



**BLOCK 3**

**GLOBAL SHIFTS: POWER AND GOVERNANCE**



---

## UNIT 12 GLOBAL RESISTANCES (GLOBAL SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND NGOS)\*

---

### Structure

- 12.0 Objectives
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Global Resistance
- 12.3 Underlying Theoretical Formulations
- 12.4 Resisting Globalisation
- 12.5 Global Social Movements
  - 12.5.1 Resistance Movements: Types of Social Movements
- 12.6 Social Movements and NGOs
- 12.7 Let Us Sum Up
- 12.8 Some Useful References
- 12.9 Answers to Check your Progress Exercises

---

### 12.0 OBJECTIVES

---

This unit focuses on globalisation, global resistance, global social movements and role of NGOs. After going through unit, you should be able to:

- Define global resistance;
- Discuss different theoretical formulations underlying global resistance;
- Understand global social movements and how they are influencing globalisation; and
- Appraise the critical role of NGOs in the global social movements.

---

### 12.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Globalisation defines twenty first century. So does the resistance to globalisation. Global resistance is a social movement with political objectives to alter or at times counter the distortions of globalisation. Often, there are versions that oppose the complete process of globalisation. These are variedly referred as the global justice movement, alter-globalisation movement, anti-globalist movement, anti-corporate globalisation movement, or movement against neoliberal globalisation. However, most of these terms are given by the believers of economic globalisation and hence may not sufficiently describe the perspective of the resisters. People participating in these movements base their criticisms on a number of related ideas. They range from opposing liberal financial/trade institutions (like IMF, WTO, OECD), large transnational corporations having unbridled political power through their wealth, to loss of cultural ideas and damage to environment. They believe that globalisation has weakened the integrity of national legislative authorities, and independence and sovereignty of many countries have been infringed upon by liberal micro and macro-economic rule making processes at the instance of capitalist corporations. Technology has helped both, the forces of

---

\*Dr. Karuna Hemam Yadav, Research Associate, NCERT, New Delhi

globalisation as well as the forces resisting it. Rapid and immediate intercommunication, beyond control of the states has empowered resisters to stay a step ahead of the adversarial authorities. We witness number of rising popular resistance movement all over the world since the end of the Cold War, like the most recent Arab Spring, the world’s largest coordinated anti-war protest against invasion of Iraq, to the rise of the Occupy Wall Street movement and the rise of indigenous resistance movement across the world. The globalised world faces new challenges such as climate change, terrorism, poverty and economic crisis. These challenges having no borders and cannot be solved by any country or inter-governmental institutions. These can be resolved only by coordinated efforts of the forces that seek solution in globalizing and those that resist the process.

---

## 12.2 GLOBAL RESISTANCE

---

Current resistance to globalisation is that it works both to counter and reform it at once, with some social movements working for direct and participatory democracy and autonomous communities (sometimes utilizing alternative economic structures such as “local exchange trading systems”) on the one hand, while others seek truly representative and democratically accountable national and global political structures, on the other (Resisting Globalisation: <https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/resistingglobalisation.pdf>). This has happened against a backdrop of the spread of demands for democratisation around the world, in the aftermath of the Cold War, and in the light of the intensifying process of global interconnectedness. (Kumar Chanchal, et. al. 2017: 70) These protests, which have often taken the name of the date on which they occurred (e.g., J 16 for “June 16th”) or the central city which they have occupied (eg., “Battle for Seattle”), have continued to erupt outside almost every major international political and economic meeting. Additionally, since 9/11, the anti-globalisation movement has increasingly become associated with targeting the militarist policies of the US and UK under in West Asia as part of a growing anti-war grassroots movement. Mary Kaldor argues “global civil society (GCS) is about “civilising” or democratizing globalisation, about the process through which groups, movements and individuals somewhat can demand a global rule of law, global justice and global empowerment”. GCS is identified as “the sphere of ideas, values, networks and individuals located primarily outside the institutional complexes of family, market, and the state, and beyond the confines of national societies, politics and economies (Kaldor, 2000 )”.

### Check Your Progress Exercise 1

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

- 1) Explain how the globalisation and global resistance define the current century?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 12.3 UNDERLYING THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS

---

The emergence of a global civil society can best be explained through the theory of ‘countervailing power’ developed by J.K Galbraith. In his view, emergent global civil society is a direct reaction to the perceived domination of corporate interests within the globalisation process. The rise of the global civil society is therefore part of a backlash against the triumph of neo-liberalism (Buzan, 2004). There are scholars who view social resistance as political actions. For example, Gills (2000: 4) defines social resistance as “a form of political action which should represent the general or societal interest and with the potential to transform the political situation and produce a real alternative.” Then there are other scholars who view resistance as a cultural reaction to globalisation. Chin and Mittelman (2000: 30) write that resistance movements “cannot solely be understood as a political reaction to globalisation. Rather, in the teeth of globalizing tendencies, resistance movements shape and are constitutive of cultural processes.” Scholarly differences over what resistance is, what is its scope and how it should be defined greatly complicate the problem of theorizing social resistance. According to Md. Nuruzzaman (2009) social resistance is neither exclusively “a form of political action” nor as an outright “cultural reaction,” but as “a struggle for survival” fought in the wider political, economic and social context.

Politics of resistance, it is important to note, call for the need to bring the state back to act as a countervailing force to neoliberal globalisation, but also of suitable new governance institutions to cope with the challenges of an interconnected world economy. This perspective is inspired by Karl Polanyi’s notion of resistance as “counter-movement”. This concept refers to the self-protective measures taken by society to cope with the disruptive and polarising effects of industrial capitalism in England during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Resistance to globalisation is about the struggles to overturn the trend towards a capitalist economy disengaging from socially defined functions. It is about reclaiming control of the market. Antonio Gramsci introduced the notion of “counter-hegemonic resistance” where the resistance is about the actions of oppressed groups, or subaltern forces, directed at undermining the power strategy used by ruling classes to create and maintain social order in conditions of uneven capitalist development (Kumar Chanchal, et. al. 2017:72). From this perspective, resistance to globalisation is about gaining control of the state by democratic means in order to advance a national popular political project and thereafter realign international political relations to transform globalisation. It is also about contesting the accepted and institutionalised knowledge and ideology that legitimates the common sense of neo-liberal globalisation and its faith in the market. A promising theory of globalisation and resistance is offered by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s *Empire* (2000) and *Multitude* (2004). For Hardt and Negri, globalisation is characterized by a new imperialistic logic that conducts virtuous wars and makes decisions over who is to live and who is to die. They see it as a complex process that involves a multidimensional mixture of expansions of the global economy and capitalist market system, new technologies and media, expanded judicial and legal modes of governance, and emergent modes of power, sovereignty, and resistance. Yet, as a global order of power in an age of nation states, it transcends and is not traceable to any particular center of power or state capital. Hardt and Negri have engendered their share of criticism, partly for being unprogrammable and partly

for having failed to account for the role of American exceptionalism and militarism in global empire. Likewise, Thomas Friedman (1999) makes a more benign distinction between what he calls the “Lexus” and the “Olive Tree.” The former is a symbol of modernization, of affluence and luxury, and of Westernized consumption, contrasted with the Olive Tree that is a symbol of roots, tradition, place, and stable community. Friedman, by contrast, is less critical of globalisation and fails to perceive the depth of the oppressive features of globalisation and breadth and extent of resistance and opposition to it. In particular, he fails to articulate contradictions between capitalism and democracy, and the ways that globalisation and its economic logic undermines democracy as well as circulates it.

(Resisting Globalisation: <https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/resistingglobalisation.pdf>).

Movements of resistance are continually arising and changing, even as technological inventions proliferate throughout the world and produce a global media culture, while economic crises, natural disasters, militarism, and war threaten to undermine the global order. Therefore, theories of globalisation and resistance must ultimately remain sensitive to ongoing change, be rigorously critical, and so overcome the tendency towards being either dogmatic or overly explanative.

Above mentioned theoretical formulations help explain the ideological orientation of most of these new groups and movements, which broadly favour a global social justice or world ethics agenda, reflected in a desire to extend the impact and efficacy of human rights. This has deepened international law, developed citizen networks to monitor and put pressure on states and international organizations. The global civil society has emerged as the third force between TNCs and international organizations, representing neither the market nor the state (Kumar Chanchal, et. al. 2017:70).

**Check Your Progress Exercise 2**

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.  
ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Discuss theoretical explanations of global resistance?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

**12.1 RESISTING GLOBALISATION**

---

Resistance to globalisation refers to the gamut of struggles and actions of social groups and individuals in response to the dislocating consequences of neoliberal reforms and its effects in the sphere of the economy, politics and identity/ culture. (Saguier, Marcelo, 2012) The core values of the new global social movements of

resistance include non-violent struggle, democratic practice, social justice, inclusiveness, secularism, peace, solidarity (in opposition to localism, parochialism and narrow nationalism/nativism or chauvinism) and equality (including opposition to patriarchal forms of oppression against women as well as class, caste and ethnic based discrimination). There is a more diffused pattern of ideas and organization that characterizes the new social movements with higher participation by women. Global social movements also act trans-nationally in order to generate domestic outcomes, but they mainly aim at changing practices and influencing ideas and norms in world politics. Some of them expect that the use of information, persuasion, and moral pressure should contribute to changes in international institutions and mechanisms of global governance. Others deploy and engage competing justifications as a political process, becoming true moral entrepreneurs in instigating campaigns around particular issues. The Narmada Movement in India, for example, as a coalition of local, national and international non-state organizations has been able to reform and even stall the construction of a set of huge dams along the Narmada River. (Transnational Social Movements: [http://socialsciences.scielo.org/pdf/s\\_bpsr/v2nse/a01v2nse.pdf](http://socialsciences.scielo.org/pdf/s_bpsr/v2nse/a01v2nse.pdf)).

