village in rapidly industrializing Malaysia gradually led to the conceptualization of infrapolitics: a way to explain the changing meaning of politics and resistance in most forms of day-to-day, dominant-subordinate relations (Scott 1976, 1985, 1990). Scott warned that, in the context of increasingly complex societies, the absence of openly declared contestations should not be mistaken for acquiescence. It is in the realm of informal assemblages such as the parallel market, workplace, household, and local community, when people negotiate resources and values on an everyday basis, that “counterhegemonic consciousness is elaborated” (Scott 1990, 200). These are the sites of infrapolitical activities that range from foot-dragging, squatting, and gossip to the development of dissident subcultures.

Taken at face value, such activities cannot tell us anything about counterhegemonic discourse until we account for the conditions from which they emerge. Infrapolitics is identified by juxtaposing what Scott calls the “public” and “hidden transcripts.” Public transcripts are verbal and non-verbal acts carried out by the dominant party or, “to put it crudely, the *self*-portrait of dominant elites as they would have themselves seen” (Scott 1990, 18; emphasis in original). They are the public record of superior-subordinate relations in which the latter appears to acquiesce willingly to the stated and unstated expectations of the former. Hidden transcripts, on the other hand, consist of what subordinate parties say and do beyond the realm of the public transcript or the observation of the dominant. In the context of surveillance structures set up by the dominant class(es) or the state, hidden transcripts record infrapolitical activities that surreptitiously challenge practices of economic, status, and ideological domination.

The study of infrapolitics, we believe, is premised on what sociologists call ontological narratives (Somers 1994). Ontological narrativity does

not refer to the mode of representation or the traditional "story-telling" method of historians (i.e., a method of presenting historical knowledge) considered nonexplanatory and atheoretical by mainstream social scientists. Rather, ontological narratives are the stories that social actors tell, and in the process they come to define themselves or to construct their identities and perceive conditions that promote and/or mitigate the possibility for change (see, especially, Butler and Scott 1992; Geertz 1983; Taylor 1989).

Even though hidden transcripts record contestations over material and symbolic resources and values in everyday life, they do not occur in a localized vacuum. Infrapolitical activities are the product of interactions between structure and agency: the ways that real and perceived constraints and opportunities affect the behavior of subordinate groups. Scott's analysis of infrapolitical activities thus falls short of capturing the complexities inherent in undeclared forms of everyday resistance. In his study of landlord-peasant relations in a rural Malay village, Scott asserted that analyses of state structures and policies were important *only* to the extent that they impinged on local class relations (1985, xix). Especially during the 1980s and in the context of national agricultural development policies and fluctuating global prices of commodities, landlord-peasant relations were shaped by impingements on, and interactions among, the rural community, state structures and policies, as well as the transformations marking a globalizing economic system.

Superior-subordinate relations, such as those of the landlord-peasant, manager-worker, husband-wife, and state official-squatter, are embedded in the ways of life, of which state structures and policies play an important part. Take, for instance, policies designed to normalize the patriarchal nuclear family form as most natural in and for the expansion and maintenance of capitalist free markets, and/or that privilege scientific and other technical education at the expense of the humanities. Such policies frame worldviews insofar as they directly and indirectly affect all aspects of social life from the rate of urbanization, housing development, and employment opportunities, to the control and distribution of resources in the household. In increasingly complex social contexts, subalterns do not have an unproblematic unitary identity. Nor can their behavior be explained by implicit reference to the economic model of the self-interested utility maximizer. Put simply, infrapolitical activities are not the mere product of subaltern decisions to conduct undeclared resistance in the face of surveillance structures set up by the dominant strata.

Class is but one important modality of identity in landlord-peasant or other forms of dominant-subordinate relations. The different and possibly conflicting modalities of subaltern identity can be as real, and under certain conditions, as constraining on behavior as the actual or perceived

futility and fear of openly declared resistance in the face of domination. By putting a unidimensional face on resistance, Scott inadvertently assigned a similar unidimensional countenance to domination, even though he analytically distinguished economic, status, and ideological domination. In this connection, Gramsci reminded us that subaltern identities are embedded in complex overlapping social networks in which individuals simultaneously assume positions of domination and subordination (perhaps as a husband or wife, an elder or junior, a manager or office clerk, and a donor or recipient of aid). Analysis of the manner in which particular combinations of identity are expressed in the context of structural constraints can help explain why, given systems of surveillance (in which rewards and punishments inhere), some conform while others engage in infrapolitical activities of different types. Conversely, this approach also deepens analysis of the changing nature of domination.

