

Borderless world

[Politics](#), [Communism](#)



The logic of globalisation would appear to be to create a borderless world of free and open mobility. What are the implications of such mobility? The society in which we live is being profoundly altered due to migration. Immigration laws control situations within nation states however the logic of globalisation would be to create a borderless world of free and open mobility, were people are free to move to any country they wish, were no restrictions are placed on individual choice and foremost freedom of the people; however a borderless world does not seem such a utopia upon examination. The aim of this paper is to discuss the implications of a borderless world. The implications of such free and open mobility can be seen through the analysis of current situations and also by examining historical movements. One possible implication of a borderless world of free and open mobility would be the vast movement of people between countries. A borderless world would have a significant effect on government, politics and power. Democracy in some countries would be threatened as different civilisations place different importance on different values and norms. In borderless states, the common rights of people would disappear. A borderless society would create conflict as different groups of people's interest clash. Another important implication of a borderless world would be the issue of inequality. If people were able to move freely to any particular country the national services of a country would be under strain. For example, in a borderless UK, the national services such as the educational system and national health services would most likely collapse as wealthier countries would become over populated. Over population would difficult for national governments to control. Over population would also lead to higher crime rates, this will be discussed in

more detail by Alison. A mass movement of people through a borderless world would certainly increase the spread of disease. By examining past events such as the BSE disease, restrictions were placed on trades of meats between the UK and neighbouring countries which brought the disease under control. In a borderless world it would be almost impossible to control the spread of disease. Another example would be the control of diseases which are more common to a particular country, such as the AIDS epidemic in Africa. In a world of free mobility conflict would most likely increase. We can already see and experience conflicts of different values and norms. For example the religious conflict in the north of Ireland between Catholics and Protestants and also racial conflicts seen throughout the world. In a borderless world people would be more integrated, seeing the mixing of extremely different cultures, values and norms. By looking at current events it would seem extremely possible that a borderless world would create extreme conflict and violence, possibly world war. Another possible implication of free movement is crime. Since the 1960s members of ethnic groups have been represented in great numbers within the criminal justice system. Compared to their distribution in the overall population, ethnic minority groups are overrepresented in prisons. In 1997 one out of eight male prisoners in England and Wales was from an ethnic minority group. With open borders comes crime which involves the transportation of guns and drugs resulting in higher crime levels. In a borderless world national economies would suffer, nations will have less economic power as a result of the spread of the global marketplace. With no one nation a world economy would be formed resulting in a world currency thus causing problems for

third world countries. This in turn would cause problems for western countries as over population would occur. In conclusion a more integrated world is not necessarily a more harmonious one. Greater risk of infection, disease, crime, fall of democracy, lower rates of pay, crime and gun crime rates are raised. Social movements have still not proved effective in pushing towards reducing global inequalities.