There are reasons to link the resistance of today's new social movements to a number of historical precedents. These include earlier examples of resistance to burgeoning globalisation such as Latin American popular education programmes and the rise of African nationalism in the 1950s and 1960s, India's Chipko movement, Chico Mendes's unionization against Amazonian rain forest destruction, and China's Tiananmen Square democracy movement in the 1980s, the 56 "IMF riots" that occurred in Latin America, the Caribbean, Africa, Europe and the Middle East from 1985 to 1992, and manifestations of resistance such as the formation of the Movement for the Survival of Ogoni People in 1991 to fight Shell Oil in Nigeria, as well as the election of a self determining Government of National Unity in South Africa and the emergence of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation in Chiapas, Mexico in 1994. Whereas some of these resistance movements were regionalized and based their approach in local traditions, which they utilized to contest the negative and colonizing influences of unrestrained capitalist development, others such as the Zapatistas have demonstrated a closer resemblance to recent mass-mobilizations against capitalist globalisation through their mix of violent and non-violent protest, attempts to form solidarity with a myriad of oppressed peoples and groups around the world, and their subversion of new media (e.g., the Internet, facebook) which they incorporate as weapons in the furtherance of resistant goals. Undeniably, much of the resistance to globalisation today cannot be understood apart from its use of the new technologies associated with the Internet. Notably, since 2001, the World Social Forum (WSF) has been held as a sort of annual counter-summit to the World Economic Forum (WEF). With its motto of "Another World is Possible," attendance in the many tens of thousands hailing from over 100 countries, and highly inclusive nature that involves diverse representatives. *As a community of social practices and political process, the World Social Forum can be viewed as an integral part of a broader movement commonly referred to as the alter-globalist movement, one which fights for global social justice ideals. The WSF has provided a suitable platform for reflection on the possible alternatives to the neoliberal globalisation model and may be considered as a group of open areas for meetings, discussions and proposals or, as suggested by Fisher and Ponniah (2003:10) "a pedagogical space enabling learning, networking, and political organization".*

---

## 12.2 GLOBAL SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

---

It has proved difficult to provide a clear definition of a social movement, because they are by nature, shifting entities. The essence, however, of a social movement is resistance. This could be resistance against the status quo, in which movement members demand basic human rights such as shelter, land and access to services, or resistance against the future violation of their rights as they oppose government initiatives, commonly for large-scale dam building, commercial fisheries or the establishment of protected environmental zones in areas crucial for local livelihoods. Schlaepfer et al (1994) define a social movement as community mobilization around the political implications of a local problem. Social movements' challenges to the status quo are generally highly vocal, and members very often posit themselves in clear opposition to government or other elites and their policies. However, the relationship between social movements and the organs of the state is a complicated one. Movements may very often oppose government, but they are equally dependent upon it to redress certain wrongs or bestow rights. Their strategic interaction with the state brings movements clearly into the realm of the political. Foweraker (1995: 69) informs that 'all social movements must be defined in some degree by their political projects or their attempts to influence institutional and political change'. Politicised social movements are often highly radical and innovative in their demands and their activities. Movement members search for new ways to make their views known and articulate their demands, and can at times break the law to achieve this.

*Alter-globalisation protests in global cities since the events of Seattle in 1999 have not been an isolated spontaneous series of events, but rather a conscious tactic of an increasingly coordinated and powerful social movement against economic and financial globalisation that often targets international organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Through these protests, and particularly by means of the series of forums organized since the first World Social Forum in Porto Alegre in 2001, transnational networks, coalitions and movements attempt to transform both domestic political systems and international politics. They create or stir up new issues for the international agenda, mobilize new constituencies, alter understandings of interests and identities, and sometimes change state practices (Khagram et al. 2002).*

Globalisation is also challenged from below at various levels. Individuals can take an array of actions that serve to resist the aspects of globalisation they oppose. For example, Jose Bove of France opposed the expansion of McDonald's, individuals refusing to buy global products like coca cola, Starbucks, or refusing to shop in WalMart because its ruthless commitment to low prices often translates into low-wage work in South. There are small, locally active, groups at the grassroots level that oppose globalisation. There are religious fundamentalists such as the Taliban, Boko Haram, ISIS etc. who seek a return to a pure version of their religion, and resist global processes that they think are a threat to their purity.

### 12.2.1 Resistance Movements: Types of Social Movements

Various types of resistance movements at different levels have cropped up in almost all parts of the world. Following is an overview of some of these movements.



### Local Movements

Globalisation adversely affects local people in different ways. It may deprive them of their source of livelihood, displace them from the local market etc. The Adivasi-Dalit led Plachimada Movement to conserve and protect the sources of drinking water at Palghat in Kerala may be cited as a good example of local resistance. Another illustration is the bold and heroic decision taken by the Koorachund farmers in Kozhikode to get relieved from the market penetration of Transnational Companies like Pepsi Cola and Coca Cola.

### National Movements

The struggles led by the various trade unions, farmers' organisations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) could initiate some national level resistance to globalisation in India. Similar attempts were there in other parts of the world. The recent resistance to Special Economic Zones (SEZs) in the farmlands in India by organised Farmers Movements may be cited as a case of National Level Anti-Globalisation Struggle.

### Global Movements

In order to counter globalisation effectively global level resistance movements are necessary. Already a number of such movements have been organised. One such effort is the World Social Forum.

The demonstrations that the world witnessed in such venues like the WTO's Ministerial Meeting at Seattle and Cancun; G-8 meetings at Genoa and the IMF/World Bank Meetings at Davos, all reveal the global level resistance to globalisation (Kurian: 2007).

### Check Your Progress Exercise 3

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Discuss types of global resistance movements?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 12.6 SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND NGOS

---

In the context of globalisation, it is often said that civil society has assumed a significant global dimension on the basis of transnational networks of non-state actors, especially NGOs such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Oxfam International and Medicines sans Frontiers whose memberships, common purpose and organizational activities transcend national borders. Global civil society has served as a source of governance through dissemination of information, formation of open forums for dialogue and debate and advocacy of greater democracy, transparency and accountability in governmental and multilateral institutions. In

this way, global civil society or global public spheres can help to prevent the powerful from owning power privately (Kean, 2003). This expanding transnational or civil society layer has often been greeted as enhancing democracy and providing a counterbalance to the power of markets and transnational institutions (Kumar Chanchal, et. al. 2017:70-71). Indeed, International NGOs (or INGOs) often play an important role in international and national advocacy campaigns, bringing together different actors from across the globe into diverse networks. The larger charities, such as Oxfam, Save the Children and ActionAid have departments devoted to these campaigns, for example on Fair Trade, GM crops and child prostitution. (Social movements and NGOs: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/80e8/f7dfb443e7f09554e4bf23fd769ec20c68cd.pdf>).

The role of NGOs in global economic governance, and the WTO in particular, has been the focus of much scholarly attention since the so-called 'Battle of Seattle' in 1999. Widely considered to be the coming out moment of the anti-globalisation movement, citizens took to the streets to denounce a global economic system that was seen to be exclusionary and unfair, and producing profound inequalities, environmental destruction and social dislocations worldwide (Gill 2000~ Halliday 2000~Wilkinson 2006). In an effort to stem off its legitimacy crisis, the WTO increased its engagement with NGOs. It is widely argued by scholars, WTO officials, NGOs and national delegates alike that more open trade policymaking processes that include NGOs will, by virtue of the divergence of interests represented, lead to a more democratically legitimate international trade system.

Obviously, some NGOs can be radical, innovative and politically combative, but there are also clear institutional differences between social movements and NGOs. The latter tend to be recognisable by their structure. By contrast, social movements tend to be more ad hoc and evolutionary by nature. NGOs also are more likely to have a set of fixed priorities, whereas social movements can often be much more fluid, and above all reactive, as their actions and goals respond to the vagaries of local and national politics, or the flexibility of global capital. Perhaps most crucial for a definition of social movements is the issue of membership. Social movements are their members. In contrast, theoretically (and sometimes in practice) NGOs can consist of just one person. It would be hard to imagine a social movement composed of a single individual. Social movements are highly dependent on their members who they must keep mobilized and committed. In this sense, movements must elicit a high level of loyalty from their individual members who in turn bestow the movement with legitimacy. In this way, NGOs are more likely to define their work by their official mission and organizational goals than by their membership, if they have one. Although NGOs have taken up issues similar to those of social movements, critics have noted a decrease in radicalism. However, not all social movements will disappear after success or failure. In some cases an organizational form that started life as a social movement can emerge as an NGO, or an NGO-like entity, the SMO (Social Movement Organization).

NGOs are seen as one of the key actors in the global economy, together with governments and firms. The creation of a complex global economy has had effects way beyond the international trade in goods and services. It leads to globalisation of unions, commercial bodies, the professions which participate in the relevant

international regimes. Any form of international regime to formulate a policy of an industry, whether it is non-governmental or intergovernmental will encourage the strengthening of the global links among the NGOs concerned with its activities. States might differ in terms of how much independence they give to civil society groups and individuals. But global balance of power system generally regards non-governmental actors where they exist, as subordinate to national actors (Nau, Henry R, 2009). Government can no longer control the flow of information across the borders of their country. NGOs from each country may combine in four ways: as international NGOs, as advocacy networks, Caucasus and as governance networks. NGOs can directly affect governments, directly affect firms, indirectly (moderate or mediate) the business-government relationship and or act as nodes with business-government-NGOs network (Doh and HildyTeegen, 2003: 565-66). It also influences the major decision process of the international organization. The growth and interaction of NGOs and Inter-Governmental Organisations (IGOs) constitute the central arena of emerging global governance.

#### Check Your Progress Exercise 4

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) What are the roles of NGOs in social movements?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

### 12.1 LET US SUM UP

---

Globalisation and its detractors in the form of locating and contesting its processes and impact have in fact, strengthened the very process of globalisation. Theoretical and practical questions can be asked whether the new social movements of global resistance are capable of acting as a counter hegemonic bloc in global politics and achieving significant transformation of the global system.

The above discussion demonstrates that global civil society provides mechanism for global collaboration and coordination for resolving global problems. Global Civil Society organizations (or GCSOs) give voice and stimulate debates amongst citizens on the various global conflicting issues and make important contributions to the democratisation of global governance. GCSOs have been able to exert an effective influence on policy-making at the international level. These organisations are the means of global governance and transforming the norms of international politics through providing more effective solutions to local problems than national governments or even international organisations, and acting as a powerful counterweight to traditional power politics. Global civil society make citizens more aware of global issues and play a positive and balancing role between globalisation and the nation states. They also contribute significantly to the public education about global governance, thereby empowering citizens to involve themselves meaningfully in the regulatory processes and can stimulate public debate about current and possible future courses of global governance.

