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Subtexts in Texts of Globalization

One of the most celebrated texts in recent times, (The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization by Thomas L. Friedman (2000) assumes the textual position of globalization implying, “free markets and free trade produce far greater incomes for a society as a whole”.

Trained to examine societies in a holistic perspective, this overtly economic exercise brings flashes of another conquest, the success of Harry Potter- a drama that gobbled thousands of short stories written in the same period all over the world. This is the impact of the mega market on smaller projects and local histories and accompanying economies.

In an era in which the geographical distances are bridged by the power of connectivity of the internet, the local spaces assume insignificance. Contradictions continue to mar the tall claims of the benefits being propitiated by the process itself. Statistics, the favourite tool of economists suggest that poverty in absolute numbers is on the rise, ethnic violence has certainly escalated in the last decade and the environmental degradation-an apparent consequence of overconsumption practices of the globalized world has acquired alarming proportions. Farmer (2003:5) a doctor, in a sensitive statement sums up the outcome of this ‘all exciting neo-liberal model of open market economics’:

“Neoliberal generally refers to the ideology that advocates the dominance of a competition driven market model. Within this doctrine, individuals in a society are viewed, if viewed at all, as autonomous, rational producers and consumers whose decisions are
motivated primarily by economic or material concerns. But this ideology has little to say about the social and economic inequalities that distort real economics. As a physician who has worked for much of my adult life among the poor of Haiti of the United States, I know that laws of supply and demand will rarely serve the interests of my patients.

With each passing year, guided by the policies of the great globalizing institutions, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, and the programme of structural adjustments insisted upon by them, we have seen greater number of poor dying in the absence of enough funds to meet their nutritional and health needs. Opening neo-economies are stressed to meet infra-structural needs to invite more global capital but these pay little heed to the parallel global construct of the Human Development Index. This paper attempts to locate these inequities in terms of the theoretical perceptions and in the contemporary political and economic policies and systems.

We are convinced that ‘anthropology offers powerful analytical tools for integrating culture, power, history, and economy into one analytical framework’ (Edelman and Haugerud 2005: 20). It is with this perspective that we trade in domains that are traditionally not awarded a disciplinary legitimacy by many. We believe that anthropology is in a unique position to construct the relevance of building notions of ‘moral economy’. (Thompson 1971, Scott 1976) vis-à-vis the pervading hegemony of ‘liberal economies’ marketed under the banner of multiple texts of globalization. We will debate theoretical texts of globalization and its historical and political contextualization at the end of this paper. At the outset we are trying to locate many subtexts that remain partially hidden in what Graber (2002: 1223) aptly describes as ‘giddy presentism’ or what Edelman and Hariggerud (2005: 22) describe as ‘exoticizing fascination with new manifestations of cultural hybridity’.

While developing these constructs, we are in concurrence with political scientist Mitchell (2002: 8) who argues that economy has become a way of or a ‘set of practices that puts in place a new politics of calculation’ and asserts that it results in ‘new forms of value, new kinds of equivalence, new practices of calculation, new relations
between human agency and the nonhuman, and new distinctions between what was real and formal of its representation' (2002: 5). It is with this presumption that economic texts of globalization talk to only burgeoning middle classes and use stories from their economic successes to evolve a universal discourse of ‘all is well with the ongoing processes of economic liberalization’. It is a contestation that is based on misrepresentation of reality, when examined in a holistic perspective. However, those engaged in examining grassroots realities argue: ‘raising aggregate incomes and productivity’ may result in:

- Making livelihoods and entitlements insecure for many:
- Creating and/or reinforcing socio-economic inequalities (gender, race, caste and class):
- Marginalizing the labour and resource needs for human reproduction, thereby ‘marginalizing’ women and their work:
- Despoiling the environment
- Forging imbalances among different human needs by privileging the acquisition of material wealth over human and spiritual values, resulting in violence and alienation and despair
- Generating conflicts and violence

These subtexts are often ignored in debates that harbour on success of economic globalization and emerging new prosperity (Sen 1997) Most of these subtexts remain hidden, as an upfront agenda and an all out attempt by the agents of globalization to please the middle classes as they impact the quality of leadership that these movements provide opposition to these dominant discourses.

