



# Globalization<sup>1</sup>, Social Regulation, and Transnational Campaigns: Innovation in International Cooperation or More of the Same?

Ronnie D. Lipschutz

## I. Research problem and goals

A critical set of issues arising from contemporary globalization are organizational, social, economic, and environmental externalities accompanying activities undertaken across national borders (Lipschutz, 2001a). In the area of transnational business, in particular, such effects have become the focus of intense international scrutiny (Haufler, 2001). To date, however, many of these effects have not been extensively addressed either within the existing international system of regulatory conventions and regimes or by states themselves.

In response to this lacuna, transnational civil society groups have begun to fill a variety of normative and functional international roles, and are increasingly prominent at international meetings and institutions, and in global networks and alliances. They have also become instrumental in the development of a growing number of semi-public and private "transnational regimes," designed to fulfill regulatory objectives not being addressed through public international conventions and laws.

Growing recognition of this phenomenon has generated a burgeoning literature, a good deal of theorizing about the significance of transnational activism (see, e.g., Lipschutz, 2002a, 2001a), as well as arguments over social actors' international authority and power. At the national and international levels, there is also some concern that these social actors are operating in violation of the "standard operating procedures" of international politics. They are coming under challenge for engaging in activities traditionally restricted to governments and international organizations and are also being criticized for lack of transparency, accountability, and representativeness.

These objections may have some basis in fact but fail to acknowledge the degree to which global governance has become a process much more complicated and extensive than mere multilateral cooperation among states (Dean, 1999; Shaw, 2000; Hardt & Negri, 2001). In the developing complex of "global management," private actors, both non-profit and for-profit, are as likely to formulate, implement, and monitor global regulations as are states or international organizations (Lipschutz, 2001b; Lipschutz and Fogel, forthcoming 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the term *globalization* to denote both a material and an ideological/cognitive process. Globalization is *material* in the sense that it involves the movement of capital, technology, goods and, to a limited degree, labor to areas with high returns on investment, without regard to the social or political impacts on either the communities and people to which it moves or to those left behind. Globalization is *ideological* in the sense that such movement is rationalized in the name of "efficiency, competition and profit." And, globalization is *cognitive* in the sense that it fosters social innovation and reorganization in existing institutions, composed of real, live people, without regard to the consequences for them (see Lipschutz, 2000, esp. ch. 2; see also the critique in Shaw, 2000).

My objective in this project is to complete a work-in-progress that analyzes both the theoretical and applied aspects of the involvement of global civil society in the expansion of public and private regulatory systems, and the implications of these efforts for international politics and governance. This project builds on my earlier and ongoing work on global civil society and its role in local and global governance (see, e.g., Lipschutz, 1996, 2000, forthcoming), and extends it to two new issue areas as well as to the concepts of global governmentality (Dean, 1999) and the “global state” (Shaw, 2000). The products will be several journal articles and book chapters, an IGCC policy paper, and a scholarly volume.

## **II. Relevance to global conflict and cooperation**

The impacts of globalization on interstate relations and intrastate stability has been the focus of considerable research and debate in recent years (e.g., Crawford and Lipschutz, 1998), and the integrating as well as fragmenting tendencies accompanying economic integration have been recognized for some time (Lipschutz, 2000). Central to these contradictory tendencies are three forms of social disruption associated with globalization.

First, as production is shifted spatially, environmental and social impacts are also relocated, with concomitant effects on health, livelihood, and nature in new locations. Second, changing forms of commodification and growth in consumption increase the volume, diversity and, perhaps, toxicity of the resulting waste stream. Finally, the drive to increase efficiency of investment and production results in organizational externalities, as familiar forms of social relations and relations of production are altered or destroyed.

All three forms of “externality” have effects on state-society relations, and spill over into the international arena. Public demonstrations and the rise of social movements critical of globalization are one example of socially-fragmenting movements in liberal societies (Lipschutz, 2001a); conflict in non-liberal states is another (Crawford & Lipschutz, 1998).

It has often been assumed that regulation through public international law and institutions, adopted and implemented effectively by states, can address such sources of social and political instability. As seen in tensions internal to organizations such as the WTO, there is considerable resistance to deploying social regulation in this fashion. The privatization of social regulation is believed to be an alternative means of accomplishing desired management of markets at lower social cost and with greater efficiency (Haufler, 2001).

What is not clear, however, is whether global regulation engenders greater international cooperation or fosters various forms of intrastate conflict. In other words, is such private regulation an “innovation in international cooperation” or, as the title of this proposal suggests, an incitement to greater national and international social conflict, as many seem to fear (Shaw, 2001)?

### **III. Literature & contribution to policy and scholarship**

The literature on global social regulation, including transnational campaigns, industry self-regulation, and corporate social responsibility, is a burgeoning one (Cutler, Haufler, and Porters 1998; Braithwaite & Drahos, 2000; Meidinger, 2001; Haufler, 2001; Meidinger, 2001; Lipschutz, 2001a; 2002a). Work on transnational campaigns builds, in particular, upon a great deal of research on transnational advocacy networks (Keck & Sikkink, 1998), world civic politics (Wapner, 1996), global civil society (Lipschutz, 1996; Korten, 1998), and transnational social movements (Smith, Chatfield, & Pagnucco, 1997). Most of this literature fails, however, to theorize fully either the context in which such regulatory campaigns are taking place (a “new international division of social regulation; Lipschutz, 2001a) or the political implications of this activity (emergent “global governmentality”; Dean, 1999; Hardt & Negri, 2000).

I expect this project to make a major contribution to this literature on global civil society and global governance, inasmuch as it is my intention to examine critically both concepts, and to assess the conflictual and cooperative results of regulatory privatization. This work will also be of considerable interest to the policy community, insofar as it deals with the applied relationship between “private” transnational actors and public international regulation and inquires to what degree the former has impacts on the regulatory environments between and within states.