The real challenge in this new wave of resistance to capitalist globalisation, however, is to maintain the impetus to action and to global solidarity and achieve more concrete political results. It is the diversity of the movement and their resistance on participation, inclusiveness and autonomy that gives the new movements their real strength. These same qualities, however, also challenge the success of global movements to solve the problem of political representation and organization in the new global politics of resistance. Global civil society and non-state actors are increasingly becoming a new pillar of global governance.

Supporters of global civil society argue that they have effectively reconfigured global power, providing a kind of bottom up democratic vision of civilizing world order. However, the states feel that they have been able to manage and often co-opt the global civil society. One good example of this mutual victory are the various INGOs. INGOs have come to occupy a large space in global affairs across many sectors – commercial, environment, human rights, etc. and increasingly affect relations with and among governments. NGOs in this way have also increasingly brought states to respect areas like basic human rights, poverty, labour rights, health and environment, and, in fact states are forced to come closer to offer global solutions.

Politically charged social movements, however, use the new force as a medium to achieve classic goals of political overthrow and are often led by politically ambitious individuals/leaders. At times, such movements are actually manufactured or supported to dethrone legitimately elected governments.

The resistance movements therefore could constitute the beginning of a global civil society of a new public sphere that might uphold progressive values such as autonomy, democracy, peace, ecological sustainability and social justice. They may however, to succeed in a long term meaningful way, have to be accountable, transparent and free from personality cult. States, on the other hand have to increasingly become adept to engage the new forces and demonstrate their compliance with the expectations these movements cultivate among citizens.

---

## 12.8 SOME USEFUL REFERENCES

---

Gills, Barry K. (2000) (ed). *Globalisation and the Politics of Resistance*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

Buzan, Barry (2004). *From International to World Society?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kean. J. (2003). *Global Civil Society?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

– ‘Resisting Globalisation’, Access on 19<sup>th</sup> November, 2018, <https://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/resistingglobalisation.pdf>

Kumar Chanchal, Lunghthuiyang Riamei and Sanju Gupta (2017). *Understanding Global Politics*, New Delhi: KW Publishers Pvt Ltd.

Kaldor, Mary (2000). ‘Civilising Globalisation: The Implications of the Battle of Seattle’. *Millennium: A Journal of International Studies*, 29/4: 105–14.

Chin, Christine B. N. and James H. Mittelman (2000) “Conceptualizing Resistance to Globalisation,” in Barry K. Gills (ed.), *Globalisation and the Politics of Resistance*, London and New York: Macmillan Press Ltd. and St. Martin's Press Inc.

Mohammed Nuruzzaman (2009), Globalisation and Resistance Movements in the Periphery: An Alternative Theoretical Approach, Access on 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2018, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250147287\\_Globalisation\\_and\\_Resistance\\_Movements\\_in\\_the\\_Periphery\\_An\\_Alternative\\_Theoretical\\_Approach](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250147287_Globalisation_and_Resistance_Movements_in_the_Periphery_An_Alternative_Theoretical_Approach)

Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2000). *Empire*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2004). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, New York: The Penguin Press.

Friedman, T. (1999). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.

Saguier, Marcelo (2012), Resistance to globalisation, Access on 19<sup>th</sup> November, 2018, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269104537\\_Resistance\\_to\\_Globalisation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269104537_Resistance_to_Globalisation)

Khagram, Sanjeev, James Riker, and Kathryn Sikkink (2002). "From Santiago to Seattle": Transnational advocacy groups restructuring world politics. In Restructuring world politics, transnational social movements, networks, and norms, eds. S. Khagram, J. Riker and K. Sikkink. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Carlos r. S. Milani & ruthy Nadia Laniado (2007). *Transnational Social Movements and the Globalisation Agenda: A Methodological Approach Based on the Analysis of the World Social Forum*, Access on 19<sup>th</sup> November, 2018, [http://socialsciences.scielo.org/pdf/s\\_bpsr/v2nse/a01v2nse.pdf](http://socialsciences.scielo.org/pdf/s_bpsr/v2nse/a01v2nse.pdf)

Fisher, William, and Thomas Ponniah (2003). *Un autre monde est possible*, Paris: Parangon.

Schlaepfer, C. G. Rodrigues Viana and S. Moretti (1994). 'Community development and social movements: an experience of solidarity and citizenship in Brazil' *Community Development Journal* 29: 4.

Foweraker, J. (1995). *Theorizing Social Movements*, London: Pluto Press.

Kurian, V Mathew (2007). "Alternatives to Globalisation: A Search" in *Mainstream*, Vol XLV, No 35, Saturday 18 August 2007 ,

Earle, Lucy (2004), Social Movements and NGOs: A Preliminary Investigation, Access on 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2018, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/80e8/f7dfb443e7f09554e4bf23fd769ec20c68cd.pdf>

Gill, Stephen (2000). Toward a Postmodern Prince? The Battle of Seattle as a Moment in the New Politics of Globalisation, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 29.1: 131-140.

Halliday, Fred (2000). Getting Real About Seattle, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 29.1: 123-129.

Wilkinson, Rorden (2006). *The WTO: Crisis and the Governance of Global Trade*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge

Nau, Henry R. (2009). *Perspective on International Relations*, Washington DC: CQ Press.

Doh, Jonathan P., and Hildy Teegen (2003). “Globalisation and NGOs: Transforming Business, Government and Society”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2003, pp. 565-66).

Mishra, Vivek Kumar (2012). The Role of Global Civil Society in Global Governance, Access on 19<sup>th</sup> November, 2018.

[http://gjestenv.com/Current\\_Issue/vol\\_1/Gjest\\_1202.pdf](http://gjestenv.com/Current_Issue/vol_1/Gjest_1202.pdf)

---

## **12.9 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES**

---

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 1**

- Your answers should include definitions of globalisations, and its connection with anti globalisation movements.

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 2**

- Highlight on Micheal Hard and Antonio Negri theory and Thomas Friedman explanations of global resistance.

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 3**

- Your answer should highlight on local, national and global social movements

### **Check Your Progress Exercise 4**

- Highlight critical role of NGOs as advocacy and connecting institute between people and its governance and also a central area of emerging global governance.

---

# UNIT 13 ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVES ON GLOBALISATION\*

---

## Structure

- 13.0 Objectives
- 13.1 Introduction
- 13.2 Understanding Globalisation
  - 13.2.1 Phases of Globalisation
- 13.3 Theoretical Explanations of Globalisation
  - 13.3.1 Realist Explanation of Globalisation
  - 13.3.2 Liberal Explanation of Globalisation
  - 13.3.3 Marxist Explanation of Globalisation
  - 13.3.4 Types of Globalists
- 13.4 Assessment of Globalisation
  - 13.4.1 Adverse Impact of Globalisation
    - 13.4.1.1 Economic Impact
    - 13.4.1.2 Political Impact
    - 13.4.1.3 Social and Cultural Impact
    - 13.4.1.4 Environmental Deterioration
- 13.5 Alternatives to Globalisation
  - 13.5.1 Theoretical Perspective
  - 13.5.2 Practical Alternatives
- 13.6 Let Us Sum Up
- 13.7 Some Useful References
- 13.8 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

---

## 13.0 OBJECTIVES

---

This Unit focuses on globalisation, its negative and positive impacts and also the alternatives of globalisation. After going through Unit, you should be able to:

- Define globalisation;
- Discuss different theoretical aspects of globalisation; and
- Explain impacts of globalisation and the need for its alternatives

---

## 13.1 INTRODUCTION

---

The concept of globalisation is no new. It has existed for long. However, by the turn of current millennium it has become more ubiquitous and applied to almost everything. It gained popularity in the 1990s with the introduction of the term in the print media. Jan Scholte (2000) finds evidence that it was first employed in the social sciences during the Second World War, but notes that it was increasingly used in 1960s and 1970s and became pervasive by the 1990s not only in the social sciences but in everyday discourse. The concept's social science formulation and popularization owes much to the theorists who studied the economic

---

\*Dr. Karuna Hemam Yadav, Research Associate, NCERT, New Delhi

stagnancy and high inflation caused by protectionist (socialist) economies in 1960s and 70s; and highlighted the importance of globalizing world and international trade. They are also called Neo-Marxist dependency theorists. Some classical neo-Marxist dependency theorists important to remember when discussing dependency theory are Paul A. Baran and Andre Gunder Frank who examined the way international economic and power relations impeded domestic development effort. Their focus on global economic exchanges paved the way for the adoption of a wider perspective which was subsequently augmented by Immanuel Wallerstein (1980) in his 'world systems theory'. By conceptualizing contemporary international economic exchange as the result of a historic process that began with European mercantile expansion in the 15th century and which had, by the 20th century produced a unitary, integrated world capitalist system, Wallerstein paved the way for the adoption of a global perspective in social science analysis.

Sociologists and scholars in communications and media studies also recognized that technological innovations have exponentially increased the flow of information around the world with profound consequences for economic, political and cultural exchanges. Marshall McLuhan (1962) found innovations in communications media were creating a "global village." It was likely that people living in the global village would eventually share a common, global world-view that would reshape identities. It was also likely that a new, cosmopolitan, global citizen, with a global consciousness of the unity of all humankind would ultimately emerge (Robertson, 1992).

The popularity of the modern concept of globalisation was also primarily due to the economic and social achievements of developed (capitalist) countries dictating its terms to the world market. During this increased era of globalisation, the world in general and Third world in particular, however also witnessed multidimensional social and environmental hazards, calling forth 'alternatives to globalisation' (Kurian, 2007). Scholars studied the effects of globalisation whether it's negative or positive. Many have emphasized the negative effects of economic globalisation and most agree with (and tend to restate) the argument that globalisation has had disastrous consequences for human welfare and social justice. They have highlighted the negative effects of globalisation on employment and wages in the various countries especially the third world countries, the heightening of inequalities, increased gender and ethnic oppression and discrimination against immigrants, retrenchments in social expenditures and programmes, the enfeebling of governments and their inability to protect the domestic economy, the spread of managerialism and a new workfare ethic in social policy that abrogates the universalism of earlier collectivist social welfare ideals (Midgley, 2007).