The assumption in our transcript is that there are multiple texts of globalization operational in the intellectual space and in popular perception of the participating agents. The common masses are the recipients of the experiments and convictions of the pseudo ideologues and political survivors. Edelman and Haugerud (2005), in a remarkable collection of essays presents a telling commentary on how development in its many avatars (reincarnations) has added to the misery of the poor and the marginalized sections of the world population. The compilation in the form of a reader is a commentary
through the intellectual history that demonstrates the resurgence of a Brahminical attitude in evolving an academic theory from evolutionism to globalization. The upfront welfare agenda after the Cold War era is loaded with shades of grey. It hides its political intentions behind a façade of rising cultural and capital flows. In the introduction to the book, the authors of the volume present a succinct summary of net output of official development flows following a remarkable study by Nolan (2002), while acknowledging that in general the financial health of the world may have improved but it has shown that:

‘———at the end of the 20th century, over 840 million people were undernourished, and nearly 1.3 billion lived on the equivalent of less than one dollar per day (FAO 2003: 6; UNDP 199: 22, 28).———Between 1950 and 1990, as the world’s population doubled, so too did the number of people living in poverty’.

Global economic inequality increased dramatically between 1960 and 1990: in 1960, the wealthiest 20 per cent of the world’s population received 30 times the income of the poorest 20 per cent; in 1997, the richest 20 per cent received 74 times as much (UNDP 1999: 36). By the late 20th Century, the world’s 200 wealthiest individuals had assets equal to more than the combined income of 41 per cent of the world’s population; the assets of three richest people were more than the combined GNP of all least developed countries (UNDP 1999: 38). Debt levels as a percentage of export earnings in poor nations doubled between 1970 and 1986, and by 1986 more money flowed to the West in debt repayments than went to the Third World in loans and investments. Official foreign cooperation (termed “aid” in the United States) declined world wide during the 1990s, dropping from about $60 billion in the early 1990s to about $55 billion in 1999. The US contribution to these amounts fell sharply—from over 60 per cent of the total in the mid-1950s to 17 per cent by 1998. . . . While official aid flows have diminished, private direct investment in developing countries has increased, rising to more than three times the dollar amount of official aid by 1997. (Nolan 2002: 231)

This citation is the preamble to the subtext hegemonic control of
resources by a handful of multinational and national corporates that build up texts of economic globalization, offering poverty alleviation and greater economic equity as their fundamentals consequently camouflaging everything. The implications are rooted in the growing disenchantment and rising tension and violence among the local populations that are being further marginalized in the process. We take recent violence in Kalinga Nagar in Orissa as our case study to demonstrate the anomaly in the stated content of the most obvious text of globalization—the economic globalization.

Tribal Travails: Story of Kalinga Nagar Industrial Area

Having witnessed tribal life for decades, one is accustomed to seeing injustice being meted out to these communities, day in and day out, in the name of development. The State justifies its actions on a plea that natural environment is a common resource irrespective of who has lived for centuries in its vicinity. The interest of the nation comes first and people have to pay small price for their welfare. It makes no difference if price is being paid mostly by tribals at every stage of development. No one is willing to answer the strange question, why it should always be the tribal, who was expected to sacrifice while the beneficiaries become those people who lived outside the affected zones. It is an awkward truth that anthropologists have, over the years learnt to live with, in their academic pursuits. Some may have protested, others may have accepted with a sense of resignation and an attitude of fait accompli.

What happened in Kalinga Nagar on January 2, 2006 once again forced the academia along with every other conscientious student of the State and development, to reexamine events that are determining the course of our future. We in India have little choice but to reread texts on globalization. The debates on the subject till date appear so real. Euphoria over rising stock indexes, growing prosperity of the urban middle classes, swanky gadgets occupy our attention, distracting the real content of the debate.

