

Globalisation in relation to the international relations



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The origin of the globalization can be looked after the end of the cold war, when nationalism re-emerged as a challenge to world order. Many countries had been disintegrated as a result of ethnic & religious conflicts, which have been interpreted as a clash of different types of nationalism. The former Soviet Union & Yugoslavia are two such examples. Even the situation in the Balkans is often looked upon as an example of national disintegration.

Some have cited nationalism & religion as two important factors that have disrupted the Balkans, but others have attributed it as one of the major culprit of globalisation.

Apparently, the roles that these two forces play & the impact of globalization on the countries differ. A comparative study was initiated to find the answers to questions raised.

There has been no general definitions of both nationalism & globalization as they are interpreted in accordance with the concept & theory used.

Globalization means as a process of globalizing but it is used here to refer as the following : " the intensification of worldwide relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring miles away and vice-versa" by Anthony Giddens.

However, there is no doubt that both western & Asian nations have faced the challenges of globalization in recent decades, and they have become more intense since the 1990's. the decline of communism and socialism as ideologies, the decreasing importance of national boundaries for capital,

companies, and even labour, have had profound implications for national identity.

Nevertheless, the impact of globalization on the states is not seemed to be similar. It has been greater on some compared to others. what has been the effects? Did it lead to stronger nationalism or national disintegration? What happened to national identity? Is the concept of nation still relevant in the era of globalization?

Based on the above raised questions. There were few nations selected to be surveyed on the basis of there homogeneity, multi-ethnic, immigrant & nationhood. Globalistion are neither willful, external, nor the result of bad management, but are produced by them & are seemed to be very essential within them.

THE DIVERGENCE OF GLOBALIZATION:-

The main concern is set upon the problem of globalization which stems from globalization itself: it can be said in a word as, unsustainable. The most basic reason for not getting well into it is that it simply does not work. this does not mean it is an empty concept, simply that it is not going where everyone thinks it is.

And perhaps at root of the problems of globalization, is that it is making the world more unequal. Here is the example taken of Kagarlitsky as he puts it simply, ' it is a myth that free markets lead to homogenization. Infact they lead to polarization between social classes, between countries, between regions.

There is prima facie, as in a contradiction in the idea that globalization has no limits, & the fact that it is polarizing the world. What unites the very disparate movement against globalization, as so far has been seen, that freedom without equality is an utter nonsense or can be said to be as unimaginaire .

Not just because it is wrong, but because it is impossible. It is hard to see how any social process that mercilessly segregates the poor from the rich without limit can sustain itself as an integrated totality.

The problem is not just that globalization is in a sense of state ' at war' with some alien tendencies towards isolation

as some writers express it, but it does produce up some isolated parts as it develops, as a part of its contradictory essence, setting up an organic internal limit .

There is a close relation between territorial inequality and political instability, both in space and in time. Looking at a map of the world today, there is an almost one-to-one correlation between those regions in which territorial extremes are sharpest- beginning with the middle-east itself.

The nemesis of globalization and the stable emergence of its self destruction from & within those in which military and civil conflicts are the most endemic & liberal democracy the most remote. the globalization process itself generated the instabilities at every level i. e., social, regional, geopolitical, military, commercial, financial- which rendered global governance impossible.

THE THIRD WORLD BOURGEOISIE :-

Globalization is a long-standing & almost inevitable result of deep-rooted historical & technical processes- the compression of space & time, the information revolution, the worldwide organization of production, the formation of the world market- which may be muted & modified, but which can be stopped, in effect by throwing history into reverse. Only one post modern world, it seems, is possible. indeed, if calling a halt to globalization could lead anywhere, it would seem to vitiate most of the globalists on arguments. The only way therefore is to act on the assumption that globalization is inevitable, with or without reservations, & try to direct it into something much better, perhaps offsetting its most fierce and harsh social defects with third way policies and poverty-eradication programmes.

The evidences based on the present terms and conditions, globalization is concerned to be injurious to health. Question comes on my mind, why have so many third world governments gone along with it? The ideology of the globalisers has played a role.

Academic globalization theory also bears a measure of responsibility for unleashing, de facto, a determined and unilateral account of world development offering few alternative choices for third world nations except to become a mere dumb and make the best use of whatever they are being given.

Nevertheless, with the collapse of the soviet union, many protective mechanisms previously available to third world countries vanished within, and to this they had no choice and stood alone and exposed themselves

<https://assignbuster.com/globalisation-in-relation-to-the-international-relations/>

both to the world market & the political offensive of the globalisers. Thus there is an underlying basis for the globalist argument the alternatives were always present there, but they involved hard choices and exposed the country concerned to great risks, both internal & external.