---

## **13.2 UNDERSTANDING GLOBALISATION**

---

The term globalisation is used in many ways, for example to describe a set of phenomenon – the transfer of money around the world, the development of information technology, international production, increased tourism and the declining of nation-states. It is also used as a discourse in which the acceptance of globalisation is put forth as being inevitable, irresistible and irreversible. As



such globalisation becomes a sort of natural process outside the control of human agency. Anthony Giddens (1990) has described globalisation as the “intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-versa”. According to Jan Aart Scholte (2005), “Globalisation is an ensemble of developments that makes the world a single place changing the meaning of importance of distance and national identity in world affairs”. David Held and Anthony McGrew (2002) have defined globalisation as growing world interconnectedness, it denotes the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of inter-regional flows and patterns of social interaction. It refers to a shift or transformation in the scale of human social organization that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across the world’s major regions and continents. Globalisation is also defined as compression of the world and intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole (Robertson, 1992).

This small sample of definitions is sufficient to realise that globalisation is a complex phenomenon with multiple effects that makes it difficult to cover all its aspects in a single definition. There are, in fact, three possible ways to approach it. First, it can be defined as intensification of global flows of goods and production factors, facilitated by modern transportation and communication means. Globalisation can also be seen as a compression of time and space in a way that events in one part of the world have instantaneous effects on distant locations. The third approach is to comprehend globalisation as a historical structure of material power. Globalisation represents historical transformation in the economy, politics and culture (Mittelman, 2006). Globalisation, therefore, denotes a significant shift and must be seen as a multi-dimensional phenomenon, involving highly intricate interactions between a whole variety of social, political and economic institutions across a spectrum of geographical scales.

---

### **13.3 PHASES OF GLOBALISATION**

---

Thomas Friedman (2005) has characterized three phase of globalisation. The first phase is from 1492 to 1800, which was the age of mercantilism and colonialism. The second phase was from 1800 to the mid-twentieth century till the end of World War II. This period was dominated by age of Pax-Britannica – built of a new form of globalisation colonizing across the globe. Finally, during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the world started shrinking from its size to a tiny and flattering playing field where the United States reinvented and popularized a new model of globalisation continents (Kumar, Riamei and Gupta, 2017). The establishment of United Nations Organization in 1945 and the agreement on economic and political fields like the establishment of International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and other international organizations have provided the ground for new age of globalisation. Further, environmental challenges such as climate change, cross-boundary water issues, air pollution and over exploitation of fishing in the oceans are linked with globalisation. Globalizing processes affect and are affected by business and work organization, economics, socio-cultural resources, and the natural environment.

### Check Your Progress Exercise 1

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Summarize various meaning and dimensions of globalisation.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

## 13.4 THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF GLOBALISATION

---

Three theoretical perspectives on globalisation are debated by scholars under Realist, Liberal and Marxist views.

### 13.3.1 Realist Explanation of Globalisation

For the Realists, the main actors on the world stage are sovereign states. Realist explanations of globalisation emphasise the relative distribution of power. For Realist, globalisation is a reflection of great powers’ struggle for supremacy. As a result, globalisation is just another context for struggle for hegemony. Realists rely on two core beliefs which shape their view on globalisation. First, they place the state in the centre of international politics. Secondly, they prioritise ‘high politics’ over ‘low politics’ i.e. preponderance of political and military issues over social and environmental issues in inter-state dialogues. Thus, globalisation is mainly seen as a process which transforms the context of inter-state relations. The effects are seen at political level even if the nature of changes tends to be predominantly economic (Kumar, Riamei and Gupta, 2017). Realist argue that globalisation is a critical factor because the changing structure of world production significantly increased the opportunity costs for being isolated from the world’s political economy.

### 13.3.2 Liberal Explanation of Globalisation

For liberals, globalisation is seen as the end product of a long running transformation of world politics. Liberals are particularly interested in the revolution in technology and communications represented by globalisation. This increased interconnectedness between economically and technologically moving societies, results in a very different pattern of world political relations. Liberals believe that globalisation brings social and political benefits. The free flow of information and ideas around the world widens opportunities for personal development and creates more dynamics and vigorous societies. For liberals, globalisation marks the end of nation states which are the dominant global actors otherwise. States has no longer sealed units and as a result the world looks more like a cobweb of relations. Liberals also argue that globalisation will inevitably lead to the dissemination of global political identity and then creation of a global civil society (Kumar, Riamei and Gupta 2017).

### 13.3.3 Marxist Explanation of Globalisation

Marxists portray the essence of globalisation as the establishment of a global capitalist order. For the Marxist, globalisation is an uneven, hierarchical order between the rich and the poor, explained by world system theorist like Immanuel Wallerstein in terms of a structural imbalance between ‘core’, ‘semi peripheral’ and ‘periphery’ areas in the global economy. For them globalisation deepens the existing world system, weakening of the democratic accountability and popular responsiveness due to increased activities of corporate power. Neo-Marxists highlight inequalities in the global capitalist system, through which developed countries operate or sometimes are operating through Transnational Corporations (TNCs) or linked to hegemonic powers such as the USA, who dominate and exploit developing countries (Kumar, Riamei and Gupta 2017). The revolution in information technology has changed the economic and political meaning of globalisation. This has brought imbalance between the nation states and within the nation itself.

#### Check Your Progress Exercise 2

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Discuss theoretical explanations of globalisation?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

### 13.3.4 Types of Globalists

There are three types found: the hyperglobalists, the transformationalists and the skeptics as identified by David Held and Anthony McGraw (2007). The goal of each of this type is to characterize distinctive features of globalisation from different points of view.

#### a) *Hyperglobalist*

Hyperglobalisers, such as K. Ohmae and R. Reich (Ohmae, 1995) believe that global economy has an important impact on humanity and politics; they argue that the market is borderless and economy is single, global and integrated. There will be no national products or technologies, no corporations, no national industries. There will no longer be national economies” (Robert Reich, 1992). Hyperglobalists’ focus on the economic dimension of globalisation covers both, the neoliberal and Marxist theorists. Hyperglobalisers argue that economic globalisation is bringing about a de-nationalisation of economies through the establishment of transnational networks of production, trade and finance, a borderless economy in which national governments are relegated to little more than transmission belts for global capital. Instead of distinctive local cultures and traditional values, globalisation promotes a globalised wealthy, highly educated and upwardly

mobile sector, which places a premium on possessive individualism, consumerism, secularism and neo-liberal capitalism. Hyperglobalist also contend that growth of a single global market and the declining capacity for states to determine their economic destiny are among the most important factors characterizing contemporary globalisation (Kumar, Riamei and Gupta 2017). Hyperglobalists conceive globalisation as a process, which has the internal logic and predictable outcome, the global society based on a fully integrated market. In other words, all the variety of heterogeneous cultures withdraws in front of the unique social pattern, based on markets and institutions derived from the radically liberal cultural framework. In this sense, a well-known assumption about the “end of history” is generated, which implies that the modern, global capitalism with liberal democracy as the political framework, represents the last word of socio-economic evolution (Stefanovic, 2008). In short, Hyerglobalism comprehends globalisation as a unique, lawful and progressive process of unification of world economy.

**b) *Sceptics***

The sceptics, such as P. Hirst and G. Thompson suggest that “globalisation is largely a myth”. They believe that the extent of existing globalisation is exaggerated and that the increase of global trade has happened only in major developed economies – in Europe, Asia-Pacific and North America. “The international economy is one in which processes that are determined at the level of national economies still dominate and international phenomena are outcomes that emerge from the distinct and differential performance of the national economies. “The international economy is an aggregate of nationally located functions” (Hirst and Thompson, 1999). Sceptics argue that contemporary globalisation is neither new nor revolutionary. They focus only on the economic dimension of globalisation, arguing that it features high levels of interstate trade and the expansion of regional common markets such as the European Union (EU), and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) which reduce global economic integration. In their view, states retain a dominant role in these activities, including an ability to regulate and even unravel globalised economic processes. All the governments will retain the formal authority to regulate the global economy. Sceptics have expressed doubts, both in terms of impacts of globalisation and its ubiquity, as well as in terms of sustainability of unification influence which it produces (Kumar, Riamei and Gupta 2017).

**c) *Transformationalists***

The third group is defined by Held and McGrew as transformationalists, which includes authors such as Rosenau or Giddens. They assume that globalisation plays an essential role in fast economic, political and social changes that are restructuring world order and modern societies nowadays. “Globalisation denotes the intensification of worldwide social relations and interactions such that distant events acquire very localised impacts and vice versa” (Held, McGrew, 2007). “Globalisation concerns the transformation of local, and even personal, contexts of social experience. Our day-to-day activities are increasingly influenced by events happening on the other side of the world. Conversely, local lifestyle habits have become globally consequential”.

Transformationalists (Giddens, Scholte, Castells, Walerstein) are more moderate in terms of emphasis of ubiquity and linearity of the globalisation process, as well as assessing of progressivism of its effects. But they do not accept sceptics' thesis about globalisation either. For them, the indisputable fundamental changes in the organization of society that globalisation brings are the growing overall integration and acceleration of socioeconomic dynamics through "compression" of space and time. However, their approach is multidimensional, taking into account mechanisms of globalisation other than economic ones. In this sense, a sociologist of modernism, Anthony Giddens (1990), considers globalisation as a phenomenon shaped by forces of "modern" capitalism: politics, military power and industrialism. These forces are the sources of dimensions of globalisation.

For transformationalists, international, sub-national and transnational groups and organizations are growing more important as state authority and power wane. And with the declining capacity of states and the reduced importance of territory, the role of the identity based features such as religion and ethnicity has grown and spread in global politics. In short, Transformationists view the process of globalisation as uneven and uncertain in terms of results, whereby insist on its multidimensionality.

