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Abstract

The working class and other disadvantaged social groups, including ethnic and racial minorities, have always been at the receiving end of the failings of capitalism. The crises of international finance capital continue to take a toll on the working class worldwide. The vulnerability of working peoples to the vagaries of the economy became more pronounced since the early 1980s when sundry economic reform programmes packaged by the Bretton Woods Institutions (BWIs) were imposed by governments in the southern hemisphere. Ever since, the lot of the working class as well as the peasantry across the world has worsened and yet it does not appear there is an end in sight. Massive job losses, job insecurity, decline in real wages, rising inflation and high cost of living are some of the problems workers contend with. Additionally, with its philosophy of roll back the state, basic welfare and social services have been taken out of the reach of the ordinary people, thereby denying them citizenship rights as enshrined in many national constitutions while repudiating the social contract between governments and the citizenry.

It is against this background that we argue that there is the need for the organization of global social movements as a necessary step in the direction of engaging and contesting developments and policies within the neo-liberal world economic order. This becomes necessary given the fact that these policies are put
together by multilateral bodies (the global state economic governance institutions (GSEGIs)) doing the biddings of both government and private corporate interests. If the disadvantaged and vulnerable groups are not to remain permanent victims of a political economy that thrives on exploitation of people by people, this is the least they should do.

Introduction

African people within the continent and in the diaspora have long been subjected to exploitation and deprivation for a very long time. This began as far back as the 15th century when Africans had the initial contact with the European world. Ever since Africans have become victims of an unequal and inequitable system of global relations among nation states. Beginning with the encounter with European adventurers and traders, through slave traders and missionaires to the activities of formal colonialists, the subjugation of Africa and her people to imperialist interests has come a long way. There is no way an honest analysis of the underdevelopment of Africa would be undertaken without coming to terms with the pillage of the continent by Europe. Essentially, the course of African development was diverted and distorted in a disadvantageous manner. This development was captured by Rodney in the following words, “African economies are integrated into the very structure of the developed capitalist economies; and they are integrated in a manner that is unfavourable to Africa and ensures that Africa is dependent on the big capitalist countries” (Rodney 2009:30).
The above, largely constitutes the basis of a situation in which after about five decades of political independence most African countries have failed to live up to the yearnings and aspirations of their people who had hoped that independent nationhood would change their lot. Instead the dividends of independence have been cornered by a few who constitute the indigenous elite that equally took over the privileges (often undeserved) hitherto enjoyed by the erstwhile colonial masters. The indigenous elite equally continued the politics of exclusion that fails to reckon with popular aspirations and inputs as crucial elements in genuine development efforts.

Things could not have been different in view of the fact the paradigm of development adopted have tied these countries to the capitalist path with all its inadequacies. The model is class based and top-bottom and has refused to factor in the common good into the development equation. The situation today is such that in spite of the rich resource base of Africa, most Africans live below the poverty line (as at 2005 the figure was put at 385million), making them susceptible to hunger and disease. The average GDP growth rate in the period 1999-2007 is put at 4.3% while consumer price inflation rate for the same period was 6.2%. In the area of education only 13 of 53 African countries are likely to meet the target set for universal primary education by 2015. Life expectancy is 50 years for all of Africa (ECA 2009:54-64).

The various National Poverty Reduction Programmes packaged by different African governments in the late 1990s at the instance of the World Bank (just like the various structural adjustment programmes of the 1980s and
1990s) is an open admission of the crisis proportion, which the incidence of poverty has assumed in the continent.

The poverty situation in Africa has remained a fundamental challenge in Africa. According to Rasheed (1996) “evidence available from diverse sources consistently underscores the acuteness of the poverty situation and its severity in the continent relative to other parts of the world”. Decades of development planning have not really impacted positively on the lives of the vast majority of the African people. The emergence of a new world economic order, called globalisation, driven by neo-liberalism, has compounded an already bad situation. Neoliberal economic policies place much emphasis on market forces rather than people in determining economic policies, with the resultant effect of de-emphasising the involvement of the state in making provisions for people’s needs.

This is the context in which citizens in many developing countries, including Africa, are being denied of their rights. It is our contention, therefore, that disadvantaged and vulnerable groups in Africa should join hands together with similar groups in the diaspora to confront the unwholesome situation and secure for themselves some decent and humane existence.