To take a view of what caused the events of January 2, 2006, we have to narrate the tribal anguish and anger in a historical perspective. Literally speaking, for every development project, to
name a few- irrigation, mining, timber and paper or for setting any new industry, it was invariably the land of the Adivasis of this country that was acquired (Gadgil 1979; Gadgil and Guha 1995; Sharma and Sharma 1981). The innocent tribals were give compensation packages which were not only inadequate but were ruthless in terms of what they did to the quality of life of these poor inhabitants (Mehta 1992, 1994, 2002). They lost their land, their traditional knowledge, their cultural heritage, the feeling of belongingness that one has with the geographical location in which they were rooted for years.

On January 2nd 2006, as Tata Steel was getting ready to start building a boundary wall demarcating the land area of the project, hundreds of Ho men, women and children from the Kalinga Nagar industrial complex arrived at the project site. The project protagonists had promised that with a projected turn over of 6 million tons of steel a year, the Tatas with their history of philanthropy would turn around the life of the people of the State. The original inhabitants of the land were skeptical. They were only asking for their legitimate rights and adequate compensation.

The compensation package given to the tribals in this particular instance was only Rs 37,500/ per acre and government had now sold it to the multinational company for Rs 3.7 lakh per acre. The resettlement procedures were not even finalized and the landless Adivasis were asked to vacate their houses and move elsewhere or nowhere. The resentment of the local people was obvious. But the government’s reaction was knee jerk. Twelve tribal and one policeman were killed and the bogey of provocation by the Maoist was used as the excuse for the opening of unwarranted firing. This recollection is patterned and reminds one of the similar reporting for more than three decades from most sites in the country, where tribals were displaced for starting industrial or irrigation projects. From ecosystem people (Dasman, 1988) to ecological refugees, these children of the globalizing world’s free economies are not willing to trade their hunger for the comfort of omnivores (Gadgil and Guha 1995) both at home and those in the multinational corporate world. Tribal patience is now getting lost. There is evidence rooted in histories of tribal movements to demonstrate that when exogenous forces test their
patience to their optimum, indigenous people react with all their choked might. Events of Kalinga Nagar were reminder of many prolonged struggles that these simple folk have launched in the past.

From Hunger to Violence

Our hypothesis in examining this patterned process of exploitation and following protest is that at every stage of process of social change, people at the grassroots are victims of processes of imposed change that neither benefits them nor fits their world view. With rampant industrialization and necessity of banking on the wealth of natural resources for its propagation, as an adopted strategy for facilitating globalization, the forces of exploitation get accentuated. The response of the native people, who get exploited in the process, may not be immediate but it certainly surfaces at some stage or the other. There are studies also from other parts of the world that exhibit a growing sense of frustration among various sections of the society towards ‘the institutions of globalization…. in those countries that are exploited’.

Now that we have started looking at a much broader and bigger canvas under the influence of texts of globalization, it is becoming clearer that consequently, the process of exploitation is acquiring huge violent proportions. In other words, we cannot delink rise of militant protests from blatant violation of rights of the indigenous people by the States for incorporating liberalization processes at the behest of the multinational organizations.

The query that we pose at this juncture of our analysis is rooted in the supposition that one of the subtexts of economic globalization is not elimination of poverty but expansion of economic agenda in obvious violation of the rights of the indigenous people at the grassroots level. The premise that industrialization of the areas that are rooted in illiteracy and poverty will bring instant packaged relief is a gross misnomer. For years anthropological texts have documented research after research that Nehru’s scientific temples brought no relief to the impoverished tribal life. They were further marginalized in their homeland as they neither had the necessary qualifications nor expertise and above all there was no sincere effort either by the
State or by the mega corporate houses to train them to take positions that were promised to them when they were ousted from their homes. How will things change in the global regime is difficult for any ethnographer of tribal histories to perceive?

Our apprehensions are based on empirical evidence provided by various organizations working in the field for years. The All India Kisan Mazdoor Sabha in its report after the Kalinga Nagar violence places certain critical facts on the table for the supporters of economic globalization to objectively examine them. Following excerpts from the report need to be examined for comprehending one of the subtexts in the multiple global discourses.