---

### **13.4 ASSESSMENT OF GLOBALISATION**

---

Globalisation was pandered in the 1980s as the panacea for all the socio-economic ills of the modern world. The Transnational Corporations (TNCs) were the main force behind its promotion. They, through the neo-liberal academia, sermmoned the Third World that the engine of 'economic growth' resides in a liberal globalised market and the resultant outcome would generate an enabling environment for resolving such socio-economic problems like poverty and inequality (Kurian, 2007). The liberalisation was one of the tools for successful globalisation, which appeared in two forms. Firstly, elimination/reduction of tariffs as per GATT schedules, elimination/rationalisation of non-tariff barriers through Sanitary and Phyto-sanitary (SPS) and Technical Barrier to Trade (TBT) agreements to WTO, simplification of import and export procedures occurred based on numerous international agreements. In other words, there was a reduction of restrictions on access and operations in the global market. Secondly, there was a change in domestic legislation relating to foreign economic relations, such as the elimination of quotas for import and export, removal of restrictions on foreign capital in the domestic market. As a result, labour-intensive, environmentally-polluting industries started to be relocated to developing countries. In addition, scientific and technological advancements created opportunities for the spatial separation process (such as capital-intensive and energy intensive processes) and placement of the individual phases in accordance with the prices of factors of production. At the same time, improved transportation and communication allowed the interaction of these scattered productions at relatively modest cost (O'Rourke, Williamson, 1999). As a consequence of all above mentioned factors, production received a really global character today. We can say that today's world became interdependent and interconnected; because one country's well being very much depends on the cooperation with other countries. In the 1950-1960s, each company worked in the market limited by national borders. However, today restrictions on movement of goods and services across national borders have decreased and international manufacturers of the world market can move quite easily.

Multilateral institutions like the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organisation (WTO) were seen as the agencies entrapping the Third World into the project of globalisation. A 'Washington Consensus' was arrived at by the neo-liberal forces to legitimise and engineer market driven programmes to facilitate flexible and free mobility of TNCs all over the world, transcending the national political boundaries.

### 13.4.1 Adverse Impact of Globalisation

Economy, politics, society and environment were all affected by the impact of globalisation.

#### 13.4.1.1 Economic Impact

##### a) *Deepening Poverty and Widening Inequality:*

Since second world-war a number of multilateral and plurilateral organizations/programmes have been initiated to address the issue of poverty and inequality. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 'New International Economic Order' (NIEO), the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) etc. are incessant efforts to continually chase the utopian oases of poverty-less world. In spite of all these attempts, one could notice only aggravating poverty and mounting inequality between the haves and have-nots, intra-nationally and inter-nationally. Globalisation has only accentuated these maladies (Kurian, 2007). In most of the Third World countries, except China and India, the macro economic performance under neo-liberal globalisation was disastrous. Even in these countries, though the national income showed remarkable progress, joblessness, and inequality between the rich and the poor widened, making globalisation unable to work for the vast populations. Farmers' suicide, poverty deaths and break up of social support system pervade all Third World countries including India. Economists have analysed last 6 decades of globalisation and have found that the advanced industrial countries of the world, such as the US and the EU, received the biggest share of the gain and the poorest countries have actually worsened off (Stiglitz, 2008). The emerging international economy is often called 'Casino economy', where the main transactions are in money and finance per se, and has nothing to do with the 'real' economy. This makes the whole world economy very unstable. The 1997-98 East Asian Monetary Crisis may be cited as an example. Most of the Third World countries are now in a 'debt trap'.

##### b) *Labour and Unemployment:*

While globalisation is very friendly to 'capital', it is unfriendly to 'labour'. Labour is downgraded as a variable factor of production. Hire and fire has become the norm and investments by big pension and other public/private funds from developed countries are contingent on relaxed labour laws in the developing countries. Advancement in technology is also accentuating the loss of jobs. Most modern manufacturing plants invest more on automation than labour welfare. Only highly skilled managerial white collar jobs are replacing the blue collar ones. Labour is migrating to industrial areas whereas the global capital flights-off to a more relaxed labour geography and replicating the models of exploitation on a global scale this world has never seen before.

### 13.4.1.2 Political Impact

The second adverse impact that scholars find with globalisation is the political one and relates to the potential regional or global instability because of interdependence of national economies on global level. This is also called as butterfly effect as a butterfly drains honey from all flowers in a lawn. In today's globalised world, national security and nation-states are increasingly dependent on the activities of other countries and decisions of governments in neighbouring states. (Michael 2005). Local economic fluctuations or crises in one country can have regional or even global implications. Neo-liberal globalisation has a political twin in 'neo-conservatism' (neocons). America claims to be its patron. Neo-cons argue for their version of 'democracy'. If a state fails to succumb to this they can brand it as a 'rogue state;' legitimising their armed intervention in it. Invasion of Iraq is such a case and regimes in North Korea and Iran are constantly under threat. Under neo-liberalism and neo-conservatism national polities are pruned and conditioned to oblige to American diktats. In the changed political scenario, the Third World governments are often found being made accountable to global capital interests and not so much to the interests of the people who have given them the power to safeguard their interests (Kurian 2007).

### 13.4.1.3 Social and Cultural Impact

Globalisation has unleashed an unprecedented harmonisation of tangible standards and cultural ideas. Diversity is seen as an aberration, and worthy of a momentary celebration alone. The main goal of a global market and current capitalist globalisation has clearly become rapid accumulation of wealth. Material success has become the final goal of life and pandered as the normal course of an individual (Kurian 2007). Globalisation has severely impacted the 'community' and an individual and his/her freedom has become an altar of rational choice. Values like selfishness and violence are displacing humanitarian values. Immorality is breeding under the cover of globalisation.

### 13.4.1.4 Environmental Deterioration

One grave threat of globalisation is on the environment. 'Our common future' is increasingly under threat by meteorological changes that are fast taking place in the life of earth. Globalisation enables TNCs and often supported by big countries to produce wealth at the cost of environment. Globalisation, in this manner, is likely to have serious consequences for the future.

The current globalisation, as powerful as it might appear, is unsustainable. It is incapable of protecting society and nature, on the one hand, and incapable of protecting capital from the potential chaos of its own markets on the other hand. Is an alternative globalisation possible?

### Check Your Progress Exercise 3

**Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.

1) Briefly discuss about the impacts of globalisation?

.....  
.....

---

## 13.5 ALTERNATIVES TO GLOBALISATION

---

In search of alternatives to globalisation, Mathew Kurian (2007) mentioned about two syndromes, namely, TINA and TAMA syndromes. In ‘there is no alternative’ (TINA), defenders of globalisation hold the view that there is no theoretical and practical alternative to globalisation. On the other, ‘there are many alternatives’ (TAMA) school suggests a diverse theoretical as well as practical alternatives to capitalist globalisation.

### 13.5.1 Theoretical Perspective

We may take Karl Polanyi’s (1957) concept of ‘embeddedness’ to start a theoretical construction of alternatives to globalisation. He argues, under prehistoric capitalism, the economy was embedded in the society, so that social rules and practices governed economic activities. In this phase, religion and ethics exerted tremendous influence over the economy. But when capitalism emerged in the 18th century, the economy became disembedded from the society. Capitalist minded political economists of classical and neo-classical schools of this time claimed that a free market economy would spontaneously resolve the ‘basic economic problem’ most efficiently. The so called ‘invisible hand’ or ‘market mechanism’ enabled this disembedded-ness. Economic decisions were taken by market laws, mainly the law of demand and the law of supply.

More serious theoretical challenge to the globalizing capitalism was posed by economists like Karl Marx, J.M. Keynes and many others. Marx theorised that a state driven by the proletariat would be the best agency for efficient economic administration. Later, Lenin introduced economic planning as an alternative mechanism for the efficient allocation of resources and just distribution of the total produce. (Kurian, 2007). In the background of the great depression, J.M. Keynes theorised the involvement of the state in the economy with ‘fiscal engineering’ to steer the economy through the steady growth path. When the Third World was formed in the post-Second World War era, the government was assigned the social and economic agency role to maximise ‘social welfare’ and development planning was prescribed as the means to achieve it. But in the latter part of the 20th century there were ‘state failures’ in all parts of the world.

### 13.5.2 Practical Alternatives

There are a number of practical alternatives that are discussed by the scholars:

#### a) *Promotion of Self-Reliance*

‘The economy’ may be viewed at various levels, from the ‘family’ to the ‘village’ to the ‘state’ to the ‘nation’ etc. At each level, there has to be relative self-reliance. For example, the family has to employ its productive resources in such a way as to provide goods to meets its ‘needs’. The cooperative efforts of members and participatory decision-making are very significant. The woman should be given an equal status to the male members in the family. Similarly, at the village level whatever is required by the people should be produced as far possible within its geographic terrain. On the state and national levels it would be preferable to phase out the dependence on foreign aid and borrowing. Foreign debt is a trap to facilitate imperialist globalisation (Kurian, 2007).



**b) *Avoid 'Bads' and 'Consumerism'***

The TNCs are the main beneficiaries of globalisation. Through various ways they domesticate the potential consumers in order to maintain their market. Most of the products of TNCs may not be necessary for ordinary people but due to 'consumerism' they are forced to buy all these. Consumerism has been leading people to indebtedness and even to suicide.

**c) *IT to re-build 'community'***

Globalisation fragmentises 'community'. But the information media evolved through globalisation could be effectively used to re-build the community. The role of media plays an important role and therefore media must be fairer and more opened. Media nowadays is driven by consumerist forces, and not by all citizens. People around the world are not being helped to recognize that most important issues – overcrowded cities, quick spread of new infections, global warming, growth of worldwide disparity, destruction of the environment – are all part of the same global process called globalisation. People should be aware that these issues do not just happen, but they all are related (Cavanagh, Mander, 2004).