However, the globalization argument has always lacked somewhat in the specific historical events and evidences. The dilemma facing by the third world countries was eternal. If, as we can believe, a new historical situation is going to be emerging, then although the challenges can or may be harsh- probably even harsher than before- the range of options is also be far wider.

The second factor is that there is strong, evidence that a transnational bourgeoisie of some kind has real significant existence, regardless of the framework in which one chooses to analyze it. As in example of the theorists of the 1970's used to describe that the capitalists who accepted the subordination of their own country to foreign economic domination, could no longer were adequately capture the status of a new third world layer integrated into world capitalism directly through the circuits of financial capital.

Globalization has fostered, and rapidly enriched, a corrupting groups of minorities that populated the political elites of most third world countries, & had elevated itself into prospering independent of the fate of its country of origin.

GLOBALISATION AND NEW WORLD ORDER:

After the international movement against neoliberal globalization took place, the powerful protests against the war on Iraq all over the world did once again reminded everyone that historical development is not simply the product of the schemes devised by the dominant forces of society, but the outcome of a struggle of contending forces, among which working people & the oppressed masses are a power to be reckoned with.

In order to create an alternative to the above perspective, what was to be needed was a serious analysis of the underlying forces for the strategy of the new world order, announced with great fanfare in 1990, on the eve of the first gulf war, by George bush senior. This concept was too often been dismissed or on the left on the pretext that it is hardly anything more than a new world disorder.

This was later conceived by US imperialism as the ultimate destination to be reached through a series of violent upheavals in the existing world order. Hence, the disorder that is time, again denounced is infact the path that the world has to travel in order to reach that ultimate destination. It is, in other words, order through disorder by its very nature. Thus the NWO was, infact, can be termed to be as a dialectical unity in the true sense of the term: the, old order had been nullified violently so that the new order may be established as a synthesis of order & disorder.

Pure denunciation or condemning also made it more difficult to analyze the methods and modalities through which the new order aspired to being built. It can be stated that US imperialism has been seeking world hegemony will

not be able to do. We have to hold on to grip with the mechanisms & modalities through which it is doing so.

In its turn, NWO cannot be understood in isolation but only as the political superstructure of the economic strategy of 'globalisation'.

GLOBALISATION: THE UNRESTRICTED CIRCULATION OF CAPITAL

The use of the term 'globalization' to characterize it in the integration of the world economy immediately confronts theory with the task of defining what is new in capitalism and which structural characteristics of the older capitalism still hold sway.

For 'globalization' is but one element in that series of theoretical concepts such as post fordism, post modernism, the information society etc. that form the basis of the overall claim that the nature of society & the economy have undergone such complete transformation that all conceptual frameworks hitherto utilized to understand the world have now become wholly inadequate for the task.

The advances in the internationalization of capital and the integration of the world economy in the recent period have been codified within the framework of the bourgeois liberal theory of globalization whose assumptions and conclusions were later adopted unquestioningly by many on the left (most notably by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri is their much acclaimed empire).

'Globalisation' theory has become so influential that it is now common sense, so to speak, for the thinkers and so on, its major ideas are being circulated in the popular media in the form of incontrovertible dogma or <https://assignbuster.com/globalisation-in-relation-to-the-international-relations/>

accepted without any objection. The core of this theory can be summed up in four major propositions:

‘ globalization’ is the direct product of the recent wave of technological process, that is of the new information’s and communication technologies.

globalization is an inevitable and irreversible process;

the new integration of the world economy has rendered the nation state obsolete as a historical category or in more restrained versions of the theory, paved the ground for this;

It has opened up a new stage in the historical development of capitalism distinct from the imperialist stage. None of these propositions can withstand the test of a confrontation with the facts of present-day world capitalism

As much is admitted by the advocates of globalization theory itself when they advise governments to harmonize their economic policies with the requirements of the ‘ global economy’ in order to be able to attract foreign capital, which is but a roundabout way of admitting the specificity of national economies and the difference national economic policy can make.

The final claim that the imperialist stage has been transcended thanks to globalization is perhaps the most insulting of all to the collective intelligence of the masses when consider in the light of the crystal clear fact that inequality between nations has, if anything, greatly increased within the last several decades thanks to the functioning of the system of ‘ globalization’.