1. The people of kalinga Nagar were highly hopeful of their development when the kalingaNagar Industrial Complex was begun as they were promised jobs, economic well being and proper rehabilitation as a part of development. In 1997 after the establishment of Neelanchal Industrial Project 634 families (actually more than 1000 as many joint families were counted as one) were displaced. Of these only 182 persons have been given employment in the industry and all of them have been engaged as manual labourers under contractors. For resettlement, each family was promised only 10 decimal lands in the nearby market area, which was refused by most. No money was given for the construction of the houses. Only one primary school was built in the colony and no other facilities except a few hand pumps have been provided. There is no electricity connection, no sanitation and no common grounds. The resettlement colony of Jindal Steel doesn’t even have a school...

2. When the MESCO plant was build, 500 families were displaced and they are still to be resettled. The Jindal Plant displaced a number of families who were forced to leave their dwellings by blasting bombs in their village. When Bhushan Steel was being established the government simply bulldozed the entire settlement after the compensations were paid.

3. On May 9th 2005, when Bhoomi poojan of Maharashtra Seamless was being organized, the same was opposed by the Tribals. The state government lathicharged (caned) the tribals.
4. Government claims notwithstanding, the compensation given to the people for their land acquired in 1992-93 has worked out to between Rs 22,000 to 37,000 per acre. However it is to be noted that compensation has been paid only to those whose names were registered as *Patta* holders (registered). They constituted only about 10-20 per cent of the people residing in these villages. One fifth of these too have not been given their compensation. The rest of the people constituting 80-90% of the people were not considered at all for compensation, as they had no land against their name.

5. It is interesting that all these “lucky” patta holders are from families who had been given land during the last land settlement done way back in 1928 by the then Zamindar Krutibas Bhupati. It thus happens that more than 90% of land belongs to the Government, which has not bothered even once to make a revenue settlement for these traditional owners of these forestlands. It also happens that even though these people are registered as voters and their Panchayats are run, yet there is no land earmarked even as Panchayat Land and the common land and hence no compensation was given to them.

6. The people also informed that all land being acquired belongs to the tribal. All land of non-tribals is being exempted from acquisition even if it means altering the free flow of the boundary.

7. The proposed Tata Steel Plant area is 2000 acres and people from 9 villages were to be displaced. In this case there was no proposal for proper rehabilitation and for jobs.


There is also enough documented evidence to suggest that a traditional corporate house like Tatas that have invested huge capital in education and welfare trusts, unfortunately in their desire to become a mega multinational organization, have undermined the interest of the local and marginalized populations. Despite repeated assurances from the company officials that the project will bring prosperity to the area, villagers are skeptical. What is critical in this empirical account is the
importance that is being attached by the local administration and management of Tata Steel to the involvement of so called ‘extremists’.

The question that one would like to ponder is who are these extremists? Are they the children of land alienation, estranged due to the increased activity in their homelands as State and the government at the Centre gives in to the pressure of foreign capital and increased industrialization demanded by economic globalization at the cost of their livelihood? Randeep Ramesh writing in Guardian (August 2, 2006) observes that many experts believe that what happened in Orissa can reoccur in any other part of the country, ‘where the same mix of tribal disaffection could bubble up into a series of peasant uprisings’. There is decidedly an upsurge in the Naxalite/Maoist activities in the tribal belts of the country during the last decade. It is often argued that these rebels, who time and again resort to violent means to meet their demands, are in principle against industrialization. Even the industrialists who, have invested huge amounts in the mining belts of India are concerned. Threats from these ‘extremists’ groups can have massive financial implications. The following excerpt from the Guardian report is of particular interest to us in our quest to unfold these multiple subtexts:

The Naxalites, who follow a radical Maoist ideology, have waged a low intensity guerilla war against India for decades. They control 92,000 square Kilometers (36,000 square miles) of the country, from Nepal to the Southern State of Andhra Pradesh. This “red corridor” runs along some of India’s poorest parts and through areas inhabited mainly by tribal peoples. In many places Naxalites have, in effect become the State-running schools, digging wells and administering justice through ‘people’s courts’. Although the movement has splintered many times in the 40 years since it began, a unified leadership emerged last year under the Communist party of India (Maoist). The new party, with a 10,000 strong armed wing, was promptly banned. . . .

