Globalization, Development and Human Security

Edited by

ANTHONY McGREW and NANA K. PO

polity

First published in 2007 by Polity Press

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Polity Press
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148, USA

ISBN-10: 0-7456-3086-3
ISBN-13: 978-07456-3086-1
ISBN-10: 0-7456-3087-1 (pb)
ISBN-13: 978-07456-3087-8 (pb)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in 10.25 on 12.5 pt Quadraat Sans Regular
by Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Manchester, UK
Printed and bound in Malaysia by Alden Press Ltd

Contents

Geneva: World Health Organization and Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS.
WHO-AFRO 2003: *HIV/AIDS Epidemiological Surveillance Update for the WHO African Region 2002*. World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa: Harare.
Williams, B. G., Gilgen, D., Campbell, C. M., Taljaard, D. and MacPhail, C. 2000: *The Natural History of HIV/AIDS in South Africa: A Biomedical and Social Survey*. Carletonville, South Africa: Center for Scientific and Industrial Research (July).
World Bank 1994: *World Development Report*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
World Bank 2000a: *Assessing Globalization*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
World Bank 2000b: *Intensifying Action Against HIV/AIDS in Africa: Responding to a Development Crisis*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

8 Transformations and Constrictions: Globalization and Huma Rights in the Third Worl

Bonny Ibhawoh

Global markets, global technology, global ideas and global solidarity can enr the lives of people everywhere. The challenge remains how to ensure that the benefits are shared equitably and that global interdependence works for the rights and welfare of all people – not just to profit a few. In this chapter, Bon Ibhawoh argues that the threats to human rights posed by economic globalization risk outweighing its accidental benefits. The chapter delves beyo economics to recognize and address the ramifications of more subtle, but no le significant, 'bottom-up' dimensions of the phenomenon of globalization. He argues for more efforts to be made to enhance the ability of Third World state and societies to negotiate their own terms within a global economy as it relat to their basic rights.

> None of the developments [of globalization] in itself is necessarily incompatible with the principles of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights . . . Taken together, however, and if not complemented by appropriate additional policies, globalization risks downgrading the centr place accorded to human rights by the Charter of the United Nations in ge and the International Bill of Human Rights in particular. (UNHCHR 1999)

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of globalization has been subjected to a number of conflicting and sometimes contradictory interpretations. Much of the discussion on globalization since the term gained currency in the mid of the last century has focused on its 'tangible' economic manifestatio Although most scholars acknowledge the multifaceted nature of globalization, there remains a disproportionate concern with its econo dimension – the operations of globalizing economic institutions, international financial institutions (IFIs) and transnational corporatior (TNCs); the marked integration of global markets, labour and product the phenomenal impact of what has been described as 'McWorld' (Friedman 2000) and the obliteration of the 'tyranny of distance' by

technological and communication revolutions (Holton 1998: 8). This has created a new orthodoxy about the economic dimensions of globalization that exalts it above all other human values or phenomena. However as several scholars have emphasized, globalization is not just a notion that defines the process of world transformation into one relatively borderless arena of economic life. It is also a notion that defines simultaneous processes of transformation in social, cultural and other subjective matters. Unfortunately, the preoccupation with its economic dimensions has tended to obscure these other important ramifications of globalization.

One possible explanation for this bias in the dominant modes of thinking about globalization is the tendency among scholars, policy makers and other commentators to see globalization from a top-down perspective – as something that comes from above in the form of multinational firms, world markets and international capital flows. Intrinsic in this, is the assumption that the globalizing initiatives originate at the top with the powerful players like multinational corporations affecting the conditions of subaltern actors like Third World workers who have little or no say in the globalizing process (Streeten 1999: 11). This unidirectional view of globalization overlooks important globalizing impulses that come from below such as environmental advocacy movements, women's movements and human rights struggles. This chapter proceeds from the premise that there is need for a more holistic approach to understanding globalization. This must go beyond economics to recognize and address the ramifications of more subtle, but no less significant, 'bottom-up' dimensions of the phenomenon of globalization. There is a need to bring globalization down from the 'rarefied and glorified atmosphere of corporate boardrooms, and home to the daily realities of ordinary human beings' (UN 2000:10). Examining the links between human rights and globalization is one way of bringing down globalization to the level of ordinary people in developing societies.

ESTABLISHING THE LINK BETWEEN GLOBALIZATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

One defining feature of globalization has been the emergence of an international moral order in the form of recognized international human rights standards. The universal human rights movement epitomizes an important trend in the globalization of ideas and knowledge. It represents the globalization of thought and consciousness, with people in different parts of the world increasingly concerning themselves with common socio-political issues like human rights, environmental protection and biodiversity in a way that transcends spatial borders. The impact of the phenomenon of globalization on human rights *ideas* and *conditions* around the world has begun to attract the attention of some scholars, policy makers and even the media. A number of studies have addressed the impacts of economic globalization on human rights (McCorquodale 1999; Brysk 2002), the globalization of human rights (Coicaud et al. 2003) and the feminist perspective on globalization and human rights (Orford 1998;

Rowbotham and Linkogl 2001). There is also a growing recognition of the link between globalization and human rights at the level of international policy-making. In 2001 the United Nations Sub-Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution titled 'Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of human rights'. The resolution expressed concern about the impact of globalization and the liberalization of trade on agricultural products on the 'promotion and protection of the right to food for members of vulnerable communities'. It reaffirmed the 'importance and relevance of human rights obligations in all areas of governance and development, including international and regional trade, investment and financial policies and practices'. The resolution drew particular attention to the human rights obligations of the World Bank, the IMF, the OECD an the WHO (UNHCHR 2001).