The Globalisation Phenomenon

In a most general sense globalization has been defined as the “increasing integration of regions and nations into the world market, the overcoming of borders and the lowering of transaction costs as frontier barriers are eliminated” (Alvater 1997:37). The apostles of globalisation argue that the world economy has been internationalized
in a context that is dominated by uncontrollable market forces where principal economic actors and major agents of change are the transnational corporations (TNCs) who owe no allegiance to any particular nation state and locale; relocate where they consider there is competitive advantage (see Hirst & Thompson 1999). It is this competitive advantage that gives them the edge and put developing countries and their citizens in trouble.

One major feature of globalisation is the internationalization of production, which is characterized by direct investment, by technological co-operation between groups that goes beyond simply taking advantage of the world market for technological innovation to include the creation of global networks in which new technology are developed and implemented (Alvater 1997:40). There is also the consequent emergence of a complex system of worldwide subcontracting of, and specialization in, the production of goods and services (Scherrer & Grenven 2001). Some major features of the new global (borderless, as some would argue) world economy have been identified and these are;

1) Investment is no longer geographically constrained, with a lot of private funds available for cross-border investment.

2) Industry is more global in orientation than it used to be (for example MNCs are propelled by the desire and need to serve attractive markets wherever they exist and to trap attractive pools of resources wherever they exist.

3) Advances/new developments in information technology facilitate the activities of TNCs and investors across the globe.
4) Individual consumers have also cultivated tastes that make them look beyond national boundaries for quality goods at cheaper price.

5) The concentration of enormous financial and economic power in the hands of TNCs

6) Deregulation of employment, and

7) Currency speculation( to buttress this, Khor(2000:2) argues that “less than 2% of the foreign exchange traded is used for trade payments)

(See Ohmae 1995 and Sunmonu 1998)

One major thrust of the globalisation thesis is the impression created by its apologists that globalisation is a novel and inevitable stage in the development of the world economy. They also insist that there is a lack of alternative (similar to their position that there was no alternative to the structural adjustment programmes of the 1980s) “in the face of conditions set by the world market regardless of the historically determined and thus specific satiating position of societies” (Alvater 1997:47). For effect, it is further argued the nation state has rapidly become an unnatural, even dysfunctional unit in terms of which to think about or organize economic activity (Ohmae 1995:42). Implied in this is that nation states, especially the developing countries should surrender the control of their economies to private corporate interests (deregulation) that is, the TNCs.

Put differently, what is labeled globalisation is essentially an attempt at accommodating growing corporate interests in exports and investment opportunities in the developing countries (Haggard 1995:7). This is the context in which the United States, for example, employs the threat of sanctions as an instrument not only for
reducing traditional trade barriers but also for forcing broader regulatory changes favourable to American firms (Haggard 1995:7).

In contradistinction to the position of global theorists, we argue that there is nothing really new about the so called “global/borderless economy”. The fact is that through its various phases, imperialism has always tried to control the world economy (through slave trade, colonialism and neo-colonialism) an effort that, lately, has been helped by the collapse of the “Soviet Bloc” and the subsequent emergence of a unipolar world order under the self-imposed supervision of the United States of America. The TNCs that are now touted/promoted as the driving force of globalisation have long been active across national borders under one guise or the other and had always been in control of the world economy. Companies such as Unilever, UAC, CFAO, PZ, and LONRHO have been trading across national borders as far back as the middle ages. This was the point made by Khor (2000:1) that:

Economic globalisation is not a new process, for over five centuries firms in the economically advanced countries have increasingly extended their outreach through trade and production activities (intensified in the colonial period) to territories all over the world. However, in the past two to three decades, economic globalisation has accelerated as a result of various factors such as technological developments but especially the policies of liberalization that have swept across the world.

Hirst and Thompson (1999) equally argue that the current changes being witnessed are not unprecedented even though they may appear significant and that they do not constitute a new type of economic system. Based on three main grounds, they further
conclude that globalisation as pushed by its most extreme enthusiasts is largely a myth. These are:

1) The absence of a commonly accepted model of the new global economy and how it differs from previous states of the international economy.

2) In the absence of a clear model against which to measure trends, the tendency to casually cite example of the internationalization of sectors and processes as if they were evidence of the growth of an economy dominated by autonomous global market forces.