The brokers (CLSA) said in a note last month: “Lack of Policy initiatives and the inability to win over the tribals, the largest stakeholders in the hinterlands where the Maoists hold sway,
means the Naxalites movement is becoming stronger”. The report pointed out that Maoist violence in India had already claimed 374 lives in 500-odd attacks in the first six months of this year.

Dislocation (Friedman 2003) that occurs due to industrial and other technological interventions provides volatile ground for open conflict against perceived hegemonies of the State and other dominating agencies. Simple tribal people remained dormant for decades. It was frequently reasoned by the schooled mind of the scholars that they were fatalistic in character. Some of them went to the extent of assuming that most of these communities had laziness rooted in their genes. Their peace loving temperament was misinterpreted as docility and subservience. After years of subjugation, if these so-called ‘lazy’, ‘fatalistic’, ‘primitive people want to rebel, why call them ‘extremists’? One wonders if there is any logic to violence—but if there is any, then, tribal rebellion in the absence of local leadership was bound to endorse Maoist agenda and follow its leadership. Should we call this as a natural outcome of widening ambit of global process?

Loss of Authentic Culture

Another subtext of the globalization debate is fear of loss of ‘authentic culture’, creating a vacuum in the individual conscious and generating a sense of rootlessness. The writings on globalization have spent far too much time and effort on arriving at a precise understanding of what the process in essence tantamount to. There is continual celebration of emerging ‘hybrid cultures’, without much attention being paid to what happens to the partner who is being supposedly ‘globalized’. An oft repeated argument in this context discusses generation of ‘multiple and shifting identities’. There is little attention paid to what happens to the multitude of humanity that is forced to go through this process of readjustment and re-identification. Some anthropologists have celebrated this process of emergence of ‘new cultural forms’. Ulf Hannerz (1992) called it creolization-a process that connotes creativity and richness of these “cultural bastards”. These scholars have missed the agony of loosing tradition and culture due to a forced ouster. The assumption is that those ousted from
Kalinga Nagar will be beneficiaries in every sense of the term. They will evolve culturally and have a bright future as hybrid individuals. There is a deliberate denial in accepting that when cultural hybridization occurs as a voluntary compromise, reactions of the people are bound to differ but when it emerges as a forced consequence, it is empirically incorrect to assume the thrill of creativity of these so called ‘cultural bastards’.

Barber (1995) came close to perceiving the discontent experienced by local communities, when in his book Jihad vs. Mcworld; he drew our attention to the process of homogenization that is launched as the upfront agenda of market forces, the sole objective of which is to turn individuals into consumers. A consumer is only a target and not a vibrating, sensitized individual. He is being made to eat a burger not because he necessarily enjoys the taste more than his traditional cuisine, but it is fashionable to eat the former in the name of global hybrid culture. Food is no longer a part of ‘authentic culture’ but has become a commodity market almost at par with steel.

We have repeatedly said in the course of this debate that globalization refers to multiple processes operational under the rubric ‘global’. We will take the position that since it is not a single or an isolable or an isolated process, the various subtexts in these multiple texts generate conflicting interests. These multiple processes operating under the colloquial understanding of what globalization may mean to an individual researcher are often at variance with the perceptions of the people who are subjects of that research. Our focus is to chart the course that intended or unintended consequences of various texts of globalization are having on people at the grassroots.

Ecosystems People, Ecology and Globalization

Nature’s first children, the native inhabitants or the first settlers in the region, the tribal in India and in other parts of the world are becoming victims of polarities of multiple globalization processes. On one hand they are being ousted from their homelands for generating spaces for the industrial expansion and growth of capital market, while on the other, nature’s children are ousted from their
homelands to provide room for conservation of bio-diversity. Man and tiger or other endangered species cannot live together, thus the tribal must be shifted out and resettled in areas away from their native habitats. It is another matter that the State instrument bring in fresh settlers to protect the endangered species at the same locations.