Earlier in 1999 the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) in the United States released a widely acclaimed documentary entitled 'Globalization and huma rights'. Like the UN report, the documentary aimed at exploring the human rights implication of globalization on developing countries in the South. It focused on human rights issues such as the uprisings against IFI and TNC activities in Indonesia and Nigeria, the massive lay-offs of miners in South Africa and worldwide protests against child labour, linking them with the forces of globalization – 'the economic engine that is transforming the wor in its own image' (PBS 1999). What both the UN report, the PBS documenta and recent scholarly works call attention to is a growing realization that far from being a purely economic phenomenon, globalization has important ramifications for human rights conditions around the world.

Most writers characterize the link between globalization and human rights, as a 'double-edged sword'. Globalization simultaneously creates opportunities and represents challenges for the international protection human rights (McCorquodale 1999: 763). Globalization threatens huma rights in developing societies but at the same time creates unprecedente opportunities to protect and promote these rights (Brysk and Gonzalez-Cueva 2000). These views are based largely on the evaluations of the human rights implications of economic globalization. They focus mainly on the response of the human rights movement to the adverse economic and social consequences of economic globalization. This presents the globalization/human rights dynamic simply as a dialectic of action and reaction, initiative and consequence. This framework overlooks a third level of the globalization/human rights dynamic – the universal human rights movement as a manifestation of the globalization of consciousne in itself rather than merely as a reaction to economic globalization.

I would argue that rather than being a double-sided affair, the globalization/human rights dynamic in the Third World actually manifest as a 'triple-edged sword'. First, there is the process of 'globalization' (or t use the language of the discourse, 'universalization') of human rights tha has occurred quite independently of economic globalization. Since the en of the Second World War and the adoption of the Universal Declaration ol Human Rights by the UN, the idea and language of human rights have cc to assume unprecedented global appeal and significance, shaping politic and social movements across the world. On no other theme is the

'globalization of consciousness' more asserted and contested than on the theme of human rights. Human rights have also become a veritable battlefield where the tensions and contradictions of globalization have been elaborately played out in the debate over universalism and cultural relativism. But while the universalism versus cultural relativism debate rages in academic and policy-making circles, grass-roots social movements in the Third World are increasingly drawing on globalized human rights discourse to articulate and legitimize local political, social and economic demands. This aspect of the link between globalization and human rights has occurred quite independently of economic globalization and may be termed the *transformative potential* of the globalization/human rights dynamic.

The second level of the link between globalization and human rights centres on the effects of economic globalization on the objective conditions of human rights in the Third World. This aspect of the globalization/human rights dynamic has received the most attention. It focuses on the impacts of international trade, investment and finance; IFI-inspired neoliberal economic reforms and free-trade zones like the *Maquiladoras* of Latin America, on economic and social rights conditions in the Third World. Related to this is how globalization impacts popular participation in governance, state-society relations and accountability. On these issues, there appears to be a growing consensus that economic globalization has benefited the global North at the expense of the South. Economic globalization has aggravated poverty and social deprivation in many Third World counties, narrowing or constricting the range of rights and liberties that they enjoy. This may be termed the *constrictive reality* of the globalization/ human rights dynamic.

The third level of the globalization/human rights dynamic borders on how the human rights movement in the Third World has responded specifically to the constrictive effects of economic globalization. As economic globalization threatens human rights, it is also creating new opportunities to respond to these threats and protect human rights. Human rights activists in the Third World are appropriating the 'tools' of globalization such as the Internet, the global media and international NGO networks to counter the adverse effects of economic globalization on their societies. This may be described as the *reactive impulse* of the globalization/human rights dynamic.

Although the reactive and transformative aspects of this dynamic are related, the main difference is that while the former refers to the global spread of human rights ideas and consciousness (which have proceeded quite independently of economic globalization in certain parts of the Third World), the latter refers to trends in the human rights movements that have emerged mainly in response to the economic and social difficulties produced by economic globalization. For example in Latin America and some parts of Asia where international trade and global investment have been pronounced, the main thrust of human rights activism has been reactive – responding to the new challenges posed by globalizing economic institutions and policies like the poor working conditions and labour standards, union rights in the free-trade zones and child labour. However, in much of Africa, where the effects of the global market have

been at best peripheral, the link between globalization and human rights are slightly different. The main impact of globalization on human rights i these societies has been the increased ability of local activists to draw on the universal human rights discourse and international networks of activists to promote their agendas. In many parts of Africa, where the vast majority of the populace is based in the rural areas eking out subsistence existence, the main human rights issues are not working conditions in 'sweatshops' because there are no sweatshops. Sub-Saharan Africa remains largely unpenetrated by global capital. The position of Africa in the economic globalization process evokes the old aphorism that the only thing worse than being exploited is not being exploited. A French diplom is reported to have stated that economically speaking, if the whole of blac Africa, with the exception of South Africa, were to suddenly disappear it would have little or no effect on global markets and financial systems (quoted in Chege 1992: 148). Such is the marginal role of African economies in the world even in an era of unprecedented global economic integration. This further underscores the limitations of seeing the phenomenon of globalization solely or even essentially as an economic phenomenon. In some parts of the Third World globalization has manifested more in the transformation of consciousness than of economies. Apart from a few exceptions, local human rights activists in Africa have been concerned more with state violations and cultural limitations on individual liberties rather than on the activities of TNCs an IFIs. The global human rights discourse has provided local activities with an effective means of addressing issues like female genital mutilation (FGM), ethnic minority rights, press censorship and arbitrary arrests and detentions. Under these circumstances, the globalization/human rights dynamic resonates more in its potential to transform local socio-cultural and political conditions than as a reaction to the adverse effects of the global trade and investment.