3) The lack of historical depth the tendency to portray current changes as unique and without precedents and firmly set to persist long into the future.

The position of Hirst and Thompson is similar to that of Alvater (1997:48) who argues that “the thesis of the novel and mandatory nature of globalisation is countered by the argument that already under the Pax Britannica before the first world war, economic interlinkage through direct investment was as diverse as it is now, that migration flows were possibly even stronger than today and that the exchange of merchandise in world trade was comparable in level to that in the final decade of this century” (See also, the seminal work of Walter Rodney, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa).

To further buttress the point that there is nothing unprecedented about globalisation, especially as it affects African countries, it is important to look at the policy thrusts of the various Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) that were imposed on them in the 1980s. According to Weisman (1990) (qtd. in Mwanza 1992):
The main objective of IMF/World Bank SAPs is to stabilize the economy through adjustment of domestic demand to reduce them to the level of external resources. In order to induce long-term growth, most SAPs normally include changes in relative prices which, it is hoped, will introduce or strengthen economic flexibility and efficiency, thus leading to better allocation of resources.

In specific terms, the main features of the conditionalities (see Onimode 1998, Sunmonu, 1998 and Mwanza 1992) attached to SAPs and which are equally embedded in most reform packages under different names across the continent include:

(i) Massive retrenchment of public service workers
(ii) Massive devaluation of national currencies.
(iii) Withdrawal of state subsidies to education, health, housing, agriculture.
(iv) Liberalization of finance and trade, including high interest rates.
(v) Flexibility (actually lowering) in standards and conditions of employment.

There is also the political component of SAP with its insistence on “reduced state participation in the economy with the private sector being the driving force with market force determining prices” (Mwanza 1992:3). This is particularly helpful in understanding why States and government in many developing countries have come to abdicate their responsibilities to their citizens. This is largely due to the fact that policy initiatives have been taken out of the control of national governments. According to Khor (2000),

National policies (…) that until recently were under the jurisdiction of States and people within a country have increasingly come under the influence of international agencies and processes or (sic) of big private corporations or economic/financial players. This has led to the erosion of national sovereignty and narrowed the ability
of governments, and people to make choices from options in economic, social and cultural policies (pp4-5).

Khalil Timamy’s (2007) argument is similar to the above. For him,

Since the imposition of structural adjustment policies on sub-Saharan Africa in the early 1980s, the freedom of many states to shape their own destinies in accordance with national development aspirations and welfare objectives has been severely compromised, if not hijacked altogether, by the Bretton Woods institutions and their backers. As a matter of fact, the policies designed by these powerful global players have become the policies of African governments. While the principle of sovereignty would, in moral terms, have armed African states with an effective weapon to fob off any attempts at interference, the truth is that their capacity for potential resistance has been neutralized by two dynamic constraints: the propensity for corrupt and self-interested African leaders to exploit, in a beneficially partisan manner, any potential opportunities that PSD initiatives might offer in their wake; and the erosive and blackmailing capacity of the conditionality-ridden diplomacy of the Bretton Woods twins in smothering a state’s potential to invoke the sovereignty principle to any decisive and practical effect (pp363-364).

This is the context in which governments in the affected countries have lost the capacity to do things in the interest of the generality of the people. This reality is a major challenge for people in developing countries who need to rescue themselves from what has been rightly described as the re-colonisation of Africa or the second slavery.
Against the background of the foregoing, it amounts to dishonesty on the part of the apologists of globalisation to present it as a new economic system. What we are confronted with is the quest of world capitalism for survival. In this context, firms are more interested in discovering, around the world, “cheap but efficient production locations that offer them the largest and most secure and profitable return on competitive success (Hirst and Thompson). This is largely a response to the crises of capitalism which unfold periodically with the consequences visited on developing countries that are extremely vulnerable in the emerging new international economic order. Haggard (1995:15) puts it thus, “sluggish and erratic growth in the advanced industrial states matched by sharp fluctuations in import demand contributed to the economic difficulties of the less developed countries (LDCs), especially in the early 1980s and again in the early 1990s”.

The critical question to pose is this; is it possible to find solutions to the economic problems facing African/developing countries from the source(s) of these problems? The paradox of the situation is that the fortunes of the developed countries create the misfortunes of the developing ones!!!