Nobody even wants to recollect that the tribal people have lived in harmony with today’s endangered species for centuries. They are accused of helping poachers and hunting wild animals. The wild life activists trained by multinational funded, international organization have become custodians of wild life and natural resources. Tribal forest rights bill mooted to safeguard the land rights of the original settlers, has remained on paper till date, as the wildlife lobby and the Ministry of Environment are worried, that if a handful of tribals were given land rights they will rob the forest of its natural-resources that are essential for the survival of the rest of the humanity, it is immaterial whether the tribal survives or not.

It is this development dilemma that is summed up succinctly by Kain and Baignet (1992: 132,210):

Forests are repositories of great wealth and ecological importance; politically, they are much more than that. Forests are often located in critical spaces that states want to control: international border areas as well as zones which might be deemed ‘sensitive’ because of either their political–ecological importance or sociological composition. Historically, forests have also been the outposts of ‘outlaws’ and ‘outcastes’ and the base for many an opposition force to imperialistic powers-from 10th century ‘china’ to 14th century Java to 20th century Peru and Vietnam (Menzies 1992). Forest mapping was embraced early by emerging European States, first for establishing political boundaries and later for management’ (Peluso, 2005:273).

Peluso further qualifies Kain and Baignet’s observation by stating:

Mapping of forest resources is therefore an intrinsically political act: whether drawn for their protection or production, they are drawings of a nation’s strategic space . . . .’ Forest maps have been an important tool for state authorities trying to exclude or include people within the same spaces as forest resources; maps increase state control
over spaces which are sources of social unrest and valuable resources (Menzies 1992). Mapping facilitates large-scale accumulation strategies that work to facilitate dweller's disadvantage, and consolidates state control over politically sensitive areas such as border zones (Girot and Nietschmann 1993).

What happened in Kalinga Nagar and the twist that was given to the violent outbursts is a classic example of how tribal unrest is being viewed in the democratic political systems. The interpretation illustrates another subtext of globalization in which ecological resources are proclaimed with impunity, as property of the State. The State control is to facilitate the demands of the liberalization process in which economy is slated to boom at the expense of the marginalized people. These people become easy targets, as they are not organized enough to protest and reclaim their resources. Sporadic violent outbursts are immediately slated as being engineered by the violent arm of the leftist movement—the Maoist brigade. There is a distinct possibility that sometimes these protests are launched under the guidance or leadership of the wider political groups, but the fact remains that these organizations have gained legitimacy among the marginalized groups because of the processes of alienation mooted by the political system. Ecology, economics and politics have intertwined in a complex way to the larger detriment of those groups in the society that are not in a position to fight for their own interests. Leadership in the existing democratic system may be at times sympathetic towards the cause of these marginalized sections of the population but finds itself at cross roads due to pressures generated by the larger world economic processes operative under the wider rubric of economic globalization.

Intellectual discourse for years is debating the legitimacy and larger validity of growth and modernization theory, now coined as globalization debates, the world systems theory in contrast to appropriate technology and radical and revolutionary theories. The usual rhetoric of cultural laziness of the underdeveloped countries have few supporters in the age of information technology revolution that draws maximum resource, both human and innovative skills from the previously perceived, underdeveloped world. The success
stories rooted in ‘better quality of life’ and much better ‘human development index’ in the globalizing world come from relatively ‘lower GDP’ States and countries like Kerala in India, Cuba, Taiwan and both South and North Korea. The Kerala Model that Frank and Chasin (2006:370) describe as ‘redistribution of wealth brought about by the organized strength and militant activity of poor people allied with committed and often self-sacrificing radicals from higher income groups’ is apparently becoming the driving strength of the agitating tribal and other marginalized groups in the country. It is this ideological militant positioning that is threatening the development agenda of liberalization adopted by the Indian State. The subtext of violence is interpreted by the State as a deviant and not a consequence of inherent suppression of the larger text of economic globalization.