The paradox of globalization at all these levels, however, is that while the 'globalization of consciousness' in the form of the universal human rights movement has empowered subaltern groups in the Third World like workers, women and ethnic minorities, the 'globalization of labour and markets' has had exactly the opposite effect. Economic globalization has, for the most part, furthered the alienation and marginalization of these groups. The questions that arise are: how do we explain this paradox of globalization? How can people and societies in the Third World take advantage of the transformative potential of the globalization of consciousness in the human rights movement while redressing the devastating impact of economic globalization on their rights?

TRANSFORMATIVE POTENTIALS: GLOBALIZATION AND 'UNIVERSAL' HUMAN RIGHTS

Long before the phenomenon of globalization gained currency, the human rights movement had laid claim to a universalizing/globalizing mission. This is evident in the assertion that the regime of rights and freedoms

established through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948 – and related UN human rights conventions – extended beyond national or regional concerns to set a global agenda for human rights protection (UN 2000: 6). Indeed, the inauguration of the UDHR marked the first time in world history that certain fundamental rights and freedoms were set forth, at an international forum, as inalienable values to which all individuals were entitled simply by virtue of their humanity. This ideal marked a shift from earlier notions and instruments of rights because, at least in theory, it was applicable to every human being irrespective of nationality, race, gender and social status. The UDHR affirmed human rights as a global project stating that the 'inherent dignity of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world'. Global freedom and peace, it declared, is 'linked to the recognition of fundamental rights, towards which, every human being aspires''. This principle has become widely acknowledged as the cornerstone of the contemporary human rights movement.

At its adoption in 1948, the UDHR was heralded as 'a world milestone in the long struggle for human rights' and 'a magna carta for all humanity' (UN 1997). However, the UDHR's claim to universality and global legitimacy was significantly undermined by the fact that even as it affirmed the rights of all humanity in 1948, half of the world's peoples still lived under colonial domination. Added to this was the fact that most colonized peoples were, at the time, not represented at the United Nations and had no opportunity of making any input into the preparation of the UDHR. The exclusion of the voices of these mostly Third World peoples in the process of drawing up the UDHR remains one of the strongest challenges to its claim to universality. It has become a powerful tool in the hands of those who argue that the UDHR represents mainly Western values and bears little relevance to non-Western, Third World societies (Cobbah 1987; De Bary 1998).

In spite of these challenges to the globalizing claim of the UDHR, the human rights movement can today lay claim to some level of global legitimacy if not acceptance. At the 1993 United Nations World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna, 171 countries, including many Third World states, reaffirmed their commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reiterated the 'universality, indivisibility and interdependence of human rights'. Moreover, beyond the level of states and international politics, the human rights movement has also been embraced by grass-roots movements around the world and particularly in the Third World. In the past five decades there has been an increasing and unprecedented globalization of the idea and ideals of human rights. These ideals have the potential of transforming political and social conditions in the Third World.

The advent of information globalization through avenues like CNN and the Internet has strengthened the human rights movements in many developing societies by transforming the nature of individual participation in discourses on foreign and domestic politics. These changes have boosted the capacity for individual autonomy, and, in consequence, fuelled the demand for more personal rights and liberties (Franck 2001).

Information globalization has brought down many of the walls that limited the movement and reach of people in the Third World and gi more power to individuals and grass-roots movements. In this respec globalization has created not just superpower states, IFIs and TNCs t also 'super-empowered' individuals and NGOs (Friedman 1999). Wo within human rights and pro-democracy movements across the Thirc World, these super-empowered individuals and NGOs have been abl act directly on a world stage to challenge governments, corporations social traditions.

Across Africa, NGOs are increasingly drawing on globalized huma rights discourses in their advocacy for political participation and soci welfare issues. Globalization has provided new discursive framework spaces for these groups to address local issues from worldwide perspectives. For instance, NGOs working for women's rights across – whether in the form of church councils as in Swaziland, Kenya and Namibia or as groups of women lawyers in Ghana, Uganda and Nige are using the global discourse on women's rights to address local iss like FGM and property laws that discriminate against women. In Gha the local branch of the International Federation of Women Lawyers h been working to ensure that local laws and cultural practices are refo to conform to global standards on women's rights. One of the organization's declared objectives is to make 'non-literate women lit in modern international laws that protect women's rights' (FIDA, 200 Similarly, in Swaziland, one of the dominant NGOs working to promc women's welfare, the Council of Swaziland Churches (CSC) uses the global human rights debate to criticize cultural practices that discrim against women (Jensen and Poulsen 1993: 16–17).

Globalization has made it easier for these groups to use universal human rights discourse to address domestic concerns in a way that w not have been possible five decades ago. The increased information fl and advances in communication technology that have come with globalization have facilitated the building of networks, alliances and coalitions among human rights movements in the Third World. New institutions, information and organizations have contributed to new l of collective mobilization. As a result of information globalization and links between local and international activists, issues like FGM which affect Third World women, many of whom are voiceless within their ow patriarchal societies, now command international attention and have become central to the global feminist and women's rights agenda. In other areas of human rights advocacy and the environmental protectio international NGOs such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace and th World Wildlife Fund are increasingly able to work with local groups to mobilize people directly for political ends. Once fragmented, social movements in the Third World are becoming part of an emerging globa civil society that exists independently from traditional patterns of interstate relations.