Globalisation, Neo-liberalism and Denial of Citizens’ Rights

Four of the major components of neoliberal economic packages imposed on many developing countries constitute a direct threat to citizens’ wellbeing and have actually led to what amounts to withdrawal of rights. These are; massive retrenchment of public service workers (denial of right to gainful employment), massive devaluation of national currencies(resulting in high cost of goods and services, thus denying people access to basic goods and services), withdrawal of
state subsidies to education, health, housing, agriculture (resulting in lack of access to basic needs and social services) and flexibility (actually lowering) in standards and conditions of employment (resulting in assault on workers’ rights and a threat to decent work). In the words of Marchetti and Pianta (n.d);

The sphere of the economy is structured, according to the neo-liberal global strategy, by the operation of firms and markets, which are driven by the search for profits. This generates a tendency to turn into commodities an increasingly wide array of activities previously provided and regulated by states and society, from knowledge to education and health, from public services to global public goods such as water and environmental protection. The resulting privatisation, deregulation and liberalisation, that have characterised since the 1980s the model of neo-liberal globalization, has asserted the power of markets and large industrial and financial firms over decisions made in the political sphere and over social behaviours (http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/general conference/pisa/papers/pp543.pdf, p2)

This ascendancy of neo-liberalism has increasingly made it difficult to actualize the social contract implied in the relationship between national governments and the citizenry in a democratic polity. Most national Constitutions contain provisions on socio-economic rights. Chapter II on Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy of the 1999 Nigerian Constitution as amended addresses these rights. Some of the socio-economic rights guaranteed (but not justiciable) include; equal and adequate educational opportunities (S.18), provision of fair opportunity for all to secure
adequate means of livelihood and adequate opportunity to secure suitable employment (S.17(3)(a), health, safety and welfare of all persons in employment (S.17(3)(c), provision of suitable and adequate food, old age care and pensions, unemployment, sick benefits and welfare of the disabled (S.16(2)(d)) (see Aturu, 2001:634-635). In the case of South Africa, “the South African Constitution (Act 108 of 1996) recognises and spells out a number of socio-economic rights, some of which relate to basic services, such as the right to sufficient water as contained in Section 27(1)(b) of the Constitution (Malzbender 2005:2). The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and The African Charter on the Rights of Man and People’s Rights (adopted in June 1981 by the OAU Summit Meeting), contain similar provisions. The African Charter, among others, provides for right to work under equitable and satisfactory conditions (Article 15), right to enjoy the best attainable state of physical and mental health (Article 16), right to education (Article 17), right to economic, social and cultural development (Article 2) as well as rights to existence (Article 20) (qtd in Aturu, 2001:635). These are rights that are being eroded because of the adoption of neo-liberal economic policies in the context of the new world economic order, also known as, globalisation.

These constitute the social dimension of democratic governance and should be pursued using the need for the society to protect the disadvantaged, weak and vulnerable groups as a thematic platform. It means that any responsible government has an obligation and owes the people a duty to respect these rights; otherwise its legitimacy is questioned. Interestingly, even the privatization of public enterprises is
against constitutional provisions in some countries like Nigeria which insists that the commanding heights of the economy should be in the hands of government. The situation today is such that basic services and needs are out of reach of the vast majority of the people. For example, in 2007 only 62% of Africans had access to safe drinking water with the projection that 78% would have that privilege by the magical year of 2015. In respect of sanitation, only 44% of Africans had access to improved sanitation in 2004 with a projection that by 2015 the figure would be 45%(ECA 2009:64-65). Already in some African countries, provision of potable water has been privatized and commercialized.

Confronting and Contesting the Neo-liberal Agenda: The Option of Global Social Movement