Hidden transcripts have the potential to facilitate understanding of the internal politics of subaltern groups. The phenomenon of “domination within domination” occurs in cases in which contradictory alliances are formed between the dominant and the subordinate that, in turn, dominate others. Although Scott acknowledges this point, his emphasis on class without a sufficiently subtle exploration of the interactions between class and nonclass forces undermines the efficacy of the infrapolitical framework. The immediate focus on class presumes that the development of class consciousness stands apart exclusively from other modalities of identity. It is, indeed, possible to argue that class contests in the context of surveillance can and do lead to infrapolitical activities that are grounded in material life. This argument is made possible *only* after having considered how and why the class dimension comes to be privileged and expressed over other modalities of identity. To do otherwise would reaffirm what Gramsci called “economism,” and subsequently relegate noneconomic considerations to the ambit of superstructure.

Infrapolitics is embedded in whole ways of life, part of which is the material dimension. They embody contestations over the processes of grounded identity construction, maintenance, and transformation, of which the symbolic and material dimensions of class are intertwined with other modalities of identity, such as age, gender, race-ethnicity, religion, and nationality. The identification, juxtaposition, and analyses of public and hidden transcripts can highlight the conditions in which certain dimensions of counterhegemonic consciousness develop, and how different or even conflicting perspectives within hidden transcripts are negotiated and/or (not) resolved in everyday life.

Resistance conceptualized as infrapolitical activities offers a possible avenue for generating theoretically grounded studies of everyday responses to globalizing structures and processes. If conducted with sensi-

tivity to the complex interplay between or among multiple identities in the context of structural constraints, the study of public and hidden transcripts may reveal changing notions and practices of work, family, and politics, for example, as peoples seek to negotiate a semblance of social control over the expansion of market forces in diverse spheres of their everyday lives. At the same time, one should not overwork the broad category of infrapolitics by imagining that every sort of reaction to globalizing structures is resistance. Whereas Scott carefully argues that diverse modes of resistance may or may not coalesce into opposition to authority structures, it is important to avoid treating resistance as an omnibus category.

AN EMERGING FRAMEWORK

The conduct and meaning of resistance are culturally embedded. This foundational proposition is no less applicable or relevant in conceptualizing contemporary resistance to globalization, as it was to Gramsci, Polanyi, and Scott's analyses of social change in different historical periods. The three master theorists acknowledged, implicitly and explicitly, that resistance arises from and is constitutive of specific ways of life. From this elemental proposition, however, the theorists diverged in their respective discussions of the forms and dimensions of resistance. Gramsci and Polanyi focused on the collective level, whereas Scott drew attention more to the level of the individual, as well as class, in everyday life. As delineated in Table 9.1, the main targets and modes of resistance differ from one theorist to another: Gramscian wars of movement and position against the state (though not to the neglect of change within civil society short of toppling the state), Polanyian countermovements against market forces, and Scott's infrapolitical activities in the face of everyday domination.

Differences in levels of analysis, main targets, and modes of resistance should not be reasoned only by way of the intellectual proclivities of each theorist per se. Rather, the conceptual tensions among the theorists correspond to, and reflect, the changing conditions of social life: From Gramsci to Polanyi to Scott, as societies became more complex, so too did the targets and modes of resistance. Contemporary transformations in social life in general, and state-society relations in particular, imply that all three major targets and modes of resistance coexist and are modified in globalizing processes.

This important conversation among the theorists forms a grid that may be profitably fastened to neoliberal globalization. The emerging framework helps to identify possibilities for contesting forms of domination,

TABLE 9.1
Three Analyses of Resistance

| | <i>Main Target</i> | <i>Mode of Resistance</i> |
|---------|--|---|
| Gramsci | State apparatuses (understood as an instrument of education) | Wars of movement and position |
| Polanyi | Market forces (and their legitimation) | Countermovements aimed at self-protection |
| Scott | Ideologies (public transcripts) | Counterdiscourses |

expanding political space, and opening new venues—hence redefinitions of politics. Seen from the observation points of this triad, a conceptualization of contemporary resistance to globalization sensitizes one to the ontological shift suggested below.