In Latin America, local human rights activists have collaborated acrc national borders to form new web-based human rights organizations lil Derechos Human Rights which have been hugely successful in their act

campaigns and as documentation resource for human rights groups across the subcontinent.[2] Another example of such international coalitions in Latin America is the Argentina-based Federation of Families of the Disappeared (FEDEFAM), founded in the 1980s to unite national and international NGOs working to promote political rights and to draw attention to the fate of the 'disappeared'. Although there are concerns that these trends in globalization have established the dominance of a Western oriented, neoliberal view of human rights (Evans 2001: 415), many agree that these NGO coalitions have transformed the mobilizing power of human rights movements in Third World. In this regard, the link between globalization and human rights in the Third World is most apparent in its potential to transform social and political conditions by empowering non-governmental sectors. However, the globalization of knowledge and consciousness, whether in the human rights or environmental arena, represents only one dimension of the globalization/human rights dynamic. The other dimension has to do with the globalization of capital and markets where human rights are more directly linked to the activities of globalizing economic institutions in the Third World.

CONSTRICTIVE REALITIES: THE HUMAN RIGHTS COSTS OF ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION

Much of the discussion on the effects of globalization on human rights has focused on the point that economic globalization has resulted in the deterioration of living conditions in many Third World countries and widened domestic and global inequalities. Indeed the integration of global production has been accompanied by the growing integration of the global elite and the further marginalization of the masses. Globalization worsens economic inequality when the economic interests that are protected by the institutions of globalization are those of the rich and economically powerful – usually elite urban males (McCorquodale 1999: 748) Even in the poorest of countries, local elites are becoming increasingly interconnected with the global elite through satellite dishes and the Internet while the poverty-stricken majority are more disconnected and fragmented. At the global level, the benefits and costs of economic globalization have divided the world more starkly into two halves – a prosperous 'core' (mainly in the West), which enjoys much of the benefits of global trade and investments, and an increasingly impoverished Third World 'periphery', which bears much the cost of economic globalization. Even advocates of globalization like the Nobel Prize-winning economist and former Vice-President of the World Bank, Joseph Stiglitz, concede that the process of globalization is clearly 'not working for the interests of the world's poor' (CCEIA 2002: 1).[3]

This view is not merely a matter of speculation. Available statistical data bear out this fact. In spite of the enormous benefits accruing to TNCs and some industrialized countries from global trade and investment, poverty, illiteracy and disease are on the rise in much of the Third World. In its Human Development Report for 1999, *Globalization with a Human Face*, the UNDP called attention to the stark disparities between the rich and poor in

global opportunity. According to the UNDP, the decade of the 1990s witnessed the 'increasing concentration of income, resources and wea among people, corporations and countries'. In 1997, the richest 20 pe cent of the world's population living in Western countries accounted f per cent of the worlds GDP while the poorest 20 per cent living in the ' World accounted for only 1 per cent (UNDP 1999: 2). These grim statis underscore the connections between globalizing forces of inequality a human rights conditions in the Third World. More progress has been i in norms, standards, policies and institutions for open global market than for people and their rights. Deteriorating living conditions in Thi World countries have meant that a vast majority of the people are den such basic rights as the right to food, shelter and fair working conditi which are stipulated in the UDHR and other international human righ covenants.

However, not everyone agrees that economic globalization has neg impacts on human rights conditions. Some policy makers and busine leaders contend that globalization actually aids the cause of human rights. James Robinson, a former head of an American TNC, argues th giving jobs to people in developing countries at salary levels that they never would have had access to before, globalization actually improve their human rights conditions (PBS 1999: 4). Moreover, the greater integration of Third World economies into the international communi enlarges the role of the private sector in developing societies. This promotes a stable legal environment and restructures the state's relati with its citizens. In this sense, it is argued, globalization and internati economic cooperation widens political participation and promotes political rights (Monshipouri 1995). Related to this is the argument th globalized economic institutions such as the World Bank and IMF tenc demand that certain conditions of 'democratic governance' must exist state before they invest. These investment conditions, which sometime include the acceptance of the rule of law, accountability and transpare in government, ultimately lead to the protection of human rights. The most frequently cited example of this is Malawi, where in 1992 all the major donor states threatened to stop investment in the country until President Kamuzu Banda dealt with gross breaches of human rights in that country (McCorquodale 1999: 754).

True, World Bank and IMF 'good governance' conditionalities introduced in the 1980s and 1990s have succeeded in twisting the arms some authoritarian regimes in the Third World to carry out marginal political reforms, but can this alone be a valid basis for concluding tha globalization promotes human rights? Would this be an accurate 'bala sheet' of the impact of globalization on human rights in the Third Worl would think not. For one thing, examples like Malawi have been the exceptions rather than the norm. The IMF and the World Bank have not pushed their 'good governance' conditionalities quite as forcefully as th have pushed their economic structural adjustment programmes. Moreover, the argument that these good governance conditionalities actually translate into an improvement in the objective human rights conditions of local people is at best conjectural. Focusing on the

persuasive influence of World Bank conditionalities seems a narrow approach to the evaluation of the impact of economic globalization on human rights. A much broader approach would be to examine not just IFI conditionalities, but also the full ramifications of the activities of globalizing economic institutions – IFIs, TNCs and the WTO – on economic and social conditions in the Third World societies.