**d) *Decentralised Planning***

Properly steered decentralised politics and planning can be a potential weapon to fight globalisation. Grassroots social and economic institutions like the Self-Help Groups (SHGs) etc. can empower people enabling them to avert globalisation (Kurian, 2007). States must be more local oriented and solve national problems first, but at the same time they should be able to react promptly to global issues, because states continue to be essential actors in determining the global regime. The same applies to business world, in order to be successful in the global competition, companies need to "think globally and act locally". Practice shows that businesses which are able to design globally for narrow local requirements and which follow "broaden your vision, yet narrow your focus" will generate growth and success. (Pinto, 2004). The idea of globalisation that "bigger is better" is wrong. It involves lack of concern with local issues and overrides locality. In connection with this agenda the concept of glocalization has been introduced. It became an aspect of business jargon during the 1980s, which originates from Japan, where the general issue of the relationship between the particular and the universal has historically received almost obsessive attention (Miyoshi and Harootunian, 1989). Glocalisation is a double process – firstly, institutional and regulatory activities move from the national scope upwards to regional or global scopes and downwards to the scope of individual or local. Secondly, economic activities and inter-firm networks are transforming at the same time to become more localised and transnational (Swyngedouw, 2004).

**e) *Better Collaboration and Coordination***

In order to have more balance as to benefits of the globalisation and the world trade, globalisation must be more regulated and countries should collaborate better. Developed and developing countries have to act co-operatively, so that the gap between poor and rich does not widen more and more each year, but it has to start narrowing. However, there are no institutions, particularly democratic institutions to do that effectively. In order to make globalisation more manageable and seek to base it on principles

of solidarity, it is important to reform and strengthen the role of such international organizations as the United Nations, the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). It is suggested by some activists that improved ties of international organisations with non-governmental organizations might be one of the examples for the reform (The Alternative Globalisation: web). The work of Bob Deacon and his colleagues (1997) contend that globalisation’s negative effects on social welfare can best be addressed through supranational institutions and discuss the work of a variety of multinational agencies that currently contribute to this goal. They argue that these organizations should be strengthened to implement what they describe as a “global government reform agenda”. A commitment to strengthening cooperative efforts to promote social welfare at the international level should also be give high priority.

**Check Your Progress Exercise 4**

- Note:** i) Use the space given below for your answer.  
ii) See the end of the unit for tips for your answer.
- 2) What are the alternative perspectives on globalisation?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

---

**13.6 LET US SUM UP**

---

Globalisation has brought in new opportunities to developing and developed counties. It has been the leading process in the global politics since the cold war, which reflects the change and continuity. But globalisation has also thrown up new challenges like growing inequality across and within nations, volatility in financial market and environmental deteriorations. Globalisation holds the promise of enormous benefits for the people of the world. To make this promise a reality, we must find a way to carefully manage the process. Better attention must be paid for reducing the negative effects and ensuring that the benefits are widely and fairly distributed.

Scholars feel it is necessary to think alternative forms of globalisation, forms that might retain some of the positive consequences of capitalism (in so far as they can exist outside capitalism) while transcending it as a socio-economic system in the transition to a new stage of world history. There have been, of course, many alternatives to capitalism historically and there are many alternatives to it today, but none of them appears greatly popular. Main requirements of an alternative globalisation are the equality for all nations, people and countries, as well as regulation of specific areas of the world’s development with the help of strong democratic international institutions. This shows that an alternative globalisation is essential for sustainable development of the world, and if the right steps and efforts are taken worldwide, an alternative to the current globalisation will be possible to implement. Alternative globalisation as described

above would bring together countries and people in single global equitable and prosperous area, despite all the crises, failures and deviations, which is in everyone's interests.

---

## 13.7 SOME USEFUL REFERENCES

---

Bhagwati, Jagdish. 2004. *In Defence of Globalisation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Cardoso, F. H. and Faletto, E. 1979. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Frank, A. G. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Frank, A. G. 1975. *On Capitalist Underdevelopment*, New York: Oxford University Review Press.

Gilpin, Robert. 2003. *The Challenge of Global Capitalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Steger, Manfred B. 2017, *Globalisation: A Very Short Introduction*, UK: Oxford University Press.

Waltz, Kenneth. 1999. "Globalisation and Governance" in *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp.693-700.

---

## 13.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

---

### Check Your Progress Exercise 1

- Your answers should include definitions of globalisations, three phases of globalisation since 1492 till date.

### Check Your Progress Exercise 2

- Highlight on Realist, Liberal and Marxist explanations of globalisation.

### Check Your Progress Exercise 3

- Your answer should highlight on adverse impact in various field i.e. economic, political, socio-cultural and environment

### Check Your Progress Exercise 4

- Highlight both theoretical and practical perspectives of globalisation

---

## REFERENCES

---

- 1) Cavanagh, J. and J. Mander (2004). *Alternatives to Economic Globalization: a better world is possible*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- 2) Deacon, B., Hulse, M. and Stubbs, P. (1997). *Global social policy: International organizations and the future of welfare*, London: Sage Publications.
- 3) Evans, Peter (2008). Is an Alternative Globalisation Possible? *Politics Society*, 36, pp. 271 – 298, Available at: <http://pas.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/36/2/271> [Accessed 23 September 2018]
- 4) Friedman, Thomas L. (2005). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- 5) Giddens, Anthony (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 6) Giddens, Anthony (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.
- 7) Held, D and McGrew A (2002). *Globalisation Anti Globalisation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 8) Held, David and Anthony McGrew (2007). *Globalisation Theory: Approaches and Controversies*, Polity.
- 9) Hirst, Paul and Grahame Thompson (1999). *Globalisation in Question*, Polity Press.
- 10) K. H. O'Rourke and J. G. Williamson (1999). *Globalisation and History: The evolution of a Nineteenth-Century Atlantic Economy*, Achorn Graphic Services
- 11) Kumar Chanchal, Lughthuiyang Riamei and Sanju Gupta (2017). *Understanding Global Politics*, New Delhi: KW Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- 12) Kurian, V Mathew (2007). "Alternatives to Globalisation: A Search" in *Mainstream*, Vol XLV, No 35, Saturday 18 August 2007, <https://www.mainstreamweekly.net/article287.html>
- 13) Leslie Sklair, 2008. *The Emancipatory Potential of Generic Globalisation*, The Berkeley Electronic Press Available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a918201775&db=all> [Accessed 23 October 2018]
- 14) McGrew, Anthony (2008). 'Globalisation and Global Politics' in John Baylis, et.al., *The Globalisation of World Politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 15) McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg galaxy; the making of typographic man*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- 16) Midgley, James (2007). 'Perspectives on Globalisation, Social Justice and Welfare' in *The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, Vol.34, Issue 2 June-Special issue on Globalisation, Social Justice & Social Welfare. - <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3247&context=jssw>

- 17) Mittelman, James (2006). *Globalisation and Its Critics*, in: *Stubs, Richard and Geoffrey Underhill, Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 18) Miyoshi, Masao and Harry D. Harootunian (1989). *Postmodernism in Japan*, Duke University Press.
- 19) Ohmae, Kenichi (1995). *The End of the Nation-State: The Rise of Regional Economies*, New York: Simon and Schuster Inc.
- 20) Pinto, Jim (2004). *Think Globally, Act Locally*, Automation World.
- 21) Polanayi, Karl (1957). *The Great Transformation*, New York: Becon.
- 22) Reich, Robert (1992). *The Work of Nations: preparing ourselves for 21st-century capitalism*. Vintage Books
- 23) Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalisation: Social theory and global culture*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- 24) Robertson, Roland (1992). *Globalisation, Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage.
- 25) Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalisation: A critical introduction*, New York: Palgrave.
- 26) Scholte, Jan Aart (2005). *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*. London: Palgrave.
- 27) Stefanovic, Zoran (2008). *Globalisation: Theoretical Perspectives, Impacts and Institutional Response of the Economy*, <http://facta.junis.ni.ac.rs/eao/eao200803/eao200803-09.pdf>, [Accessed on 30 September, 2018].
- 28) Stiglitz, J.E. (2008). Making Globalisation Work, in *The economic and social review*, Columbia University, USA, 39 (3).
- 29) Swyngedouw, Erik (2004). Globalisation or Glocalisation? Networks, Territories and Rescaling, in *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17(1), pp. 25-44.
- 30) *The Alternative Globalisation*, <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/international-relations/the-alternative-globalisation.php>, [Accessed 23 September 2018].
- 31) Wallerstein, I. (1980). *The capitalist world economy*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 32) Wallerstein, Immanuel (2004). *World System Analysis: An Introduction*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- 33) Zurn, Michael (2005). *From Interdependence to Globalisation, Handbook of International Relations*, London: Sage publications.

---

## SUGGESTED READINGS

---

Acharya, Amitav, et.al. (eds.), (2006), *Studying Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Trends and Issues*. Singapore: Marshall Cavandish.

Acharya, Bhairav, (2016). "The Future of Asylum in India: Four Principles to Appraise Recent Legislative Proposals." in *NUJS Law Review*, 9.

Alkire, Sabina. (2003). *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*. (CRISE), working Paper 2, London, University of Oxford, 2003.

Anderson, Benedict (1991), *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.

Appadurai, A. (1996), *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Aron, Raymond, 1966. *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*, trans. Richard Howard and Annette Baker Fox, Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Baruah, S., ed. (2009). *Beyond Counter-Insurgency: Breaking the Impasse in Northeast India*.

Baylis, John, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, eds. (2001). *The Globalisation of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Beck, Ulrich. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.

Behr, Hartmut and Amelia Heath, 2009. "Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique: Morgenthau, Waltz, and Neo-Realism," *Review of International Studies*, 35(2): 327–349.

Behr, Hartmut, 2010. *A History of International Political Theory: Ontologies of the International*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beitz, Charles, 1997. *Political Theory and International Relations*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bell, Duncan (ed.), 2008. *Political Thought in International Relations: Variations on a Realist Theme*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhagwati, Jagdish. (2004). *In Defence of Globalisation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Blackmore, J. (2000), Globalisation, a useful concept for feminists rethinking theory and strategies in education, in *Globalisation and Education, Critical Perspectives*,(eds.) N.C. Burbules & C.A. Torres, London: Routledge.

Bolewski, Wilfried. (2007), *Diplomacy and International Law in Globalized Relationships*. Springer, Berlin.

Booth, Ken and Steve Smith (eds.), 1995. *International Relations Theory Today*, Cambridge: Polity.