Neither does this claim hold water at the theoretical level. All the characteristics of imperialism depicted by the classical Marxist theory of imperialism, developed by Hilferding, Bukharin and Lenin, with significant contributions by Luxemburg and Trotsky, are truer today than when formulated at the beginning of last century. At the stage we have reached, we feel entitled to state clearly that the specific thesis of bourgeois liberal 'globalization' theory are mere fancies and that the imperialist nature of capitalism has hardly changed at all. It is now time to turn to the new reality, of which 'globalization' theory is but a symptom and a refracted image.

However important it is to lay bare the social force behind globalization and neoliberalism, a vulgar (i. e. non-marxist) understanding of the category capital may still lead to a kind of a conception where the adoption of the new strategy of globalization can be seen, in pure functionalist tradition, as the adaptation of the superstructure of economic policy to the shift of the fundamental structures of world capitalism.

The very essential fact that the adoption of the neoliberal cum globalization strategy is in effect a class assault by the international proletariat and the working masses at large.

Globalization is the strategy that aims to pit national sections of the international working class against each other. Globalization is the drive initiated by the international bourgeoisie to create a race to the bottom by re-establishing the full force of competition between countries and their working classes and masses. It is, then, true that globalization is an attack on the nation state, but only from a certain angle,

Globalization tries to dismantle every aspects of the existing nation state that, over a certain period, had come to act as a bumper mechanism to tame the wild forces of market competition and create a defence for the working class and the masses at large.

But globalization exercises, and can only exercise this impact on nation states with the active consent and participation of ruling classes of each state in question, even in those countries dominated by imperialism. For this kind of change acts not only in favour of the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries, it also changes the domestic balance of forces within the dominated country in favor of the ruling classes at the expense of the working masses. Imperialist super-exploitation is concomitantly reinforced.

The picture of globalization that emerges the fact that all so-called nation-states actively pursue policies that favour the capitalist class, both international and domestic.

It is here that one can discover the real ideological function of the theory and ideology of globalization by declaring general, completed and irreversible a process that is only partial and only at its initial stages, globalization theory and ideology act disarm the great masses of working people and dissuade them from entering into struggle against what is in fact of matter a capitalist assault on their position.

This, though is not the only factor that works to weaken the mass struggle against globalization and neoliberalism in general.

GLOBALIZATION: GRASPED BY PROVOKATION :-

<https://assignbuster.com/globalisation-in-relation-to-the-international-relations/>

With the near completion of the decolonization process which resulted in the birth of a host of afro-asian states in the 1960's, it was generally assumed that nationalism had passed its heyday. But the end of colonialism and the gradual emergence of an interdependent world seemed to suggest that the age of nationalism was well and truly over. Sovereign states were thus seen to be fighting a rearguard action as boundaries became porous and penetrable by unconventional intruders.

But the events associated with the end of the cold-war, particularly the break-up of the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, have belied such claims.

Increasingly, nationalist demands have been surfacing both in the developing and the developed countries.

The cases of individual nation-states while being important must, however, be located within the broader context of the contemporary international order, the defining feature of which is globalization. It would appear that the world we live in at present is confronted by the contradictory pulls of nationalism and globalism. The essence of globalization being a closer integration of states and societies, overriding the particularist identities of people and nations, it should in theory stand opposed to nationalist urges.

But it is argued that the very forces of invasive globalization has unleashed an extremely strong backlash in the form of resurgent nationalism with assertion of freedom in all sphere. What distinguishes people from one another rather than what unites them in finding new emphasis in many societies.

The communication and the information revolution are highly appreciated for their association with globalization which has created a heightened awareness regarding particular issues and dealings among some nationalities, culminating in their demands for a separate nation-state. Thus reinforcing the disintegrative tendency within multi-ethnic states.

Therefore, in this sense globalization has begun its hastening the disintegration process in some states. Many multi-ethnic states in the communist blocs that had failed to satisfy the aspirations of the minorities began to be perceived as being captivated from which dissatisfied groups longed to escape.

The global electronic revolution greatly facilitated such yearnings. The transmission of news and views across state boundaries not only tended to help in sensitizing the viewing public about their identities but also spurred them to act to realize their dreams for a national homeland. It was not surprising therefore to witness the emergence of several new states in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Globalization has also resulted in unification of divided countries like Germany and Yemen. This should be clear to any observer that the dynamics between globalization & nationalism is a complex & an overwhelming one.

For many states, globalization is like the proverbial tiger which they are forced to ride but do not quite know when or how to get off. While they may react against its corrosive influence on their societies, they would be the last to deny themselves its benefits.

It is this dilemma which haunts the policy-makers in many states who want to reconcile the influence of western culture propagated through mass-media with the values of their traditional culture.

Similarly, they see the benefits of integrating their economies with the global economies with the global economy but also become irritated by the idea of being dictated to by the outsiders.