Developing appropriate options and strategies by disadvantaged and vulnerable groups must proceed from the premise that they have rights as citizens which national governments must recognize and respect, no matter the temptation and pressure to do otherwise. If the government is not alive to its responsibility, these groups owe themselves a duty to compel governments and the States to do the right thing. As such, the rest of society organised into civil society and various non-governmental organisations need to undertake a robust programme of advocacy and mobilisation of the people themselves on the need to confront and engage the process of governance and development policy formulation as active participants in order to ensure that they are not short-changed in the scheme of things.
Given the global character of imperialism and the fact that the major drivers and actors in the world economic sphere operate across national boundaries, peoples of developing countries must organise their own resistance against anti-people policies across national boundaries. The forces we are contending with are very formidable. Some of the trans-national corporations are richer than many national governments in the southern hemisphere. In addition these policies that are reducing the vast majority of African people to second class citizens of their own countries are decided off-shore. This point was put succinctly by Khor (2000:5) as he argues, “most developing countries have seen their independent policy-making capacity eroded and have to adopt policies made by other entities, which may on balance be detrimental to the countries concerned”. At another level is the fact that national governments of developing countries are also part of multilateral institutions and also belong to intergovernmental bodies at global, regional and sub-regional levels even though they do not exert much influence in some of these bodies, as such the people must form platforms across countries for the purpose of contesting issues with them wherever they go.

Unfortunately civil society groups, which organise people together “to achieve a common purpose, outside the boundaries of government or the market economy” (qtd. in Burbidge (ed.) 1997:28, are not in a position to take on the forces of imperialism on their own. This reality makes it expedient for them to band together, not just within their own countries, but also across national boundaries, to fight the forces inimical to the people’s well-being. As argued by Saul(2005) disadvantaged social groups in the Southern hemisphere have to contend
with “global structures and domestic elites that have come to inherit much of the power and privileges of the erstwhile beneficiaries of the old colonial and settler dominated orders”.

This is where the option of a global social movement comes in. As used here, social movement refers to a conscious engagement of citizens’ groups with broad social and political issues as well as the immediate concerns of the members which they undertake in loose coalitions. This is in line with Wikipedia Encyclopedia’s conception which views social movement as “large informal groupings of individuals and organisations focused on specific political or social issues, in other words, on carrying out, resisting or undoing social change (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_movement, retrieved on 12, August 2011). It is along this line that Rucht(2004) argues that:

A social movement exists to the extent that the following qualities are co-present:

In structural terms, social movements are networks of groups and/or organizations; regarding their aims, they are attempts to fundamentally change society (including power structures and basic values) or to resist such changes (qtd. in Ghimire 2005:2).

Essentially, social movements are part of popular expression of dissent or social discontent either local, national or global. They equally harness and organise social discontent to press for changes. Social movements are also concerned with the social dimensions of, and problems created by unpopular economic and political regimes. It is essentially a relationship which the cooperating organisations enter into for mutually beneficial goals.

According to Marchetti and Pianta, the global civil society (movement) is:
The sphere of cross-border relationships and activities carried out by collective actors—social movements, networks and civil society organisations—operating independently from states and markets. Within this context of globalization, this emerging global civil society has played an increasing role by formulating a number of political demands vis-à-vis the political and economic spheres. These include the following: a) demands for global democracy, human rights and peace to the state system; b) demands for global economic justice to the economic system; and c) demands for global social justice and environmental sustainability to both systems. Since the 1980s, a growing activism and social mobilisation has addressed global issues, defended fundamental rights, and advocated change in a transnational perspective (Pianta, 2005; Pianta & Marchetti, 2007). …In the last decades, however, the demands and activities of civil society moved beyond the domestic interaction, challenging political and economic power across and above national borders, and questioning some fundamental aspects of the nature of the inter-state system and of the global economy (http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/general conference/pisa/papers/pp543.pdf, retrieved on 12, August 2011).

Citizen groups in developing countries need to take advantage of, or buy into, the emergent civil society movement to advance the interests of vulnerable groups in their countries.

The idea of global social movement is not totally strange to the people in developing countries. Such movements were involved in the campaigns for the abolition of the trans-Atlantic slave trade and the termination of colonial rule. The prevailing
social-economic regime the brunt of which is borne by the workers and other oppressed strata in society, makes the option of global social movement more compelling. The debilitating consequences of neo-liberal economic policies foisted on these countries by the Bretton Woods institutions, some of which include mass retrenchment and unemployment, excruciating poverty as well as the privatisation and commercialization of social services, are enough to, in the words of Saul (2005), “(draw) the trade unions into common cause with other actors in “civil society” to put genuine pressure on the government. Civil society organisations have indicated their readiness to join hands to confront the inadequacies of neo-colonial economic relations in Africa. In the words of Falana (2001), “the time has therefore come for civil society organisations to mobilize the working people to put up a stiff resistance against the re-colonisation of the African continent”.