Boucher, David, 1998. *Theories of International Relations: From Thucydides to the Present*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Brown, Chris, 2001. *Understanding International Relations*, 2nd edition, New York: Palgrave.
- Bull, Hedley, 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bull, Hedley, 1995. "The Theory of International Politics 1919–1969," in *International Theory: Critical Investigations*, J. Den Derian (ed.), London: MacMillan, 181–211.
- Butterfield, Herbert and Martin Wight (eds.), 1966. *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buzan, Barry (2004). *From International to World Society?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caballero-Anthony, Mely et.al, eds. (2017). *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Dilemmas in Securitization*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Cardoso, F. H. and Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carnoy, M. (1999), *Globalisation and Educational Reform: what players tried to know*, Paris: UNESCO.
- Carnoy, Martin (1999), *Sustainable Flexibility: Work, Family and Community in the Information Age*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Caroline Thomas. (2000). *Global Governance, Development & Human Security: The Challenges of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Pluto Press.
- Carr, E. H., 2001. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919–1939: An Introduction to Study International Relations*, New York: Palgrave.
- Castells, Manuel (1996), *The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture, Vol. I: The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cawkwell, George, 1997. *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War*, London: Routledge.
- Chima, J.S. (2010), *The Sikh Separatist Insurgency: Political Leadership and Ethnonationalist*
- Chin, Christine B. N. and James H. Mittelman (2000) "Conceptualizing Resistance to Globalisation," in Barry K. Gills (ed.), *Globalisation and the Politics of Resistance*, London and New York: Macmillan Press Ltd. and St. Martin's Press Inc.
- Cohen, Benjamin J. (2011). "Introduction" in Benjamin J. Cohen, ed., *International Political Economy*. New York: Routledge.
- Cox, R. W. (1981). "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 10, 1981.
- Cox, Robert W., 1986. *Neorealism and Its Critics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 204–254.
- D. Held (Ed.). *A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*. London. NY:

Routledge. The Open University.

Dadwal, Shebonti Ray and Uttam Kumar Sinha, ed. 2015. *Non-Traditional Security Challenges in Asia: Approaches and Responses*. Routledge.

Deng, N. (2005), On the national literature's tactics in the globalisation's language environment, *Journal of Human Institute of Humanities, Science and Technology*, 1, 39-41.

Der Derian, James (ed.), 1995. *International Theory: Critical Investigations*, London: Macmillan.

Destsch, Klaus Gunter and Bernhard Speyer, eds. (2001) *The World Trade Organization Millennium Round: Free Trade in the Twenty-first century*. New York: Routledge.

Doh, Jonathan P., and Hildy Teegen (2003). "Globalisation and NGOs: Transforming Business, Government and Society", *Journal of International Business Studies*, 2003, pp. 565-66).

Donnelly, Jack, 2000. *Realism and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dowlah, Caf, ed. (2004). *Backwaters of Global Prosperity: How Forces of Globalisation and GATT/WTO Trade Regimes Contribute to the Marginalization of the World's Poorest Nations*. Westport: Praeger.

Doyle, Michael W., 1997. *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*, New York: Norton.

Dunning John H. and S. M. Lundan. 2008. *Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Elliott, Lorraine. 2004. *The Global Politics of the Environment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Heywood, V.H, and k. Gardner, eds.1995. *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, Cambridge: UNEP and Cambridge University Press.

Emmerson, Donald, K. ed. 2009. *Hard Choices: Security, Democracy and Regionalism in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Utopia Press.

Foweraker, J. (1995). *Theorizing Social Movements*, London: Pluto Press.

Frank, A. G. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Frank, A. G. 1975. *On Capitalist Underdevelopment*, New York: Oxford University Review Press.

Friedman, J. (1994), *Culture Identity and Global Process*, London, UK: Sage.

Friedman, T. (1999). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.

Ganguly, Sumit, Manjeet Pardesi and Nicolas Blarel, eds. 2017. *The Oxford Handbook to India's National Security*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Ganguly, Sumit. 2016. *Deadly Impasse: Indo-Pakistan Relations at the Dawn of a New Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Geertz, Clifford (1973), Religion as a Cultural System, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.
- Gibson, J., and D. McKenzie, *Australia's Pacific Seasonal Worker Pilot Scheme: Development Impacts in the First Two Years*, New Zealand: University of Waikato, 2011.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1999). *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Reshaping our Lives*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Gill, Stephen (2000). Towards a Postmodern Prince? The Battle of Seattle as a Moment in the New Politics of Globalisation, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 29.1: 131-140.
- Gills, Barry K. (2000) (ed). *Globalisation and the Politics of Resistance*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Gilpin, Robert. (1987). *The Political Economy of International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gilpin, Robert. (2001). *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gilpin, Robert. 2003. *The Challenge of Global Capitalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Göksel, Nilüfer Karacasulu. (2012), "Globalisation and the State" <http://sam.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/1.-NiluferKaracasuluGoksel.pdf>.
- Gordon, Suzanne E. (2008), "Changing Concepts of Sovereignty and Jurisdiction in the Global Economy: Is there a Territorial Connection?" *York University*. <http://ccges.apps01.yorku.ca/wp/wp-content/uploads/2008/12/gordon-changing-concepts-of-sovereignty-and-jurisdiction-in-the-global-economy-is-there-a-territorial-connection.pdf>.
- Gray, John. (1995). *Liberalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Greig, J. Michael (2002), The End of Geography?: Globalisation, Communications, and Culture in the International System, *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 46, No. 2, April, 225-243.
- Gustafson, Lowell S. (ed.), 2000. *Thucydides' Theory of International Relations*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Guzzini, Stefano, 1998. *Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy: The Continuing Story of a Death Foretold*, London: Routledge.
- Harbour, Frances V., 1999. *Thinking About International Ethics*, Boulder: Westview.
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2000). *Empire*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2004). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, New York: The Penguin Press.
- Hayes, Richard D., Christopher M. Korth, Manucher Roudiani. 1972. *International Business: An Introduction to the World of the Multinational Firm*. New Jersey: Englewood Press,

- Held, David & McGrew, Anthony. (2003). *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalisation Debate*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Herz, Thomas, 1951, *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study of Theories and Realities*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heywood, Andrew. (2007). *Politics*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heywood, Andrew. (2015), *Global Politics*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York
- Hirst, P. & Thompson G. (1999). *Globalisation in Question*. Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press.
- Hobbes, Thomas, 1994 (1660), *Leviathan*, Edwin Curley (ed.), Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. (1996). *The Age of Revolution 1789-1848*. New York: Vintage.
- Hoekman, Bernard and Michel Kostecki. (2001). *The Political Economy of the World Trading System: From GATT to WTO*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Hoffman, Stanley, 1981. *Duties Beyond Borders: On the Limits and Possibilities of Ethical International Politics*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Holton, Robert (2000), Globalisation's Cultural Consequences, *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 570, July, 140-152.
- Holum, John D. 1999. "The Proliferation of Weapons Of Mass Destruction: Challenges and Responses. U. S. Foreign Policy Agenda", *USIA Electronic Journals*, Volume 4, No. 2.
- Hopewell, Kristen. (2016). *Breaking the WTO: How Emerging Powers Disrupted the Neo-liberal Project?*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Hudson, Alan. (1998), "Beyond the Borders: Globalisation, Sovereignty and Extra-Territoriality", *Geopolitics*. Vol. 3, No. 1.
- Huntington, Samuel (1996), *Clash of Civilizations*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- India's Position on Legal Status of Refugees, Introduction, 2010, available at:[http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/128419/12/09\\_chapter%201.pdf](http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/128419/12/09_chapter%201.pdf)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM), World Migration Report, 2018, available at:[https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr\\_2018\\_en.pdf](https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr_2018_en.pdf)
- International Organization for Migration (IOM), World Migration Report, 2011, available at:[https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr2011\\_english.pdf](https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/wmr2011_english.pdf)
- IOM's Strategy to Enable, Engage and Empower Diaspora, IOM, Geneva, 2017, available at:<https://diaspora.iom.int/ioms-strategy-enable-engage-and-empower-diaspora>.
- Ipsos MORI, *Perceptions are Not Reality: What the World Gets Wrong*, December, 2016, available at:[www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/perceptions-are-not-reality-what-world-gets-wrong?language\\_content\\_entity=en-uk](http://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/perceptions-are-not-reality-what-world-gets-wrong?language_content_entity=en-uk).
- Jackson, Robert and Georg Sørensen, 2003. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kaldor, Mary (2000). 'Civilising Globalisation: The Implications of the Battle of Seattle'. *Millennium: A Journal of International Studies*, 29/4: 105–14.
- Kean, J. (2003). *Global Civil Society?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennan, George F., 1951. *Realities of American Foreign Policy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph Nye, 1977. *Power and Independence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Keohane, Robert O., 1989. *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory*, Boulder: Westview.
- Khagram, Sanjeev, James Riker, and Kathryn Sikkink (2002). "From Santiago to Seattle": Transnational advocacy groups restructuring world politics. In *Restructuring world politics, transnational social movements, networks, and norms*, eds. S. Khagram, J. Riker and K. Sikkink. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Khor, Martin. 2001. "Globalisation and Sustainable Development: The Choices Before Rio+10", *International Review for Environmental Strategies*, vol.2, no.2.
- King, Garry, and Christopher Murray., *Rethinking Human Security*, Political Science Quarterly, vol. 116, no.4
- Korab-Karpowicz, W. Julian, 2012. *On History of Political Philosophy: Great Political Thinkers from Thucydides to Locke*, New York: Routledge.
- Korab-Karpowicz, W. Julian, 2017. *Tractatus Politico-Philosophicus: New Directions for the Development of Humankind*, New York: Routledge.
- Koser, K., Dimensions and dynamics of irregular migration, *Population, Space and Place*, 16, 3, 2010.
- Kumar Chanchal, Lughthuiyang Riamei and Sanju Gupta (2017). *Understanding Global Politics*, New Delhi: KW Publishers Pvt Ltd.
- Kurian, V Mathew (2007). "Alternatives to Globalisation: A Search" in *Mainstream*, Vol XLV, No 35, Saturday 18 August 2007 ,
- Lebow, Richard Ned, 2003. *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Linklater, Andrew, 1990. *Beyond Realism and Marxism: Critical Theory and International Relations*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, 1515. *The Prince*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1985.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, 1531. *The Discourses*, 2 vols., trans. Leslie J. Walker, London: Routledge, 1975.
- Macintyre, Anthony G., George W. Christopher, Edward Eitzen, Jr., et.al. 2000. *Weapons of Mass Destruction Events With Contaminated Casualties Effective Planning for Health Care Facilities*, JAMA, January 12.
- Mahbub-ul-Haq. 1999. *Reflections on Human Development*, London: Oxford University Press.