THE IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

The IMF, World Bank, the OECD and the WTO have been described as the 'practical manifestations of globalization in its trade and commercial aspects' (UNHCHR 2001). Their globalizing economic activities generally produce winners and losers. In some countries, World Bank-inspired economic reforms and WTO regulation have led to economic growth and raised national GDPs. In most countries however, these reforms and regulations have resulted in economic crisis and a precipitous decline in living standards. In many parts of the Third World, WTO regulations in particular have produced more losers than winners, spelling significant implications for human rights. As one UN report clearly outlined, the activities of the WTO do not simply end with trade and commerce – they also have 'serious human rights implications' (UN 2000: 6)

The main threats to human rights and security posed by global trade and financial regulation in developing societies include job and income insecurity, health insecurity, political insecurity and environmental insecurity (UNDP 1999: 4). These are often the direct result of strict funding conditions and structural adjustment programmes imposed on developing nations by international financial institutions. Such IMF and World Bank-inspired structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) and lending conditionalities typically include the devaluation of national currencies, which results in high inflation; market liberalization; cuts in public wages and social sector programmes; and the elimination of subsidies and price controls. These 'reforms' and conditionalities adversely affect the living conditions of the poor and vulnerable sections of the population.

In Africa the liberalization of labour markets has left millions of breadwinners unemployed, while the introduction of fees in the delivery of formerly free social services like health and education have raised the cost of living. In circumstances where there are no reliable social welfare systems – as in most African countries – millions of dependants have become destitute or 'economic refugees' in the already overcrowded urban centres. Mass retrenchments in the public sector swell the ranks of the unemployed, creating social tension and a discontented and restive population. For instance, the drastic fall in the price of South African gold in 1997 – a result of international financial speculation – led to a crisis in the gold-mining industry. Thousands of South African gold miners found themselves out of work and those that remained faced an uncertain future in the weakened gold-mining industry. In Tanzania, the devaluation of the shilling by 26 per cent in 1984, the de-subsidization of the staple maize

meal, and the relaxation of import regulations in line with IMF conditionalities had a disastrous impact on the living conditions of th vast population of rural and urban poor (ARB 1984: 275).

In Asia, the devastating impact of economic globalization became particularly evident in the economic crisis that engulfed the continen the late 1990s. Two of the hardest hit countries were Indonesia and Thailand, which a few years earlier had been hailed as a miracle of globalization. The Asian crisis proved that the miracle had been a my Indonesia, the local currency lost 26 per cent of its value in one day. L people saw their savings wiped out and their standard of living drop precipitously as workers could no longer afford basic necessities for t subsistence. Many saw the widespread rioting that subsequently brok as a protest against globalization.

Increasingly, economic decision-making is being taken away from World governments and put in the hands of foreign financial 'experts' globalized economic institutions. This often means that people and th elected representatives in developing countries become less involved i making important economic decisions affecting their lives (McCorquc 1999: 746). Thus, the globalizing activities of IFIs in the Third World ra questions not only about economic and social rights but also about th right to political participation and self-determination.

With TNCs, the major human rights issues that arise in connection their globalizing activities in the Third World are labour and environmental conditions in the export processing zones (EPZs) or spe economic zones (SEZs) where they operate. Since the 1980s, the EPZs h been created in Third World countries by governments eager to attract foreign investments. These EPZs mainly comprise labour-intensive industries in search of cheap Third World labour. Although TNCs work in the Third World EPZs have quantitatively increased work opportuniti these have come at the expense of poor, and sometimes inhuman, wor conditions. The shrinking role of the state in national economies alon with the deregulation of the labour market, de-unionization of workers and decentralization of wage bargaining, have contributed to a progressive decline in working conditions in these industries. Women, who dominate the workforce of the EPZs, have been particularly vulner to these difficulties. In Latin America, the semi-skilled, poorly paid wor who make up 80 per cent of the workers employed under deplorable conditions in the *maquiladoras* (export assembly plants) bear many of th problems of globalization. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan has descri this trend as the global 'feminisation of poverty' (UN 1999; 19).

Two issues that particularly underscore the link between global trade and human rights are environmental pollution and the use of child labo In many parts of Asia like India, Bangladesh and Thailand, the use of ch labour either directly by TNCs or their local contractors have come to symbolize the dark side of globalization. Anti-globalizers often draw attention to the use of child labour and the 'sweatshop' phenomenon as examples of burdens of economic globalization on Third World societies In Nigeria, the campaign by the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP) and other minority ethnic groups of the Niger Delta

against the environmental pollution caused by TNCs prospecting for oil in their land, also symbolizes the link between the forces of globalization and human rights.

That the globalizing activities of TNCs and IFIs sometimes have negative fallout on living conditions in Third World countries is hardly a matter of contention. However, questions have been raised as to whether these are human rights issues. Can we really link the socio-economic and political fallout of globalization with the violation of specific human rights guarantees under international and domestic laws? This question arises out of a tendency to see the negative consequences of economic globalization merely as the inevitable 'social costs' of economic growth, which can be overcome with time, rather than as human rights issues. It is also informed by the tendency to draw a distinction between civil and political rights on the one hand and social and economic rights on the other. The assumption is that civil and political rights are more important than economic and social rights, and since globalization has a more direct impact on economic and social life, it has little to do with 'real' human rights issues. This assumption is erroneous. The UN Vienna Declaration and Programme for Action on Human Rights (1993) emphasizes that human rights are 'indivisible, interdependent and interrelated'. Economic and social rights are integral parts of the international human rights corpus. In addition to its explicit civil and political rights provisions, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms such economic and social rights as the right to an adequate standard of living, the right to work and just and favourable conditions of work, and the right to education. The UDHR also recognizes the right of everyone to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in it can be fully realized (UN 1948, article 28). The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) elaborates on these economic and social rights.

