



**IDEA GROUP PUBLISHING**

701 E. Chocolate Avenue, Suite 200, Hershey PA 17033-1240, USA  
Tel: 717/533-8845; Fax 717/533-8661; URL-<http://www.idea-group.com>

**ITB9439**

---

## **Chapter XIV**

# **Globalization, Citizenship and New Information Technologies: From the MAI to Seattle**

Peter J. Smith  
Athabasca University, Canada

Elizabeth Smythe  
Concordia University College of Alberta, Canada

## **ABSTRACT**

*This chapter examines how information technologies have been used by non-governmental organizations to contest economic globalization. The chapter uses as case studies the failed attempt to negotiate the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (1995-1998) and the failed effort to launch a new round of trade negotiations at the World Trade Organization ministerial meetings in Seattle 1999. We do not take the simplistic view that non-governmental organizations were solely responsible for defeating the MAI, or stopping further trade negotiations, but rather use these cases to examine how Internet technology contributed to the capacity of groups to communicate, to quickly mobilize and widely disseminate critical information, outside the control of national elites.*

This chapter appears in the book, *Strategies for Managing IS/IT Personnel*, edited by Magid Igbaria and Conrad Shayo. Copyright © 2004, Idea Group Inc. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of Idea Group Inc. is prohibited.

# INTRODUCTION

For more than 300 years, politics has been a state-centered activity revolving around the institutions of states and relations between states. Since the 18<sup>th</sup> century, who we are as citizens was defined, and given meaning by, states. Culturally, beginning with the French Revolution, people identified themselves as citizens of particular nation-states. Moreover, the territory of states not only provided the public space in which politics occurred but also the primary space for economic activity, as markets tended to be located within and regulated by states. In sum, there was a considerable overlap of economic, political, and cultural space (Shields & Evans, 1998).

Today, political, economic, and cultural spaces are said to be becoming increasingly separated. Economic activity is becoming globalized, while politics is still defined by the shrinking confines of the nation-state. The cultural question of “who am I?” is being separated from its association with civic nationalism and being reattached to homogeneous ethnic communities (Shields & Evans, 1998). The driving force behind these changes is, observers claim, globalization. Globalization is commonly defined in economic terms as an increasingly integrated system of global production involving a transnational division of labor organized within a single linked group of corporations. As part of this process, capital, unlike labor, moves fairly freely, facilitated by rapidly changing technology. Increasingly open national economies, as a result, have become integrated into, and dependent upon, networks of international exchange.

As states open to the global economy, they expose themselves to a loss of political and economic authority. Indeed, much of the recent popular discussion of globalization has centered on the extent to which it has constrained states, undermined sovereignty, and created an international system where global capital dictates state policies (Greider, 1995). Susan Strange (1996), for example, contended that:

*Where states were once the masters of markets, now it is the markets which, on many crucial issues, are the masters over the governments of states. And the declining authority of states is reflected in a growing diffusion of authority to other institutions and associations, and to local and regional bodies, and in a growing asymmetry between the larger states with structural power and weaker ones without. (p. 4)*

As the state retreats and becomes less relevant, the implications for the politics of the state are profound. According to Brodie (1997), “the ascendancy of the market over the state and *inside* the state...atrophies the public, closes political spaces, and further marginalizes the already marginalized” (p. 7). The atrophy of the public and the problematizing of the state, territory, and sovereignty have, in turn, profound implications for citizenship. Lipschutz (1998, p. 3), for example, argued that there is a crisis of citizenship that arises, in turn, from a crisis of the nation-state, itself in trouble largely as a consequence of globalization.

Globalization thus poses serious questions to the futures of the state and the citizens. If there are no sovereign people, can there be a state? How can citizenship have any relevance in a world in which national borders are becoming porous and even disappearing? This is, no doubt, a pessimistic interpretation of the impact of globalization on the state, politics, and citizenship. In our opinion, it is too pessimistic. We argue that globalization is contestable and that as capitalism globalizes, so do its opponents.

34 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/globalization-citizenship-new-information-technologies/18633](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/globalization-citizenship-new-information-technologies/18633)

## Related Content

---

### Natural Language Processing and Psychology in e-Government Services: Evaluation of a Crime Reporting and Interviewing System

Alicia Iriberry (2015). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 1-17).

[www.irma-international.org/article/natural-language-processing-and-psychology-in-e-government-services/126942](http://www.irma-international.org/article/natural-language-processing-and-psychology-in-e-government-services/126942)

### Usenet and the Proactive Ombudsman

A. P.G. van Meeteren (2007). *Encyclopedia of Digital Government* (pp. 1582-1587).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/usenet-proactive-ombudsman/11717](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/usenet-proactive-ombudsman/11717)

### E-Government Diffusion: Evidence from the Last Decade

Madison N. Ngafeson and Mohammad I. Merhi (2013). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 1-18).

[www.irma-international.org/article/government-diffusion-evidence-last-decade/78298](http://www.irma-international.org/article/government-diffusion-evidence-last-decade/78298)

### Examining the Impacts of Technology and Trust on I-Voting Acceptance in the COVID-19 Aftermath

Mitja Decman and Edvard Kozel (2023). *International Journal of Electronic Government Research* (pp. 1-23).

[www.irma-international.org/article/examining-the-impacts-of-technology-and-trust-on-i-voting-acceptance-in-the-covid-19-aftermath/327454](http://www.irma-international.org/article/examining-the-impacts-of-technology-and-trust-on-i-voting-acceptance-in-the-covid-19-aftermath/327454)

### Business Process Redesign in Implementing E-Government in Ireland

Martin Hughes, Murray Scott and Willie Golden (2008). *Electronic Government: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 217-226).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/business-process-redesign-implementing-government/9706](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/business-process-redesign-implementing-government/9706)