- Mansfield, Harvey C. Jr., 1979. *Machiavelli's New Modes and Orders: A Study of the Discourses on Livy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mansfield, Harvey C. Jr., 1996. *Machiavelli's Virtue*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Maxwell, Mary, 1990. *Morality among Nations: An Evolutionary View*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mearsheimer, John J., 1990. "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War," *International Security*, 19: 5–49.
- Mearsheimer, John J., 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: Norton.
- Meinecke, Friedrich, 1998. *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'État in Modern History*, trans. Douglas Scott. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Migration Advisory Committee, (2014), *Migrants in Low-Skilled Work: The Growth of EU and Non-EU Labour in Low-Skilled Jobs and its Impact on the UK*, London.
- Modelski, George. 1979. "Transnational Corporations and the World Order in George Modelski, ed. *Transnational Corporations and World Order*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Molloy, Seán, 2003. "Realism: a problematic paradigm," *Security Dialogue*, 34(1): 71–85.
- Molloy, Seán, 2006. *The Hidden History of Realism. A Genealogy of Power Politics*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., 1946. *Scientific Man Versus Power Politics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., 1951. *In Defense of the National Interest: A Critical Examination of American Foreign Policy*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., 1954. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 2nd ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Morgenthau, Hans J., 1970. *Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960–1970*, New York: Praeger.
- Nardin, Terry and David R. Mapel, 1992. *Traditions in International Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nau, Henry R. (2009). *Perspective on International Relations*, Washington DC: CQ Press.
- Nayyar, Deepak, ed. (2002) *Governing Globalisation: Issues and Institutions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold, 1932. *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study of Ethics and Politics*, New York: Charles Scriber's Sons.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold,, 1944. *The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness: A Vindication of Democracy and a Critique of Its Traditional Defense*, New York: Charles Scribner & Sons.

- Nye, Joseph S. and John D. Donahue, eds. (2000). *Governance in a Globalizing World*, Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.
- Oommen, G. Z., South Asia–Gulf migratory corridor: Emerging patterns, prospects and challenges. *Migration and Development*, 5, 3, 2015.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), The fiscal impact of immigration in OECD countries. In: *International Migration Outlook 2013*. OECD, Paris, 2013.
- Ozkan, Gokhan (2012). ‘Emergence of International Political Economy as a Sub-Discipline of International Relations and Impact of the Global Crisis on International Political Economy’, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 13; July. Pp. 198-204.
- Paul, Darel E. and Abla Amawi, eds. (2013). *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy: A Reader* New York: Oxford University Press
- Pednekar, Samiksha. ‘The impact of international institutions on the idea of sovereignty’. *Linkedin*. July 20, 2016. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/impact-international-institutions-idea-sovereignty-samiksha-pednekar>.
- Pieterse, Jan Naderveen (2015), *Globalisation and Culture: Global Mélange*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Pieterse, Jan. (1995), Globalisation as hybridization, in *Global modernities*, (ed.) Mike Featherstone, S. Lash, Ronald Robertson, London: Sage Publications.
- Pocock, J. G. A., 1975. *The Machiavellian Movement: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Political Tradition*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rao, MB and Manjula Guru. (2001). *WTO and International Trade*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Rao, P.K. (2000). *The World Trade Organization and the Environment*. New York: St Martin’s Press.
- Ringmar, Erik. (2017). “The Making of the Modern World”, in Stephen McGlinchey, ed. *International Relations*. Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing.
- Ritzer, George. (2010). *Globalisation: A Basic Text*. Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Robertson, Ronald (1992), *Globalisation: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Rosenau, James N. and Marry Durfee, 1995. *Thinking Theory Thoroughly: Coherent Approaches to an Incoherent World*, Boulder: Westview.
- Russell, Greg, 1990. *Hans J. Morgenthau and the Ethics of American Statecraft*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Ryan, Alan, (1993). “Liberalism”. Pp. 291-311 in Robert E. Good and Philip Petti eds. *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sachs, Wolfgang. 1999. *Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment and Development*, London: Zed Books

- Sagan, Scott D. 2009. "The Causes of Nuclear Weapon Proliferation", *Annual Review of Political Science*.
- Sampson, Gary P., ed. (2001). *The Role of the World Trade Organization in Global Governance*. New York: the UN University Press.
- Sarooshi, Dan. (2010) *International Organizations and their Exercise of Sovereign Powers*. Oxford, UK.
- Scheuerman, William, 2011. *The Realist Case for Global Reform*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Scheuerman, William. (2014). *Globalisation*. In Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. Retrieved from <http://www.bibme.org/citation-guide/apa/website/>
- Scholte, J.A. (2005). *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shultz, George P., William J. Perry, Henry A. Kissinger and Sam Nunn. 2007. "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons", *Wall Street Journal*, January.
- Sleat, Matt, 2013. *Liberal Realism: A Realist Theory of Liberal Politics*, Manchester: Manchester University Press. (Scholar)
- Smith, Steve, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski (eds.), 1996. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Somavia, Juan. 1999. *People's Security-Globlising Social Progress*. ILO.
- Speth, James Gustave. 2004. *Global Environmental Challenges, Transitions to a Sustainable World*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Srivastava, R., and A. Pandey., *Internal and International Migration in South Asia: Drivers, Interlinkage and Policy Issues*, 2017. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, New Delhi.
- Steger, Manfred B. (2017), *Globalisation: A very short Introduction*, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Strong, Maurice. 2001. *Where on Earth Are We Going*. New York: Texere.
- Thompson, Kenneth W., 1980. *Masters of International Thought*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Thompson, Kenneth W., 1985. *Moralism and Morality in Politics and Diplomacy*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Thorsen, Dag Einar and Amund Lie. 2009. *What is Neoliberalism?*. Working Paper. University of Oslo [www.folk.uio.no/daget/neoliberalism.pdf](http://www.folk.uio.no/daget/neoliberalism.pdf)
- Thucydides, 1993. *On Justice, Power, and Human Nature: The Essence of Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War*, Paul Woodruff (ed. and trans.), Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*, trans. Rex Warner, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.
- UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), *Global Trends: Forced Displacement in 2017*, Geneva, 2017.

- UNCTAD. 2007. *The Universe of the Largest Transnational Corporations*. New York: United Nations Publication. <http://unctad.org/en/Docs/iteia20072en.pdf>
- UNCTAD. 2013. “Global Value Chains: Investment and Trade for Development” in *World Investment Report 2013*. <http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2013en.pdf>
- UNCTAD. 2017. “Investment and the Digital Economy”, World Investment Report 2017, [http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2017\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2017_en.pdf)
- Van Hear, N., “Diasporas, recovery and development in conflict-ridden societies”, in *The Migration-Development-Nexus: A Transnational Perspective on Changing Paradigms and Organizations*, T. Faist, M. Fauser and P. Kivisto, eds., London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Vasquez, John A., 1998. *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vinod, M. J. & Deshpande, M. (2013). *Contemporary Political Theory*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Ltd.
- Walid, Abdulrahim. (n.d), ‘State Juisdiction’. *Private Site for Legal Research and Studies*. <https://sites.google.com/site/walidabdulrahim/home/my-studies-in-english/7-state-jurisdiction>.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1990), Culture as the ideological battleground of the modern world system, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7: 257-81.
- Waltz, Kenneth, 1979. *Theory of International Politics*, Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1999. “Globalisation and Governance” in *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 693-700.
- Walzenbach, Gunter. (2017). “Global Political Economy” in Stephen McGlinchey, ed. *International Relations*. Bristol: E-International Relations Publishing.
- Walzer, Michael, 1977. *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*, New York: Basic Books.
- Wang, Yi (2007), Globalisation Enhances Cultural Identity, *Intercultural Communication Studies*, XVI, 83-86.
- Weaver, Ole, 1996. “The Rise and the Fall of the Inter-Paradigm Debate,” in *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Steven Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 149–185.
- Wendt, Alexander, 1987, 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wendt, Alexander, 1987. “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics,” *International Organization*, 46: 391–425.
- Wight, Martin, 1991. *International Theory: Three Traditions*, Leicester: University of Leicester Press.
- Wilkins, Mira. 1991. “European and North American Multinationals, 1870-1914: Comparison and Contrast”, in Mira Wilkins, ed., *The Growth of Multinationals*, Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Wilkins, Mira. 1991. "Modern European Economic History and the Multinationals", *ibid.*
- Wilkins, Mira. 2005. "Multinational Enterprise to 1930: Discontinuities and Continuities", in Alfred D. Chandler Jr and Bruce Mazlish eds. *Leviathans: Multinational Corporations and the New Global History*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkinson, Rorden (2006). *The WTO: Crisis and the Governance of Global Trade*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge
- Williams, Bernard, 1985. *Ethics and the Limit of Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Bernard, 2005. "Realism and Moralism in Political Theory," in *In the Beginning was the Deed: Realism and Moralism in Political Argument*, ed. G. Hawthorn, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1–17.
- Williams, Mary Frances, 1998. *Ethics in Thucydides: The Ancient Simplicity*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Williams, Michael C., 2005. *The Realist Tradition and the Limit of International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Michael C., 2007. *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Raymond (1976), *Keywords*, London: Flamingo.
- Wohlforth, William C., 2008. "Realism," *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wohlforth, William C., 2011. "Gilpinian Realism and International Relations," *International Relations*, 25(4): 499–511.
- World Bank (2018) "Organization", <http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/leadership>
- World Bank, *Migration and Development, A Role for the World Bank Group*, Washington, D.C., 2016.