What is presently required in light of the ascendancy of full blown neo-liberal economic policies is a robust and structured engagement of civil society organisations in countries of the southern hemisphere. The individual weakness of each group or national networks can be mitigated by the collective strength of the other groups in the alliance who can appeal to their mass base made up of people who are victims of the system. The emergent social movement would thrive on its ability to mobilize and organise on social discontent of the people. Based on such a background the movement should engage the political process with a view to ensuring that people, and not markets, are the focus of the development process.

Already in most countries civil society groups and broad coalitions as well as networks organised around different thematic issues are on ground. They only need to
come to the consciousness of the value of trans-national or cross-border mobilisation to advance their causes. The value of using this approach is that since people of developing countries suffer similar problems, it creates greater impact if they speak with one voice. In addition, governments of these countries also belong to different global, regional and sub-regional bodies which meet regularly. As such global social movements can target their gatherings to make known the grievances and concerns of the people. A good example of such moves is the World Social Forum that has been on since 2001. They need to draw public attention, worldwide, particularly in the countries of the northern hemisphere to the problems confronting people in the developing world with the hope of generating interests in such issues. This may have the salutary effect of making citizen groups to put pressure on their own governments to act positively on the side of the people.

In making a case for a global social movement one is not unmindful that alliances are also fraught with dangers, even within countries. This is because social movements, at times, bring together diverse social forces that may not be in agreement over details of their joint actions. Of course this is not unexpected in social interactions. All that need to be done is for each national coalition or network to do a comprehensive assessment of the situation on ground, the location and interests of the members, what they want and strategies to wrest major concessions from the ruling class. The debate on all these issues should involve all members of such groups and not just a few office bearers who may be self-seeking. This is one safe-guard to ensure a rewarding engagement with the political process. Within this framework, specific issues can be addressed and alliances struck based on
strategic choices made through democratic process. The importance of this point is based on the fact that social movements represent an important platform to give voice and constitute new forms of participation and involvement in the new global order (Ghimire 2005).

**Ultimately social movement should be seen as one of the options available to the civil society groups to advance and protect the interests of their members.** However, while drawing global attention to local problems, the real action to ensure positive social change is within national boundaries. This is because a robust engagement of national political and development processes would likely guarantee a situation in which citizens’ interests would be factored into national economic policies. Along this line, it is necessary to identify groups and stakeholders with similar interests and aspirations. Joint and collaborative actions, which can take varying and diverse forms, can be undertaken. Such actions can be issue-specific (such as the need to amend the constitution) and without the collaborating groups losing their identities. Collaborating with others in mass actions means that group members must be mobilised around such issues identified as well as the need for joint actions with other stakeholders.

**Conclusion**

The crises of capitalism have been more pronounced over the last two decades. The working class and other weaker groups within developing countries have been at the receiving end of policies that are meant to protect the interests of the ruling class which acts at the behest of its international mentors. This explains the class character of the unfolding regime of neo-liberal economic policies. There is the need for people to
come to terms with this grim reality and respond appropriately. Those who claim to represent and work with the oppressed strata of our societies should realise that they are contending with the power of international finance capital that is in firm control of the unipolar world economic order. The heavy involvement of Transnational corporations and foreign investors in the national economies and across nation states means that the we are contending with formidable foes and this underscores the need for collaboration among civil society actors in addressing social, political and economic concerns.

Harnessing the gains of international working class solidarity should be a major justification for belonging to these bodies. However, in doing this they should know that the major task is at home, within national boundaries. In other words, civil society groups should think global and act local.

The civil society should take advantage of its immense potentialities. Unfolding developments all over the world suggest that the vulnerability of the capitalist system that thrives on man’s exploitation, if not man’s inhumanity, to man. The operators of the system stand on a lower moral pedestal than those at the receiving end.

If people are to benefit from the development process and reap the immense dividends of citizenship, now is the time for the civil society groups to forge a sustainable strategic alliance to ensure responsive and responsible governance. Governance is about how our lives are structured, it about how common resources are deployed, it is about good life for everybody and it is about the common good. Progressive intellectuals and genuine political activists should work with the CSOs nationally and globally to enthrone people-centred democracies.
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