### **IV. Research methods, progress & workplan**

I have, so far, addressed efforts to develop and implement international regulatory systems for (1) fostering sustainable forestry and (2) establishing workers rights in the apparel industry, and plan to include two others: regulation of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and watershed protection activities. The theoretical portion of this project has relied on my earlier research and published literature on regulation, reconfiguration of the state, and non-state actors; the empirical portion on organizational materials and in-depth semi-structured interviews. The interviews have been intended to (1) develop a chronology of organizational involvement in the issue area; (2) compile a list of collaborating organizations and their involvement (which has also provided the names additional interviewees); and (3) determine to what extent the organization’s regulatory efforts have borne fruit and are deemed successful.

I have collected materials and conducted interviews over the past two years in the United States, Asia, and the United Kingdom. I will be spending the fall term 2002 at Sussex University, and will conduct additional research in the UK and Europe, as seems necessary.

I also intend to organize a conference at UCSC in April, 2003 (I have applied for a fellowship from the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs in support of the conference), which will focus on global regulatory privatization, especially as it applies to global governance and international conflict and cooperation. A growing

number of scholars are working on various aspects of this topic, and I hope to invite several of them, as well as UC academics, to the conference.

The project workplan for the next 18 months is as follows:

**January-June 2002:** update and complete research on sustainable forestry and apparel industry; interviews and collection of materials from watershed groups in Northern California; complete relevant chapters for book manuscript

**July-December 2002** (at Sussex University, UK): interviews and collection of reports, studies, etc. on regulation from organizations and agencies in the UK and Europe; revision of completed chapters; preparation of journal articles

**January-June 2003** (return to UCSC): Completion of chapters and papers on GMO regulation and watershed protection; conference at UCSC in April, 2003; preparation of IGCC policy paper; final revisions to book manuscript and submission to publisher

To date, this project has been supported by the the Aspen Institute, Soka University-America, the UC Institute for Labor and Employment and internal UCSC funders (these are listed on the cover sheet). I have made a commitment to the Aspen Institute to engage in public dissemination activities at the conclusion of the project, and IGCC support for such presentations at the UCDC Center would offer an excellent means through which to fulfill this commitment.

## **VII. Responsibilities**

I am Principal Investigator on this project and have written the bulk of the published and unpublished material (see references) resulting from the research. I have been assisted in data collection and organization by several undergraduate research assistants, a Post-graduate researcher (Angela McCracken) and three UCSC graduate students (Cathleen Fogel, David Newstone, John Twomey), all of whom have or will make contributions to articles, the policy paper, and the book manuscript.

I am requesting graduate student research assistant support for two quarters to help with the additional research, management of data and interviews, and editing and completion of the various papers and manuscripts. Twomey is likely to be selected as the GSRA.

## References Cited

- Braithwaite, John and Peter Drahos. 2000. *Global Business Regulation* (Cambridge: Cambridge).
- Crawford, Beverly & ----- (eds.). 1998. *The myth of "ethnic conflict": politics, economics, and "cultural" violence* (Berkeley: UC Berkeley International and Area Studies Press).
- Cutler, A. Claire, Virginia Haufler and Tony Porters, eds. 1998. *Private Authority and International Affairs* (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY).
- Dean, Mitchell. 1999. *Governmentality* (London: Sage).
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard).
- Haufler, Virginia. 2001. *A Public Role for the Private Sector* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment).
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Across Borders* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell).
- Korten, David. 1998. *Globalizing Civil Society: Reclaiming our right to power* (New York: Seven Stories).
- Lipschutz, Ronnie D. forthcoming. *Bringing Politics Back In--Interepistemic Agency and Global Life*.
- , forthcoming 2002a. "Doing Well by Doing Good? Transnational Regulatory Campaigns, Social Activism, and Impacts on State Sovereignty," in: John Montgomery and Nathan Glazer, eds., *Challenges to Sovereignty: How Governments Respond* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington).
- , forthcoming 2002b. "Civil Society, Globalization and the Environment." In: Kate Crowley (ed.), *Globalization and the Environment: Achieving Our Common Future?* (New York: Nova).
- and Cathleen Fogel. forthcoming 2002. "Regulation for the Rest of Us? Global Civil Society & the Privatization of Transnational Regulation," in: Thomas J. Biersteker and Rodney Bruce Hall (eds.), *The Emergence of Private Authority: Forms of Private Authority and Their Implications for Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge).
- , 2001a. Paper presenter, "Regulation for the Rest of Us? Activists, Capital, States, and the Demand for Global Social Regulation," International Studies Association Conference, Chicago, February 20-24. At: <http://people.ucsc.edu/~rlipsch/Regulation%20for%20the%20Rest%20of%20Us.html>
- , 2001b. "Why Is There No International Forestry Law? An Examination of International Forestry Regulation, both Public and Private," *UCLA Journal of Environmental Law & Policy* 19, #1:155-82.
- , 2000. *After Authority: War, Peace and Global Politics in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY).
- with Judith Mayer, 1996. *Global Civil Society & Global Environmental Governance* (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY).
- Meidinger, Errol. 2001. "Law Making by Global Civil Society: the Forest Certification Prototype" At: <http://www.law.buffalo.edu/homepage/eemeid/scholarship/GCSEL.pdf>. (1/15/02).
- Shaw, Martin. 2000. *Theory of the Global State* (Cambridge: Cambridge).
- Smith, J., C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (eds.). 1997. *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics: Solidarity Beyond the State* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse).
- Wapner, Paul. 1996. *Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics* (Albany, N.Y.: SUNY).