Thus, this aspect of globalization has set in motion a strong nationalist reaction in many countries.

The globalization of production and finance undercuts national economic planning, eroding state sovereignty and the political identities it presupposes. In short, identities which were conventionally grounded in their particular state territoriality are losing ground to a politics or new, or even non space.

Empirically, the 'new times' we live in are marked by dynamics of fragmentation, pluralism, decentralization, flexibilisation, and even globalization. In this sense, their theorizing is relatively more 'grounded' and relevant to daily practice, even when it emerges from post modernist orientations. The feminists as well add to and go beyond non-feminist perspectives by including women's lives, experiences and ways of knowing in the construction of knowledge claims.

They demonstrate how masculinist constructions of subjects and subjectivity are disembodied and disembedded. The neglecting of history and presumption of territoriality have led to impoverished international relations

theory, representing it as particularly inadequate in the context of globalization.

Ignoring history has also led to a great loss or worsen the tendency towards static and reductionist understanding as many critics also have observed, that the prevailing theories deal poorly with change and simply deny the basic fundamental transformations.

On the other hand, the raising of politics over economics has prevented the sophisticated and critical analysis of market dynamics. In the absence of such analysis, the globalization of capital has cleverly avoided our understanding: we rely too much on liberal-capitalist orthodoxies, we know too little about unstable and unregulated financial markets and non territorial power and we lack any kind of believable alternatives to a model which are ultimately self-destructive.

Globalization: the scenario of global politics after the cold war

The picture of the world is being viewed very differently than what it had been before the cold war. Where the capital is increasingly been moving, the labour is often not. The discourses of globalization and the focus on European transformations after the cold war often ignore the emergence of what critics are sometimes now calling ' global apartheid'.

Any issue or agenda for the critical study of world politics in the era of globalization must take into account the lives of the poorest people if it is to be appropriately comprehensive. Globalization has highly uneven geographies, despite the implicit assumptions of homogenization in most

uses of the term. Given the inextricability of theory and practice, much is at stake in the formulation of knowledge about globalization.

Consciousness does not singly and wholly create the social world, but it does play a significant role in the making of history. Orthodox (i. e., conservative and liberal) paradigms have the effect of containing the concept of globalization and by extension, the forces for structural disruption and transformation that this trend might include and move forward.

Towards A Critical Theory of: Globalization

The consequences of globalization will arguably one of the most wide ranging and unsettling systematic trends in contemporary history- had remained quite open and will be considerably influenced by the sorts of knowledge constructed about, and fed into the process.

Till date, orthodox(and especially liberal) discourses have held higher hand, but there are ample of opportunities that remain to saving notions of globalization for critical theory and associated politics of emancipation.

To some extent, no doubt globalization has been remained a buzzword, a term as having an end number of meanings as it is in particular. Much discussion of the global circumstance has been conceptually imprecise and empirically their. References to the global often still merge with ideas of ' international relations' & ' world system' simply to denote the extension of social relations beyond national, state and country confines. But in this loose form ideas of globality say nothing particularly new & could be applied as much to the seventeenth as the twentieth century.

THE RISE OF GLOBALIZATION :-

So the term globalization has been defined in various ways but here it can be understood here that globalization refers to the emergence and spread of supra territorial dimension of social relations. In institutional terms, the process has unfolded the proliferation and growth of so called 'transnational' corporations, popular associations and regularity agencies sometimes they are even termed as global companies, global civil society.

In ecological terms as well, globalization has taken place in shape of planetary climate change, atmospheric depletion, worldwide epidemics, and the decline of Earth's biodiversity, among other things.

Economically, what Karl Marx had anticipated as capital's 'annihilation of space by time' or in simple terms complete destruction of capital, globality has been realized inter alia in twenty four hour round the world financial markets, whole world production lines and a host of global consumption articles.

Normatively, globalization has occurred through the expansion of worldwide standards⁹ eg: common scales of measurement and so called universal human rights) as well as through non-territorial networks of collective solidarity.

Even psychologically speaking, globalization has developed through growing consciousness of the world as a single place, an awareness reinforced by everyday experienced of fooding, music, socializing as well as pictures of outer space showing planet Earth as one location. In these ways, the rise of

supra territoriality has been comprehensive and beyond much of all in some form and to some degree spanning all aspects of social relations.

Although, globalization has been most pronounced, sort out and intense in recent years, on a smaller scale and at a slower pace the trend stretches back more than a century.