Forms of Resistance

As certain dimensions of political and economic power become more diffuse and less institutionalized, so too will forms of resistance. Undeclared forms of resistance conducted individually and collectively in submerged networks parallel openly declared forms of resistance embodied in wars of movement and position, and countermovements. Depending on the context, everyday activities, such as what one wears (e.g., the veil in Muslim societies or the dashiki in the African-American community), buys, or consumes, may qualify as resistance—as much as that of organized strikes, boycotts, and even armed insurgencies against states and TNCs throughout the world. One of the key challenges here is to problematize the absence of openly declared forms of resistance. Doing so can explicate the changing meaning of politics as a result of interactions between forces of change on the local, national, regional, and global levels.

Agents of Resistance

In the past, agents of resistance were synonymous mostly with union workers, armed rebels (many of them peasants), and political dissidents, including students and certain intellectuals, as class contestations assumed overt political and, in some cases, military dimensions. At present, agents of resistance are not restricted to such actors. They range

from blue-collar and white-collar workers to clerics, homemakers, and middle managers. It is important to note that even state functionaries can resist the wholesale implementation of neoliberal development paths (especially the veneer of liberal democratic politics), such as those who insist on “Asian-style democracy” in the midst of establishing open markets and free trade. It is the complex ways in which symbolic resources and values articulate with the material conditions of life in different societies that produce a variety of organic intellectuals, a more encompassing group in the current phase of globalization. Class contests only partly form the basis of resistance. Instead, agents of resistance emerge from interactions between structure and agency that lead to the contextual privileging of particular intersections of different modes of identity, i.e., class-nationality-gender-race/ethnicity-religion-sexual orientation. Implicit in the designation of diverse peoples as agents of resistance is an expansion of the boundaries associated with the traditional sites of political life.

Sites of Resistance

Resistance is localized, regionalized, and globalized at the same time that economic globalization slices across geopolitical borders. What this means, in part, is that the “public-private” dichotomy no longer holds, for most, albeit not all, dimensions of social life are affected in varying and interconnected ways by globalizing forces. Everyday life in the household and the informal market can facilitate, as well as resist, such forces in distinctly material and symbolic ways. Another closely related phenomenon is the development of cyberspace, a site at which resistance finds its instantaneous audience via the Internet or World Wide Web. Counterdiscourse is a mode of globalized resistance in cyberspace. One has to bear in mind, however, that although states in general are incapable of effectively monitoring and censoring cyberspatial counterdiscourse, this particular means of resistance is open only to those who have access to computers, modems, and the Internet.

Strategies of Resistance

By strategies, we refer to the actual ways that people, whose modes of existence are threatened by globalization (e.g., through job loss, encroachment on community lands, or undermining of cultural integrity), respond in a sustained manner toward achieving certain objectives. While forms of struggle differ, groups may adopt varied means to contest, and

link objectively and subjectively to their counterparts in other countries or regions. Local movements become transnational or global with sustained access to communication technologies that construct and maintain communities of like-minded individuals. For example, community activists and scholars meet at different forums for the exchange of information and plans. An emerging strategy of “borderless solidarity” is to link single issues such as environmental degradation, women’s rights, and racism, and to highlight the interconnectedness of varied dimensions of social life. Analyses of this may bring to bear the conditions and methods by which commonality can be achieved in spite, of and because of, the fragmentation of identities and interests while economic and political life is being globalized. Nonetheless, evolving global strategies of resistance do not necessarily sidetrack the state. Under certain circumstances, strategies of resistance can, and do, pit state agencies against one another (e.g., in the case of shipping toxic waste to the developing world, state agencies in charge of environmental protection may join in protests, while their counterparts responsible for industrial development continue to encourage the kind and methods of industrialization that cause environmental damage). Studies of global, transnational, and local resistance must then take into account transformations in state structures, whether or not strategies of resistance manifestly engage the state.

Quite clearly, an ontology of resistance to globalization requires grounding. When contextualized, the elements of *forms*, *agents*, *sites*, and *strategies* may be viewed in terms of their interactions so as to delimit durable patterns and the potential for structural transformation. The Gramsci-Polanyi-Scott triad calls for conceptual frameworks that link different levels of analysis. Integration of the local and the global can bring to the fore the conditions in which diverse forms, agents, sites, and strategies of resistance emerge from the conjunctures and disjunctures in the global political economy, as shown in the following chapters, which are intended to exemplify the intricacy and the variability of *combinations* of resistance from above and below. The next chapter threads the categories and propositions developed here through the environmental realm, and the penultimate chapter complicates the analysis by bringing to light a very different kind of resistance, one that emulates the market by adopting its logic, yet interfering with neoliberal rules, and profoundly affecting the nature of political life.