A related question that arises is whether non-state actors like global economic institutions have any obligation under international law to promote human rights. Underlying this question is the assumption that human rights are the obligations of state rather than non-state actors. This, too, is erroneous. Although states are the primary concern of international human rights law, the obligation to protect and promote universal human rights is not limited to them. The UDHR calls on every individual and *organ of society* (including IFIs and TNCs) to take action to secure the universal and effective recognition of human rights.[4] Similarly, the UN's 'Guidelines on evaluating violations of economic, social and cultural rights' adopted in Maastricht in 1997 recognizes that violation of economic and social rights can result though omission or commission of both state and non-state actors. Human rights violations can result either from the direct transgressions of states and TNCs, or from the failure of states to exercise control over the operations of TNCs. The guidelines also state that given the far-reaching impact of their activities on the lives of a great number of people around the world, TNCs and IFIs cannot absolve themselves from the obligation to uphold international human rights standards.

GLOBALIZATION AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

Apart from the direct impacts of IFI and TNC activities on economic a social rights in Third World countries, there are also important ramifications for the right to self-determination and the enjoyment c and political rights. Several studies have linked IMF and World Bank inspired SAPs and lending conditionalities to political repression an authoritarianism in the Third World (Bangura 1986; Hutchful 1987). Because IMF and World Bank adjustment programmes and lending conditionalities create economic difficulties for local peoples and are unpopular, they predispose governments in Third World countries, n which already have problems of legitimacy, to resort to the excessive repression and coercion to enforce them (Rusk 1986). Claude Ake ar that there is no way that Third World regimes can implement structu adjustment programmes recommended by global financial institutic without resorting to some level of political repression (Ake 1989: 62).

The structures of globalization and the pressures they place on vulnerable Third World states sometimes make repression and the circumscription of political rights and freedoms inevitable. For insta following the devastating impact of the Asian financial crisis on Ind in the late 1990s the International Financial Community promised t government a $40 billion bailout on the condition that Indonesia restructured its economy and drastically cut subsidies on social programmes. Under this pressure the government increased fuel pri 70 per cent and started a programme of massive lay-off of civil serva The result was an outbreak of popular public protest which the Suha government tried to suppress with armed force, arbitrary arrests and detentions and press censorship until it was overthrown in 1998.

In this regard, globalization represents a surge in the power of ca over social classes which ultimately results in the narrowing of the s of democracy and popular participation in national politics. It repres world-view through which the transnational elite attempts to reduce scope of national and regional decision-making, blocking any altern to the patterns of social organization it projects. Economic globaliza espouses the triumph of the neoliberal political paradigm and, as so scholars argue, the 'end of ideology'. The governing institutions of economic globalization such as the IFIs reward governments and cou that play by the rules of neoliberalism with investment and credit. Th that dare to differ and explore alternative paths are punished with divestments and exclusion. Thus globalization, which has created ba free global space for market networks, has also created a rigid ideolo boundary which ultimately imposes limits on the scope of local participation in the decision-making process and people's right to se determination (Mengisteab 1999; Latham 1997: 56)

Because global investment and marketing decisions are being m by IFIs and TNCs beyond the control of states, many Third World governments are unable to control macroeconomic monetary polici This ultimately affects the ability of people to influence their governments since their governments have no control in the first pl

For instance, facing hyperinflation and economic collapse in 2000, the government of Ecuador was forced to go against the grain of public opinion and adopt the US dollar as the national currency in 2000. This raises important questions about the right to self-determination. The UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights recognizes the right of self-determination of peoples as being fundamental to the enjoyment of other rights. An important aspect of this is the right of peoples to exercise sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. Economic globalization increasingly denies this right to vulnerable states and societies in the Third World.

Related to this is the right to development. As globalization increases the gap within and among nations it limits the capacity of Third World states to break out of the circle of poverty and achieve sustainable economic development. The United Nations 1986 Declaration on the Right to Development (UNDRD) recognizes that individuals and societies have a right to development and that this right cannot be assessed solely on the basis of economic and GDP indices. Rather, UNDRD affirms, the central focus of the process of development must be the human person – the socio-economic well-being of the individual. The right to development means that 'every human person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized' (UN 1986). In many parts of the Third World, economic globalization threatens both the political right to self-determination and the right to development as spelled out in the UNDRD. This is recognized even by institutions of economic globalization like the World Bank, which has acknowledged that, 'globalization is a threat to weak or capriciously governed states' and has made efforts to address some of the concerns about the impact of its activities on human rights in the Third World (World Bank 1997: 1).

After years of insisting that its mandate was purely economic rather than political, the World Bank issued a set of guidelines in 1998 linking its activities to what it perceived as its human rights obligations (World Bank: 1998).[5] The Bank acknowledges that it policies can no longer be restricted to economic considerations alone but must also involve considerations like the social costs of economic reforms, good governance, public sector accountability and the objective living conditions of affected people. The IMF issued similar guidelines on 'Good governance' in 1997 (IMF 1997). The shift by IFIs towards incorporating non-economic indices like human rights guidelines into their operations clearly represents the growing awareness among the governing institutions of globalization that they can no longer ignore the adverse effects of economic globalization on the enjoyment of human rights in the Third World.

However, these policy statements tend to focus on civil and political rights rather than economic and social rights, which are the more direct outcomes of economic globalization. The economic and social rights issues arising from the globalizing activities of IFIs, TNCs and the WTO in the Third World have not been adequately addressed. Recognizing this, the UN Committee on Economic and Social Rights has called on

institutions of economic globalization, particularly the IMF and the Bank, to pay enhanced attention to economic, social and cultural ri their activities by broadening their lending policies and by 'encoura explicit recognition of these rights' (UNHCHR 2001). Thus, althoug is a growing awareness of the adverse impacts of economic globaliz on human rights, the institutional mechanisms of globalization ha to address them seriously and fundamentally.