It is claimed here that globalization has touched and influenced every person, location and sphere of activity on the planet, or each to the some extent nor that globalization is a linear and irreversible process even if it has appeared to have an overwhelming quality and in a basic form that globalization constitutes one and only as well primary motor of contemporary history, nor that territory, place and distance have lost all significance, nor that state and geopolitical have ceased to be important, nor that everyone enjoys equal access to an equal voice in and equal benefits from beyond the natural realm.

The globalization entails regarding homogenization and of cultural differences, it also proclaims the birth of a world community with perpetual peace.

The question also remains here whether, in what ways and to what extend does contemporary globalization has shaped, or might produce, a basic discontinuity in social history. Are there now certain distinctive global forms of social existence which transcend and even super side circumstances of locality, country and international relations? How, if at all, has globalization encouraged and reflected changes in social structure, and with what consequences for the human conditions?

<https://assignbuster.com/globalisation-in-relation-to-the-international-relations/>

Conservatives tend to reject liberal enthusiasm for globalization as 'utopian' and to ignore critical perspectives altogether.

In academic circles, globalizations have been especially prevalent among proponents of so-called realist-international theory. This analysis holds that the world system is reducible to interstate competition for power.

Perhaps realist arrogance contradicted intuitive awareness that globalization calls into question, traditional knowledge methodological nationalism & territorialism- and thereby the very discipline of international relations and the realist vocation itself.

Another stream of orthodox thinking liberalism, does acknowledge a reality of globalization, but regards the process uncritically as progressive and mild. In liberal discourse the terms internationalization and globalization are regularly used interchangeably, and cognizance of recent major transformations of social space is often underdeveloped.

In liberal eyes, contemporary globalization offers the prospect of at last fully realizing the promise of modernity.

Neoliberalism, holds that globalization will yield this 'end of history' more or less automatically critical accounts of globalization have chiefly developed along two broad methodological lines. On the one hand, historical-materialist analysis have interpreted the rise of supraterritoriality as a particular turn in capitalist development.

On the other hand, what are broadly termed post modernist or post structuralist narratives have highlighted psychological and cultural oppressions that attend globalization.

GLOBALIZATION AND ITS GLOBAL EMANCIPATION:-

On the contrary, the case for critical theory is compelling. To date, globalization has often perpetuated poverty, widened material inequalities, increased ecological degradation, sustained militarism, fragmented communities, marginalized subordinated groups, fed intolerance and deepened crises of democracy.

Globalization has helped to increase ecological consciousness and programmes to enhance environment sustainability. Many of the more globalised parts of the world have witnessed major and quite possibly structural disarmament in recent year and in so far as war is a struggle for territorial occupation, armed conflict may tend to decline as supra territorial interests gain greater sway.

For some, globalization has fostered greater awareness of and respect for the diversity of human cultures. In relation to democracy, recent years have witnessed a spread of multiparty elections to many more countries, often with united nations oversight, nad a proliferation of supra territorial citizens action networks.

Globalization has to date mostly been an extension of modernization. At the same time, the rapid rise & wide ranging reach of this transformation of social space-the transcendence of territoriality- has brought great instability

to capitalism, made traditional conceptions of sovereignty unviable, heightened worries about ecological sustainability, injected much confusion into the construction of identity and encouraged reactions against reason.

To this extent, globalization has opened space for critical theory and a fundamental rethink of production, governance, ecology and community, as well as the nature and purpose of knowledge itself.

GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AS A DISCIPLINE:-

Perhaps the most obvious equality of discourses of globalization is their all-encompassing intention or nature, their orientation towards descriptions, explanations or theorizations of the whole, the global.

This orientation clearly displays distinctive as well as common characteristics across different areas of substantive and theoretical interest in the field broadly defined as international relations these areas are numerous and diverse. They include global political economy, global commons and the role of global institutions. They are concerned in a range of ways with change and particular importance of technology, culture and global structures, processes and patterns of production, marketing and consumption.

They renew a debate which has long preoccupied international relations scholars and practitioners concerning the changing capacities and influence of states as key actors.

In developing discourses of globalization, international relationists confront two major challenges, both of which require a self-conscious and self-critical

recognition of the nature of their particular realm of thought and its established discursive practices.

The first relates to the hybrid nature of international relations as a field of study , and the second concern the specific, most important dimension of this hybridity.

It can be regarded as a strength in the context under discussion here that international relations scholars have always had to recognize the degree to which their subject, as a relatively young discipline, has relied on other long-established areas of thought, eg: philosophy, political theory, diplomatic history and political economy.

Power continues to be a central preoccupation for the field of international relations, it needs to be considered more forcefully as a dimension of understanding the impact of the discipline's own hist