The political analyst may also be tempted to read a design in the subtext of violence. Robust economic growth further vitiates Human Development Index and promotes inequity among the marginalized sections of the population. The resultant disenchantment will manifest itself in social unrest. This will keep the State engaged in resolving internal political strife. There will be no immediate impact on economic liberalization and rampant industrialization and the international agencies along with the major developed nations will continue to find a secondary market for sustaining their economies. The decision for the “Governments to choose whether to proceed with generating more economic output through stimulating capitalist enterprise or to dampen growth by redistributing wealth and then undertaking some form of government sponsored investment” (Franke and Chasin 2006: 370) will become harder, if violence persists. The State will have no choice but to legitimize repressive tactics to facilitate foreign direct investment and permit capital inflow for facilitating mining and other globalizing projects. The subtext violence thus becomes a designed subtext and is not perceived as an unanticipated consequence.

From Empiricism to Theory

The dilemma of numerous texts of globalization and futile attempts at presenting a uniform theory of these diverse texts is being debated
by every credible student of societies both traditional and contemporary.

Calling it a 'Mega Trope', Knauff writes:

Globalization, even more so than development, is a protean term, with distinct connotations for different people, a moving target that is not the same from one day to the next or in different locations or social situations. Globalization, like capitalism and modernity, is a 'mega trope' (Knauff 2002:34; cf Edelman and Haugerud 2004:21)

For Anna Tsing, it is only a kind of an "ism" that she refers to as a multireferential point:

Globalism is multireferential: part corporate hype and capitalist regulatory agenda, part cultural excitement, part social commentary and protest" (Tsing 2000: 3:32)

Mines & Communities Website in one of its releases after the Kalinga Nagar Killings on 6th January 2006 reciprocated the same argument by writing:

The Mines and Communities board (editors of this site) has consistently supported our Indian colleagues in exposing the impacts on India's aboriginal communities of escalating "development aggression by mining companies and governments, both state and central. On the very day of the atrocities in Kalinganagar, MAC decried the "blatant disregard of tribal peoples' rights" deriving from "mineral rush"...While the Indian government has presented itself as a 'leader' of the third world in the so- called "Doha Round" of trade re-negotiations, it has actually capitulated to most of the key demands made by rich countries and their industries-at least when it comes to accessing resources and profiting from their import and export'.

'...the three legged beast-globalization'—slunk from under the auspices of the world's most influential "development agency" in order to stalk mineral- rich economies in the generic south. "Liberalization" (opening the door to foreign investment); "privatization" (sequestering state-own mining assets) and "deregulation" (the evisceration of nominally self-protecting mining codes)...In a grotesque form of "trickle down", the destructive consequences of this warped "globalizing/
denationalizing” process are now impacting hardest at the village level.
(www.minesandcommunities.org/Action/Press858.htm)"

From academics to activists, reservations on inherent implications of the processes identified as globalization are rooted in experience. For years, they have witnessed what process of industrialization and liberal market economics has done to the poor masses living in the remote parts of developing nations. A group of scientists from Xavier’s Institute of Management located in Bhubaneshwar in Orissa, in an appeal to the State government focussed on their years of research arguing that industrialization was no panacea for the rural and tribal poor in the State. They were of the opinion that “large scale industrialization may hurt Orissa more than they help, if at all”. Expressing their anguish these scientists wrote:

‘What bothers us more is that, in the rising tempo of globalization, almost all political parties have become enamoured with myths of the so-called advantage of LPG (liberalization, privatization, and globalization). . . . Unfortunately—and horrifyingly—it is the current political mindset in the whole country. Unless the mindset is reversed, what happened at Kalinga Nagar may not remain an exception, but become a commonplace occurrence. (www.minesandcommunities.org/Action/Press858htm)

The escalating violence in the red corridor of India that largely passes through the tribal heartland is a witness to the apprehensions of the academics and the activists. There are many in the world that are saying that globalization in the long run may not be sustainable (Chua 2003, Dunklin 2005,). The subtext of violence whether generated by the deliberate design or as an unintended consequence, is draining not only at the roots of the democratic system but is creating economic and political inequalities that most modern nation States, willy-nilly becoming part of the so-called globalizing world, will find hard to sustain.