REACTIVE IMPULSES: CHALLENGING THE MARKETS

Economic globalization has had some negative impacts on human conditions in the Third World. Yet, it has created new fronts and str with which Third World people have tackled the difficulties arising f economic globalization. This is particularly true of Latin America wl has been most affected by economic globalization. In many Latin American countries, global relations have become a vehicle for challenging the excesses of economic globalization and developing humane political, social and economic relations. Unlike in most pa Africa, the human rights movements in Latin America have respond more directly to the globalization of labour and markets. Human ri activists in Latin America have been more involved in using human to challenge the activities of globalized economic institutions than been the case in Africa. Many human rights activists are shifting fro traditional focus on abuses by governments and are now confrontin multiple impacts of economic globalization on the working and livi conditions of people within their countries.

In Colombia, land rights conflicts between peasants and transna corporations involved in the lucrative oil and coffee export trades ha contributed to rural violence and widespread human rights abuses. I the same time, these conflicts have led to an unprecedented awaren universal human rights and have strengthened the human rights movement in the country. Both local and international human right organizations have become more involved not only in the conflict be local peasants and transnational corporations but also in other hum rights abuses arising from the Colombian military's campaign again leftist guerrillas. The renewed attention accorded to human rights in Colombia has led to the emergence of several new non-governmenta institutions dedicated to the promotion of these rights. For instance, UN set up a special division of its Human Rights Office in Colombia helped found and fund human rights-oriented organizations like the Children's Peace Movement, which has led nationwide demonstratio against human rights abuses resulting from the activities of TNCs an Colombian government. Other international NGOs in Latin America l the International Peace Brigade have worked with local activists on is of human rights, democracy and accountability in activities of TNCs i country (Brysk and Gonzalez-Cueva 2000).

Seeking ways to respond to the negative impact on TNC activities, human rights activists in the Third World have achieved greater succe

building on global cooperation and networks with advocacy groups in the North and the South. Transnational information campaigns have been effective in bringing to international focus the human rights implications of TNC activities. Working with groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, local activists have adopted an effective strategy of 'naming and shaming' corporations implicated in human rights abuses. In Mexico, local activists collaborated with Human Rights Watch in the 1990s to publicize and lead an international campaign against the practice of compulsory pregnancy testing of Mexican workers by some US border assembly plants. As a result of this campaign, several TNCs were forced to discontinue the practice. Similarly, the Coalition For Justice in the *Maquiladoras*, which focuses on monitoring and improving labour conditions in the export plants concentrated along the US-Mexico border, has been successful in using the global media in its advocacy work. In Asia, the South Asia Coalition on Child Servitude had built a global coalition of NGOs and other interest groups working to address the problem of child labour in India, Bangladesh and Thailand. Thus, the same 'instruments' that further economic globalization, such as the Internet, global banking and the media, have become effective means of challenging it.

It is evident, however, that challenges from activist and the non-government organizations alone cannot redress the adverse impacts of economic globalization on human rights conditions in the Third World. Meaningful and sustainable changes can only come when the activities of NGOs working from below are complemented by a fundamental reform of the rules and institutions of economic globalization from above.

CONCLUSION: REINVENTING GLOBALIZATION

The links between globalization and human rights in the Third World is multi faceted. Globalization has the potential of both transforming and constricting human rights. On one level the globalization of knowledge and information have strengthened human rights movements in the Third World. Local activists are increasingly able and successful in using the universal human rights discourse to address local issues. On another level, economic globalization has limited the enjoyment of human rights in many Third World Societies by creating economic and political conditions that have worsened individual living conditions and made it difficult for states to meet their social welfare obligations to citizens. On a third level global human rights networks and coalitions have become effective means of challenging the excesses of economic globalization and moderating their effects on Third World societies.

Finally, the question that arises is: what more can be done to ensure that the forces of globalization increasingly benefit rather than threaten human rights in the Third World? The emerging consensus is that the threats to human rights posed by economic globalization risks outweighing its accidental benefits (McCorquodale 1999: 764). In its 1999 Human Development Report, 'Globalization with a human face', the

UNDP called for a reorientation of global governance that ensures
in international trade negotiations and that has, as its central focu
human development and human rights (UNDP 1999). Indeed the
formulation of the rules of global trade and investments are preser
unacceptable and needs to shift. As presently constituted, the rule:
global trade and investments, as set by the powerful state, IFI and
players seem to be guided by one question alone: how can global t
and investments be protected and sustained? This questions needs
mediated by a more important question: how can global trade and
investments be conducted in a way that conform to international h
rights standards?

The integration of human rights principles more fully into the
making processes of global trade and investment should be the fi
in the reform process. The rules of globalization have to be reinve
with human rights and human development at their core. Such re
must deal not only with markets, investments and profits, but als
issues concerning participation and involvement of local people i
decision-making processes, the transparency of such processes,
negotiations, leadership, inclusiveness and dispute-settling. Mor
importantly, international human rights law has to provide more
effective mechanisms though which non-state actors like IFIs and
can be held accountable for human rights violation resulting dire
indirectly from their activities. Presently, international human rig
places much of the obligation on human rights protection and
promotion on states. While this may have been adequate in a post
Westphalian age of absolute state sovereignty, this is no longer te
today. In an era where the power of states over their citizens is
increasingly replaced by the influence of global economic instituti
these institutions must bear as much responsibility as states in
upholding human rights.