The logic of globalization is that the ‘resources should be taken over by those who are able to put them to most productive use’ (Nathan and Shrestha 2004:246). The philosophy eliminates the original inhabitants of the forest lands, who in the absence of defined rights can not stake claims to ownership. Even in those few cases
where, due to certain provisions made in the past, the rights are recognized, compensation offered is more in the form of mercy than right. The threshold of tolerance of the marginalized masses is reaching a point that is akin to the kindled timber. We used Kalinga Nagar as an example to demonstrate that economic prosperity of the few cannot mask the anger of million others. Are there any inbuilt mechanisms within the existing texts of globalization that can absorb disclosed or undisclosed subtexts of anger and exploitation? The world is experiencing a strange dialectic of those who are sponsors of globalization and those who are victims and not the so called benefactors of globalization. The assumption that globalization benefits all and that there are no inherent dangers in the process (Amartaya Sen 2001, Friedman 2000) is not sustainable in the wake of growing discontent among the marginalized sections of the population.

IMF in its own brief (2002) admitted to some of the contradictions to which we have drawn attention in this paper. The brief argues: “In short globalization does not reduce national sovereignty. It does create a strong incentive for governments to the [sic] pursue sound economic policies”. The implication is apparent; if you want financial assistance from the IMF, encourage privatization and use land and other natural resources for optimum capital use. The consequences of these policies are also admitted by the brief in the same report, when it admits that “as globalization has progressed, living conditions (particularly when measured by broader indicators of well being) have improved significantly in virtually all countries. However, the strongest gains have been made by the advanced countries and only some of the developing countries. That the income gap between high-income and low income countries has grown wider is a matter of concern. And the number of world’s citizen [sic] in abject poverty is deeply disturbing”. These inbuilt contradictions that we have termed in this paper as the subtexts of globalization are acknowledged by the promoting agency. The skeptics have a right to know what measures are being taken by the promoters to ensure that the subtexts do not take over the presumed progressive policy interventions. If anomalies are allowed to persist, or we may reason that attention is deliberately being diverted from it by accusing the non-participating
economies or slow economies for persisting with the outmoded
cultural and economic programmes, then there may be an agenda
that the advanced nations of the globalized world are encouraging
to retain their economic and political hegemonies.

NOTES

1. Some statistics in this context often cited are: From 1980 onwards, the financial
assets have grown at 250 percent faster than the “aggregate GDP of all the rich
industrial economies” (Sassen 1996: 40). The current financial markets are
estimated to be worth about $75 trillion and the statistics has risen to $83
trillion in 1999, that is, three and half times the OECD’s aggregate gross
domestic product (GDP) (Sassen 1996:41; Sassen 2000: 3).

2. The 53rd round of national sample survey reported that from 1991-1997, the
percentage of rural poor in India actually increased from 35 to 38.5 per cent. An
IMF issue base brief (2002: 7) on globalization suggests that 'during the 20th
century, global average per capita income rose strongly, but with considerable
variation among countries... the income gap between the rich and the poor
countries has been widening for many decades. The most recent World Economic
Outlook studies 42 countries (representing almost 90 percent of World
population) for which data are available for the 20th century. It reaches the
conclusion that output per capita has risen appreciably but that the distribution
of income among countries has become more unequal than at the beginning of
the century'. (Globalization: Threat or Opportunity? Issues brief for IMF. pp. 1-
11)

3. In Orissa itself nearly 1.5 million triabls have been displaced and the
compensation offered, if offered at all is virtually insignificant.(for details read
'Shots Form The Hip' in Outlook dated January 30th 2006)

4. * There is a view that irrespective of the debate whether globalization as a
process is old, new or relatively recent, it is important to view economic history
of the world having passed through phases that may approximately be described
as 'globalizing' from 1870 to 1914, a deglobalizing period from about 1930 to
1980, and a renewed era of globalization since 1980. (Edelman & Haugerud
2005:23).
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