Fortunately, some steps have already been taken in this direction.
UN Sub-Commission on Economic and Social Rights has formulated
code of conduct for TNCs which stresses the responsibility and oblig
of corporations to promote the core human rights values of respect fo
liberty, justice, equality, tolerance, mutual respect and integrity that
underlie the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declara
Human Rights. The hope is that this code of conduct will constitute t
basis of a regime of enforceable international law that spells out the
rights obligations of non-state actors within the context of globalizati
(UN 2000: 21). However, to be relevant and effective, such efforts at
integrating human rights standards into the rules of global trade and
investment must have the direct input of Third World states and peop
who bear much of the social and economic cost of globalization. Ther
should be an effort to enhance the ability of Third World states and so
to negotiate their own terms within a global economy as it relates to t
basic rights – the right to political and economic self-determination, t
right to development, the rights to fair labour conditions for workers a
their right to organize, negotiate and bargain collectively. Global mar
global technology, global ideas and global solidarity can enrich the liv

people everywhere. The challenge remains how to ensure that the benefits are shared equitably and that global interdependence works for the rights and welfare of all people – not just to profit a few.

Notes

1 See the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
2 More information about the activities of Derechos Human Rights can be found at www.derechos.org/.
3 Also see Stiglitz (2002).
4 See preamble of the UDHR.
5 For a more incisive discourse on the human rights obligations of the World Bank and the IMF see Skogly (2001).

References and Further Reading

Adams, F. et al. 1999: *Globalization and the Dilemmas of the State in the South*. New York: Macmillan and St Martin's Press.

Ake, C. 1989: *The Political Economy of Crisis and Underdevelopment in Africa: Selected Works of Claude Ake*, ed. J. Ihonvbere. Lagos.

ARB 1984: *Africa Research Bulletin*, 2, 4.

Bangura, Y. 1986: Structural adjustment and the political question. *Review of African Political Economy*, 37.

Brysk, A. and Gonzalez-Cueva, E. 2000: *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 34 (1).

Brysk, A. (ed.) 2002: *Globalization and Human Rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CCEIA (Carnegie Council for Ethics and International Affairs) 2002: Edited transcripts of remarks by Joseph Stiglitz at the *Books for Breakfast* 05/15/02 at www.carnegiecouncil.org/about/transcript_stiglitz.html (accessed 13 October 2002).

Chege, M. 1992: Remembering Africa. *Foreign Affairs*, 71.

Cobbah, J. 1987: African values and the human rights debate: an African perspective. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 9, 3.

Coicaud, J.-M. et al. (eds) 2003: *The Globalization of Human Rights*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

De Bary, W. T. 1998: *Asian Values and Human Rights: A Confucian Communitarian Perspective*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, T. 2001: Globalization, human rights and international citizenship. *Alternatives*, 26 (1).

FIDA 2002: International Federation of Women Lawyers, Ghana, 'FIDA objectives', at http://iisd1.iisd.ca/50comm/commdb/list/c29.htm (accessed 13 November 2002).

Franck, T. M. 2001: Are human rights universal? *Foreign Affairs* (January–February).

Friedman, T. 1999: DOScapital. *Foreign Policy* (Fall).

Friedman, T. 2000: *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*. New York: Anchor Books.

Holton, R. 1998: *Globalization and the Nation State*. London: Macmillan Press.

Hutchful, E. 1987: The crisis of the international division of labor: authoritarianism and the transition to free market economies in Africa. *Africa Development*, 12, 2.

IMF 1997: Good governance: the role of the IMF at www.imf.org (ac 13 October 2002).

Jensen, M. and Poulsen, K. 1993: *Human Rights and Cultural Change: V Africa*, 6.

Latham, R. 1997: Globalization and democratic provisionism: readi Polanyi. *New Political Economy*, 2, 1.

McCorquodale, R. with Fairbrother, R. 1999: Globalization and hun rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 21, 3.

Mengisteab, K. 1999: Globalization and the struggles for democrat in Africa. Unpublished seminar paper. Old Dominion University.

Monshipouri, M. 1995: *Democratisation, Liberalization and Human Righ Third World*. New York: Lynne Rienner.

Orford, A. 1998: Contesting globalization: a feminist perspective o future of human rights. *Transnational Law and Contemporary Probler*

PBS 1999: The view from the top. Transcripts of PBS documentary *Globalization and Human Rights* at www.pbs.org/globalization/hom (accessed 16 November 2002).

Rowbotham, S. and Linkogle, S. (eds) 2001: *Women Resist Globalizati Mobilizing for Livelihood and Rights*. London and New York: Zed Boc

Rusk, J. 1986: Structures of neocolonialism: the African context of h rights. *Africa Today*, 33, 4.

Skogly, S. 2001: *The Human Rights Obligations of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*. London: Cavendish.

Stiglitz, J. 2002: *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: W. W. Nor

Streeten, P. 1999: Globalization and its impact on development cooperation. *Development*, 42, 3.

UN 1948: *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: UN.

UN 1986: *Declaration on the Right to Development*, General Assembly Resolution 41.128 of 4 December 1986.

UN Department of Public Information 1997: *The Universal Declaration Human Rights: A Magna Carta for all Humanity*. Vienna: UN.

UN 1999: The role of employment and work in poverty eradication: empowerment and advancement of women. Report of the Secret General (E/1999/53).

UN 2000: Globalization and its full impact on the enjoyment of hur rights (June) (E/CN.4/Sub.2/2000/13).

UNDP 1999: *Human Development Report 1999*. London: Oxford Univers Press.

UNHCHR 1999: Globalization and its impact on the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights. Decisions adopted by the Committee at its eighteenth session, 15/05/98 (E/1999/22).

UNHCHR 2001: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment human rights. Sub-commission on Human Rights resolution 200 2001 at www.unhchr.ch (accessed 27 October 2002).

World Bank 1997: *World Development Report 1997*. Washington, D.C.

World Bank 1998: *Development and Human Rights: The Role of the World* Washington, D.C.: