

Chapter 1 : Frontline: In-depth analysis of issues and events in India and around the world

Globalization has polarised the community. Economic commentators and political leaders extol its virtues, yet many people see it as a source of insecurity and instability.

Share via Email We will look back on the banking crisis of September as a defining moment for economic globalisation. It may have started in the US mortgage market and on Wall Street, but through an integrated global economy it has become an international problem. Whatever our response, we should be guided by two principles. First, we should not jettison our commitment to globalisation. Second, a global economy needs global governance. Globalisation works by widening economic networks. It multiplies the sizes of markets, increases the economies of scale that push down prices, and allows countries to tap into sources of productive investment from around the world. Those networks have created a global economic engine that is the biggest eliminator of poverty and creator of opportunity the world has ever seen. But globalisation transmits risk and volatility as well as benefits. Sustaining the huge benefits of economic globalisation relies on preserving these fundamental networks of interdependence, not rolling them back. Changes to financial regulatory frameworks must tackle excessive risk while defending open trade and foreign investment as vital to development. Beyond ending the liquidity crisis, our first response should be to fix the source of the shock. We need to inject confidence by regulating to control excessive risk-taking and heavy leveraging, and to improve the way ratings agencies work. The European commission is right to now come forward with new European rules on these questions. Certain financial products have become so complex that they are not understood by the very institutions that buy and trade them. This is a regulatory and professional failure of the first order. Politicians need to recognise that national solutions are only half the solution. For years, financial markets have been global more than national, yet they operate with limited multilateral coordination or governance. Asset bubbles in one market can have serious consequences in another. The effects of monetary or currency policy are easily exported. Yet the machinery of global economic governance barely exists. Mechanisms for cross-border cooperation in Europe exist but they are incomplete. The rescue package for Dutch financial group Fortis showed European governments can act quickly to limit damage. But the Benelux states that stepped in to help the group have close ties and habits of cooperation. Guarantees for Irish banks have proved more politically complex. The general mechanisms of European coordination must be strengthened so governments and regulators act effectively to address the fact that many financial institutions operate across borders. Internationally, the problem is even more acute. There is no institution with a mandate or real capacity to assess systemic risk in financial markets. There is no institution empowered to speak from the perspective of global economic interdependence and to counsel states on the global picture. Coordination mechanisms among central bankers and regulators exist, but they are weak. They are also skewed towards an economic order that is increasingly outdated. The large emerging economies - especially China - are growing sources of capital and economic demand. They are tightly knit into the global economy. Bodies like the G8 simply do not reflect this changing economic architecture. Effective multilateral governance of the global economy will require institutions that do. It is 64 years since the Bretton Woods conference put in place the basic machinery of modern global economic coordination. It is time for a Bretton Woods for this century. It has always been a mistake to believe that globalisation was putting governments out of business. States and effective governance are what makes globalisation possible: We have been reminded over the past two weeks that the state underpins the market as lender of last resort. But it has a legitimate claim to a wider role. Its role is to ensure that the conduct of individuals or businesses does not put at risk the stability of the system or the foundations of our economies. We have nothing to gain by shutting down financial globalisation. But the networks that make up globalisation will keep transmitting the shocks along with the benefits unless we take a tougher line with excessive risk, and strengthen the multilateral instruments that govern the global financial system.

Chapter 2 : Popular Globalization Books

In Defense of Globalization is an important contribution to an often incoherent debate. As we expect of Mr. Bhagwati, it is cogently argued and well written. As we expect of Mr. Bhagwati, it is.

For globalisation of compassion Print edition: Faruqui Kailash Satyarthi, Nobel Peace laureate, talks about his work, his mission and the award. Satyarthi, a Gandhian who won the prize for his contributions to the global child rights campaign, was himself surprised when a newspaper reporter called him for a comment. He had no idea that the prize was being announced on that day and thought that the journalist was asking him to make an observation on the winner, whoever that was. He says he was calm and did not display great excitement, much to their amazement. His name had been in the reckoning for the prize for some years, so the prize was not a complete surprise. The Nobel Committee deemed it important to award a Hindu and a Muslim, especially an Indian and a Pakistani, in a common struggle for education and against extremism. There are million child labourers in , the figure was 78 million more around the world today, according to the committee. The BBA says it had rescued more than 82, victims of trafficking, slavery and child labour by But Satyarthi says that these big numbers do not count; the smile that lights up the face of each rescued child is more precious to him. Two of his colleagues were murdered, and he himself was attacked while undertaking independent rescue operations in remote areas of India. The organisation has often taken a confrontational approach, going into quarries and rescuing children with or without the help of the police. The award has already begun to bring the issues he works on into the limelight, says Satyarthi. More front-page stories on the issue appeared within hours of his winning the award than had appeared in the past years, he says. To him, the award is welcome but what drives him is an applied spirituality that begins with and may end with children. He thanks those who have given him an award and gives more thanks to those who have not given him any. His concerns remain pedestrian. Excerpts from an interview he gave Frontline: On winning the award: So it is for the first time that their plight, struggle and the issues concerning them are being recognised at the highest level in one way. Some minutes ago, I was interviewed by a Colombian radio channel and he was asking more about India. But I said I also work in Colombia. I work in countries. Child labour is a global problem. I always believe that no problem on the earth is an isolated one. They are so interwoven that we cannot address the problem in isolation. So the solutions cannot also be found in isolation. We have to work collectively. And that is something that is sometimes missing. Many of our traditions and mindsets are responsible for the perpetuation of child labour. It is a crime against humanity and against many of the constitutional provisions and law. And we have to deal with it as a crime. Trafficking is rampant globally and it is the third single largest illicit trade in the world. Millions of children are victims of slavery. In the holistic sense, it is violence, and children are the worst victims of all sorts of violence, especially girl children. So this prize will not only give visibility to the issue but a big boost to hundreds of thousands of ordinary workers like me globally. It has already given their morale a high. I know there are many people and organisations doing wonderful work, making bigger sacrifices than I and are more knowledgeable than I. They have to walk miles in search of trafficked girls, their parents, and so on. This prize goes to them all. We were together recently in the Netherlands along with her family. So this recognition for two South Asians and one from the other side is quite significant. I cannot read much politically, so I am not going to react politically on what Malala has said "that the two Prime Ministers should come together. These are diplomatic and political issues. But what I can and will do is work with people in both the countries. I have been visiting Pakistan for the past 25 years and have travelled to the remotest areas. When we organised the Global March in , we went across countries and Pakistan was one of them. I know the problems, the people and their love. I have been advocating that globalisation of the market and the economy looks fascinating but cannot be sustained without globalisation of compassion. Let us translate compassion into a social and political agenda. He was able to translate truth and non-violence into the freedom struggle. That was his beauty and innovation. I learnt this from him and my journey in all these years was how to translate human compassion into social action. Compassion and care for children is there, but we do it only for the sake of our own children. We are materialistic for our children and grandchildren. We have

to break that. We have to use our compassion for bigger and better causes. He was very open in the way he talked and listened on the issues and we shared the view that we have to make India a child-friendly, proud, prosperous and clean country. If the Prime Minister of the country is excited about my work, then what else do I need? Let us see how the officers and the bureaucracy react, but I could see that excitement at the top. The biggest problem is the mindsets of people in all these places. There is a need for geopolitical will. Governments globally should make more budgetary allocations and that has been my fight for so many years. Developing countries must fulfil their promises towards children and the developed countries must put more money for the education of children. So the world has been able to produce more guns, weapons and bullets than books and toys that are needed for children. So, we have to introspect as to what is needed in the world. Do we need what people call defence because for me it is basically an offence – if you are going to use bullets and bombs, who is going to be defended? We must give good-quality and free education to children globally. I am not talking of just one country here. Swami Agnivesh and I worked together on bonded labour. We started together in and I have big respect for him. All of us have flaws and difficulties, he may have some or I may have some, but I have big respect for him. For anyone and everyone with whom I have worked in my life, I am thankful to all of them.

Chapter 3 : Forging a New Frontline in the War Against Neoliberalism

Get this from a library! In defence of globalisation. [Keith Suter] -- "Globalisation has polarised the community, bringing protesters into the streets and generating new political movements.

By the dictatorship of the proletariat was an actuality – not just in Russia but in Bavaria and Hungary. Like Bernstein, Giddens argued that the structure of capitalism had changed, creating conditions that made the old programme of state-led socialism permanently impossible. Unlike Bernstein, Giddens never claimed capitalism had become permanently stable; instead it had become permanently mercurial in a way that was potentially benign, so long as progressive governments could take control. The task of social-democrats was to help working class people survive amid the permanent insecurity and disempowerment that globalisation had unleashed. Instead of a programme to clear the capitalist jungle, social-democracy would become a kind of survival kit. The general crisis of social democracy is happening because the world Giddens described has vanished. The world of Trump, Putin, Erdogan and Xi Jinping is as different to the world of Blair and Schroeder as the street fights of Weimar were to the peaceful, electoral socialism of the 1970s. Twice, then, in the space of a century, social democracy has entered crisis because its strategic project came to be based on conditions that ceased to exist. If we survey the remnants of centrist social democracy and social liberalism – Renzi in Italy, Schulz in Germany, Hillary Clinton in the USA and the Progress wing of the British Labour Party – the image that springs to mind is of shipwreck survivors clinging to pieces of wreckage. Schulz clings to Merkel, Renzi wanted to cling to Berlusconi, but they both lost so many votes it became pointless. Hillary Clinton clings to Wall Street. All of them are clinging to a form of globalisation that has failed; and for the Europeans it has become obligatory to cling to the Europe of the Lisbon Treaty – even as this, too, is failing. To renew social democracy we have to do what Bernstein and Giddens were trying to do: Both argued from premises concerning the future dynamics of capitalism, the role of the state in the economy, and the atomisation of class structures, cultures and alliances that had prevailed in the decades before them. Significantly, both were critically engaged with, and borrowed eclectically from, the Marxist method of historical materialism – a method of no concern to the party apparatchiks who used their theories as adornments for the project of managing capitalism. Starting from a material analysis of the world – rather than a list of policies, tactics and principles – is a tradition that got lost inside European social democracy during the neoliberal era. If neoliberalism is broken, what exactly is the central mechanism that has failed? It cannot be that the collapse of a mere banking system has turned large parts of the population of the West against universal rights and cosmopolitan social arrangements. Goldsmiths University economist William Davies offers two definitions of neoliberalism which explain why the world Giddens described – and fairly accurately – has disappeared. Davies points out that neoliberalism, over time, became less about the creation of exchange-based relationships and more about the imposition of competitive behaviour in areas where no market could exist. School league tables and global university rankings are just two examples of this – a third being the fake tendering process which has seen billions in public service contracts handed to firms like Carillion and Interserve. For Davies, it is economic calculation – not markets per se – that is being coercively forced into all aspects of life under the neoliberal system. That leads to his second, pithier, definition of neoliberalism: Neoliberalism failed because it was not a solution to the problems of the Keynesian system but, in fact, a work-around. What caused the ruin of both models was their inability to sustain both productivity and corporate profitability. Between stagnation and growth was driven by unsustainable financial expansion, by fiscal deficits, by the rapid catch-up of Asia and Latin America, and by the expansion of the working population. In a global system reliant on financial fiction exploded. Rising inequality boosted by the surge in asset values triggered by quantitative easing. Entire sectors dominated by rent-seeking monopolies. A global financial elite clustered around the defence of its strategic privilege – which is to keep its wealth in offshore jurisdictions and unavailable to the tax collectors of nation states, and therefore immune to redistribution. A global market that has begun to fragment along regional and national lines; the stalling of trade liberalisation treaties; the Balkanisation of finance systems and the information economy; and the

beginnings of an open trade war. There are typically three kinds of response to this situation among national political elites. The first is to try to maintain the status quo, resulting in the continued rise of inequality, continued impoverishment of workers and the lower middle class. Liberal democracy gets in the way of the real democracy – which is the will of the white, Catholic Polish people, untrammelled by such things as an independent media, judiciary and multilateral obligations. That is the message of Law and Justice. None of these responses can remedy the breakdown of neoliberalism strategically. The basic problem with the Macron strategy – carry on regardless with a globalised free market – is that it cannot be done by standing still: You have to renew TTIP; you have to do more privatisations; you have to go expanding the EU to the East, pulling in yet more xenophobic and corrupt national elites. To renew social democracy, we need to stop clinging to the wreckage. Even though it was mainly window dressing for Blair and Clinton, the Third Way was a serious and coherent theory. Some of its premises survive even though, as a practical project, it is dying. While the neoliberal right would have us stab each other in the back, people with a stiletto between their shoulder-blades will still need a hospital to go to. Unequal opportunities to do so – as we are today seeing with the MeToo movement – could, he said, be a much stronger driver of protest and radicalism than pure economic inequality. Fourth, recognising that globalization would weaken the formal democracy of states, Giddens called for a democracy of self-help groups and social movements. These, it was understood, should forget trying to bend the state to their wishes – it was irrevocably under the control of corporations and destined to shrink – but they could achieve stuff for themselves, empower themselves, and boost their own emotional literacy in the process. Fifth, the left must be prepared to rip up the welfare state. The welfare state, said Giddens, was sexist, bureaucratic, impersonal and never fully eradicated poverty anyway. Finally and perceptively, Giddens warned that a neoliberal global order would lead to violence, and that the left needed to find ways to mitigate that. What strikes me today about this political framework, on which Third Way social democracy was built, is its absolutism. The state would wither, the market would triumph, the welfare state would have to be abandoned, class solidarity would collapse, and individual lifestyle politics would dictate everything. This was the assumption. But nearly 25 years after its publication all of the things that were considered already gone are still here, even in a society like Britain which became under Major, Blair and Cameron a laboratory of social atomisation. Like Bernstein, he created a formula for coping with capitalist stability that failed to survive the return of instability. In the hands of Blair, Clinton and Schroeder these assumptions became an excuse for venal collaboration with the interests of corporations against those of the very people who voted for social democracy. The most important fact about the new reality is that, since , states, regions and communities have begun to attempt to exit the system. What was deemed impossible has become the dominant trend: Whether it be the globalisation of workforces through migration, or the privatisation of the public realm in the name of trade liberalisation, or the impoverishment of industrial communities through offshoring. Interestingly, the very forces Blairism assumed were spent – community, trade unionism, working class identity and of course language and ethnicity – have been factors driving this rush for the exit, both to the left and right. As to what is driving the desire for exit, it is primarily insecurity. All over the world, state welfare provision has been ripped up, but not replaced by any new forms of solidarity as Giddens advocated. Ludicrous as it may sound to the paid-up technocrats who still believe in neoliberalism, it is a rational desire when change brings only stress, impoverishment and anxiety – and in this case perceived competition for a limited welfare and social budget. Practically, far from empowering those from whom the safety net was removed, neoliberal policy during the crisis became increasingly focused on coercing them, as with the scandalous disability assessments by the DWP in the UK or in the mass incarceration programmes of black people in America which boomed under both Clinton and Obama. In subsequent contributions I will try to spell out the details. Here, however, it important to state the broad conclusions if you accept the idea that neoliberalism is over. First, the rise of authoritarian nationalist projects among some western elites is both logical and inevitable, given their histories. It is not that the globalism of the elites during neoliberalism was fake – only that, in the entire history of industrial capitalism there have been only two modes of regulation: Most elite groups in the world have intellectual traditions that can accommodate both, and some are prepared to reach into the dark basement of those traditions to revive the nationalist

ideologies that suited their grandparents. What sections of the elites and intelligentsias of Poland, Hungary, Italy and Austria are doing now is no mystery. Second, the rise of authoritarian populism and xenophobic narratives among the populations of many western democracies is “ as I argued in the first essay “ the result of the breakdown of a coherent narrative and of intense perceptions of insecurity. The strategy of keeping the economy on life support does not keep the ideology that underpinned neoliberalism on life support. The reward for all the backstabbing, atomisation and conformity to market individualism was supposed to be prosperity. Once that disappeared, the story became incoherent. It follows from this that social democracy “ and the wider progressive movements it must ally with “ needs to construct very quickly a new narrative about how the world gets better for you, your children, your community. People want to know how life becomes less insecure, and how change becomes more predictable and manageable. Unless the left answers that question, the xenophobic right will do so. Third, logically the new project of social democracy must be framed around a radical break with neoliberalism. What is destroying our movement is that a whole generation of social democratic leaders have tied their personal prestige and identity to an economic model that no longer works. Schulz wanted to keep Merkel in charge forever; Renzi in Italy would rather see Berlusconi in power than admit the grievances that are driving people towards the Northern League and the Five Star Movement were real. To salvage what is salvageable from the global system we must prevent its implosion: Here the analogy with trench warfare holds good. If the front trench is overrun, the last person standing in it is going to get bayoneted. Better to retreat to the next trench and defend that. This has informed my approach to Brexit. The substantive issue was always going to be: Because people were told freedom of movement was non-negotiable inside the EU, they voted to leave it. Given that, it is neither possible nor desirable to use intrigue and elite chicanery to override the votes of 17 million people. What is possible is to persuade them to accept a limited “ and thus reversible “ semi-detachment from the EU in the form of a Norway style agreement, a customs union or something in-between. On top of that, Corbyn has “ correctly “ accepted the result of the Brexit referendum, refusing the invitation from the die-hard Blairite right to destroy his own party by labelling a third of Labour voters deluded xenophobes. The exact lesson they refuse to draw: Europe has to be redesigned to allow state aid, nationalisations, the equalisation of social safety nets and minimum wages “ removing the Maastricht criteria on debt and borrowing which mandate austerity. Until they can imagine themselves operating in the same way “ either collectively across an alliance of core EU countries or individually “ the European social democratic parties will go on destroying themselves for the sake of Lisbon and the Bundesbank. They should stop doing so. Orban, Kaczynski and the Blue-Black coalition in Austria will be beaten at the level of the national cultures, parliaments, intelligentsias and the national demos “ not through the authority of the European Commission and tongue-lashings by Guy Verhofstadt in the Brussels parliament welcome though these may be. Done intelligently, and without conceding to the rhetoric of the right, a limited reassertion of economic sovereignty is going to be key to the revival of left politics both in Europe and the USA. Indeed, if it had been done five years ago then, like a flu jab, it might have prevented the current sickness. Working out how to reform capitalism to meet the needs of those on stagnating wages and in precarious jobs becomes easier once you accept that the place that is going to be done is national parliaments and regional assemblies. They will still have to be constrained by multilateral agreements, but they will probably look more like the flexible deals that preceded the heyday of neoliberalism, not the inflexible ones that are currently falling apart. Customs unions, free trade areas, bilateral currency pegs, an exchange rate mechanism rather than a single currency for Europe, and a two-speed structure for the EU itself “ these might have to be the forms in which globalisation survives. For social democracy, internationalism “ which was rooted into its practice from the formation of the Second International in “ is a strong trench to fall back on as globalism evaporates.

Chapter 4 : In Defense of Global Capitalism - Wikipedia

Suter, Keith. In Defence Of Globalisation. Sydney, Australia: UNSW Press, Print. These citations may not conform precisely to your selected citation style. Please use this display as a guideline and modify as needed.

The quest for equal justice has sparked movements and empowered youth across the nation for decades. Reports of racism, discrimination, sexual harassment, disenfranchisement, and LGBTQ hate crimes continue to appear in our workplaces, schools, and neighborhoods. Today, Millennials continue to engage in equal justice policy and are committed to tackling the structural barriers and institutional inequities that prevent the full realization of equal opportunity and rights in the United States. Youth have long been on the frontlines in of the social justice movement, actively participating in redefining civil liberties, inspiring progressive politics, and mobilizing young people across the country in an effort to end social injustices. For Millennials to shape the future we will inherit, we must effectively voice our needs and priorities and assert ourselves in all conversations involving equal justice. Millennials must continue to focus on the policies that exclude some and marginalize others. For example, the landmark Civil Rights Act of and the Voting Right Act of once outlawed discriminatory practices and made great strides in America, but today these laws exclude millions of marginalized Americans through criminal history checks or other determinants. Readers and politicians will hear from Millennials motivated to solve the problems of yesterday and promote the progress of all people in the future. These proposals represent the urgency of restoring progressive values and principles that once aimed to confront unfair practices and standards in America, while focusing on future obstacles and trends. Marielle DeJong and Katherine Reilly, students from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, are challenging the communication between tribal and federal law enforcement and their practices in investigations in order to address the unprecedented rates of violent crimes and sexual assaults on Native American women. They outline policies necessary to effectively combat the assault on Native America women and restore justice on tribal lands for all victims. Emily Apple, a student at Hunter College, proposes a plan to bridge the poverty gap for vulnerable communities in New York City by making healthy food accessible to all. She insists that all New York residents should have an agricultural community garden within a one-mile radius of their homes where they can purchase low-cost fresh fruits and vegetables. She writes that all communities have the right to healthy, affordable food, and aims to eliminate disparities and inequities by encouraging large community garden programs to participate and the usage of EBT cards. Erik Lampmann, a student at the University of Richmond, exposes the tax inequities between same-sex couples and heterosexual couples. Lampmann is interested in encouraging employers to change their LBGTQ priorities to include the absorption of an added tax on transfer of health benefits among domestic partners while advocating for the repeal of the Defense of Marriage act DOMA. Although these are a just few of the many Millennial voices featured in the publication of 10 Ideas of Equal Justice, Millennial across the country continue to be deeply involved in developing social innovation to end discrimination. Students are addressing structural and institutionalized inequities, social norms, and unjust practices in our society in order to create equal opportunities and uphold basic human rights for all. The Roosevelt Institute brings together thousands of thinkers and doersâ€”from emerging leaders in every state to Nobel laureate economists. We reimagine the rules that guide our social and economic realities. Follow us on Twitter rooseveltinst and like us on Facebook.

Chapter 5 : Library Resource Finder: Location & Availability for: In defence of globalisation

The process of globalization is under attack from a rise in populism on the political left and right, resulting in new forms of protectionism, isolationism and nationalism in the Western world. The Western alliance is under fresh strain and a vision of a world order based on democratic values and.

In it and in this article, he analyses how the United States uses and intends to use its military might in the defence of capitalist globalisation, of which it is the principal beneficiary. The US Congress has made the following observation: To only mention the very recent period, the Administration has organised military operations without any mandate from the UN, for example the bombing of Iraq in December, with the United Kingdom. Or again, after the bomb attack on the embassy in Nairobi Kenya in August, Clinton ordered the bombing of Afghanistan and of a factory producing medicines in Khartoum Sudan on the grounds that this factory was making chemical weapons. A year later, to general indifference, the Administration recognised that it had been mistaken about this factory in Khartoum see the International Herald Tribune, 28 October. During the same very recent period, the United States got out of respecting international treaties, whether it had signed them or not. We can quote the decision of the US Congress not to ratify the convention that banned the use of anti-personnel mines, the Complete Test Ban Treaty, the decision to reinforce the National Missile Defence NMD programme, a programme which takes into account and brings up to date the Strategic Defence Initiative programme. The pursuit of this programme is in open violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missiles accord agreement of This treaty, which constitutes one of the major pillars of the system of control of nuclear weapons, forbids signatories to build systems of defence against strategic attack and strongly limits the development and the deployment of defensive missiles. All that has not been done without there being a framework of strategic theory. Quite on the contrary: The Commission on American national interests published a report in June 2. It included influential members of congress, renowned economists Paul Krugman and Condoleeza Rice, who has since been appointed National Security Adviser in George W Bushs administration. To establish a doctrine in the matter of military interventions which is adapted to the era of globalisation necessitates defining what American interests are, what are the stakes in terms of security. How can we define security? In the framework of capitalism, insecurity never means the insecurity that workers and their families suffer faced with the social plans of the enterprises and with the violence of unemployment. Internal security means nothing other than the protection of private property, and external security means the protection of the territory against a foreign invasion. The report insists on the fact that it is necessary to establish a hierarchy of American national interests, in distinguishing those which are vital, very important and less important or secondary. Indeed it underlines that it is necessary to finish with the illusion that the United States, because it is the only super-power, can intervene everywhere in the world. Thus, conscious of the controversies that that can lead to, the Commission nevertheless declares that the prevention of genocides such as that in Rwanda in should not constitute a vital objective for the United States. This is not only a declaration for the future, but a justification of what has happened: It of course listed the actual military threats, nuclear, chemical and bacteriological, against the United States and its forces stationed in the world. It continued by stating that because it is the biggest economy in the world and because it is the main beneficiary of it, the defence of globalisation must figure among the vital interests of the United States, those in defence of which American forces should intervene in priority. This is what Thomas Friedman. In other reports, top-ranking members of the American military machine explain that the globalisation of many systems resources, energy, capital, technology, information and knowledge, but also the infrastructures that allow their diffusion, as well as the institutions that regulate them are more and more decisive for countries, and in the first place for the North Atlantic democracies sic. Globalisation is therefore radically modifying the traditional approaches to security. As a result, whereas for centuries a nations security meant the inviolability of its territory, it now means the viability the proper functioning of these global systems 4. All in all, these experts propose generalising, including to the protection of financial markets, the right of military intervention that the United States has always exercised whenever it considered that the protection of its energy networks oil was at

stake. That is also the programme that they have defined for NATO. The experts that we have just quoted are very clear. They are not paid to deal in ideology, to proclaim the good news of the neo-liberal Utopia, but to think about the defence of private property and the monopoly of wealth. They therefore have no difficulty in recognising the unequal and incomplete [character] of globalisation 5. Elsewhere, it is necessary to relieve the burden. This is particularly the case for Africa where the fiasco of the intervention in Sudan has left very bad memories. The African states are no longer colonies, but their independence is no obstacle for either the former colonising powers or for private capital in search of investments or financial investments. The existence of fragile state machines, which are either structured around the Army or more ramified between leading factions, more or less rivals but backed up by armed groups, is not a handicap for the former colonial powers. Placed under the control of international economic organisations, these countries guarantee to the companies which exploit their mining resources, and to creditor institutions which hold securities on these super-indebted states, the protection of their property and the respect of contracts. It is only because of this international recognition that the ruling classes of what some people call the quasi-states of Africa can maintain their political authority and their control over economic resources and take their share of the spoils along the way. Even the countries promoted to the status of regional powers by some analyses are undermined by internal conflicts. The formal independence of the former colonies exempts the dominant countries from the costs of running them which fell to the colonisers, without them losing their profits. It exempts the governments of the developed capitalist countries from taking responsibility for the expenditure necessary for the reproduction and the maintenance of life, for the education of young people. As for the multinational groups, their only aim is to take advantage of the natural resources, and the creditors are exclusively preoccupied by the maintenance of a regular flow of payments of the debt. If we consider globalisation as a whole, functioning on a world scale, the mode of reproduction of capital has now only very selective demands in relation to Africa. For the developed countries, faced with slow economic growth, and which are recording new gains in productivity based on the extension of new production technologies which contribute to the maintenance of high levels of unemployment in their own countries, Africa no longer even offers the attraction of a source of cheap labour. In this framework, the sovereignty of African states and the legitimacy conferred on governments under the domination of foreign capital allow capital to take full advantage of the advantages offered by these countries without having to be responsible for either the economic costs or the social inconveniences. The genocide organised in Rwanda, of which the American and European governments were perfectly well informed, has in no way prevented the pursuit of the mining and oil-producing activities of the multinational groups. The social scourges, above all the food shortages, the famines and the epidemics of which AIDS is only the most recent and most exacerbated version which are exterminating populations are not the product of internal causes. In the framework of the movement of de-colonisation, these scourges could be the reflection of the bad start which was well underlined by Rene Dumont at the beginning of the s. Four decades later, we have to consider that they have become an irreversible component in the framework of present economic and social relations. This population is now too numerous. Claude Meillassoux observes that the control of the demography of the exploited peoples by demographic means birth control, sterilisation, etc. A form of control by hunger, disease and death, more effective and more cruel, is being established under the pretext of economic rationality and structural adjustment: The law of Malthus, writes Meillassoux, is that the working population must be permanently kept on the verge of starvation in order to avoid an excessive demographic growth 6. The new wars serve also the tragic function of enabling Malthus law to be applied. Because in spite of its status, there is no question of American troops starting to intervene everywhere in the world to manage the problems linked to the respect of the rights of property. First of all because the objective of zero deaths remains for the moment the priority, and then because the threats are more and more diffuse and many-sided. It is therefore incumbent on the United States, while continuing to prevent the emergence of peer competitors, to determine the order of priority of its strategic and tactical objectives. It is furthermore in the framework of this debate that some of those responsible for American policy are proposing to dump on the European armies the management of a certain number of conflicts not only in Europe but also in Africa. Now, the ambitions of the big European countries, especially France and Britain, to continue to play a world role

thanks to their military power are entirely compatible with the doctrine of the United States, and thus of NATO. The European governments have the same vision of the stakes and the risks posed by the economic and geopolitical transformations of the s. The system of European defence which is in the process of emerging is clearly conceived of as a component of the transatlantic alliance. Some months afterwards, the creation of a rapid reaction force was decided on at the Nice summit December The constitution of a European defence will furthermore push the European countries to increase their defence budget, as is already the case with a majority of the NATO countries. The subordination of the European defence system to NATO is accompanied by a growing transatlantic integration on the economic level. Integration has been strengthened since the crisis of that broke out in South-East Asia, before spreading to Russia then Latin America. The economic crisis widened a little more the gap between the economic situation of the United States and Europe on the one hand, and on the other hand the immense majority of countries, including the emerging countries. Transatlantic integration, dominated by the United States, is reflected in the multiplication of financial and commercial links between big American and European multinational groups 7 , in the adoption of the same rules of enterprise management, entirely oriented towards the demands of the shareholders corporate governance , as well as in the convergence between the macro-economic policies conducted on both sides of the Atlantic. It does not suppress inter-imperialist rivalries, but it circumscribes them within the framework of fundamentally common interests and of the domination of they United States, which no European state can challenge. Transatlantic integration is still more marked in the armaments industry. The level of the American military budget, the technological advance largely demonstrated during the wars conducted against Iraq and Serbia, together with the necessity to harmonise national military equipment with the operational requirements of NATO are going to lead on the industrial level to an increase in the programmes of research and development and in the production of transatlantic arms, of which the American groups will by definition assume the leadership. The leaders of the United States also wish Japan to be much more involved in the defence structures that the Pentagon has established in South-East Asia. Robert Zoellick, some months before being appointed representative for Trade in the Administration of George W Bush, was conscious that what was involved was a historic change. In the language of American strategists, the notion of failed state appeared officially in to designate the decomposition of states under the effect of civil or infra-state wars. Because the discourse on happy globalisation and the economic and social convergence between nations as a result of globalisation only commits those who believe in it. The American administration and its strategists are perfectly well aware of the damage caused by really existing globalisation as we used to speak of really existing socialism. The writings of experts in strategy and international relations are overflowing with dark scenarios where the disintegration of states combined with globalisation will lead to terrible social consequences. Thats what the top-ranking members of the American military establishment quoted above call the unequal and incomplete [character] of globalisation. For the American leaders, globalisation carries heavy threats to their security. Among the main dangers that this unequal and incomplete globalisation provokes, we find the constitution of immense megapoles. It is true that the population influx towards the cities presents different traits from that caused by the massive rural exodus that took place in the countries of Europe in the 19th century. Even if the conditions of existence of the peasants and artisans driven from their villages were tragic, this exodus was concomitant with industrialisation and the expansion of capitalism ended up by absorbing these populations. The situation is entirely different today. The situation of the developing countries offers no perspective to the hundreds of millions of people who are coming to live in the cities. The number of cities with more than ten million inhabitants is constantly increasing. It is estimated that around , 45 per cent of the population of the developing countries will live in towns and cities. It is of course the dangers represented by cities situated near its territory and in countries where it has major economic interests that worry the United States. Mexico City 20 million inhabitants , Sao Paulo 26 million inhabitants , Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro each more than 10 million inhabitants represent risks against which it is necessary to prepare. But today, the danger that the American leaders can see is not that of the proletarianisation of masses of people, since the hope of salaried employment is irreparably closed to them. The danger is that people will be driven by despair to shake the fragile state machines that the United States has helped to establish, in particular on the American continent.

The American leaders are also perfectly aware that despair and extreme poverty are forcing people to engage in illicit activities. Brazil, Argentina, Chile and Venezuela, the Caribbean and Colombia are the countries cited in the report of the Commission on American national interests, but it is Mexico that is the object of sustained attention. The report doesn't mince its words. The report mentions the fear that in the case of economic collapse and political crisis, a massive flood of immigrants on its South-West frontier would come to threaten the United States. Vital interests in the sense defined above of an obligation to intervene militarily would then be involved. A researcher, adopting more or less the same analysis, points out that American investments in Mexico, a total of 50 billion dollars, would be threatened, as would the bilateral trade of billion dollars, which is for a large part oil exports. In a future [civil] war [in Mexico], millions of Americans who have a family in Mexico could take part, and provoke violence in the United States itself. What the Commission's report obviously doesn't say is that the economic policy imposed on Mexico by the United States bears the main responsibility for the social distress. In a well-documented book on the proceeds of crime Guilhem Fabre points out that the planet-wide expansion of the market economy, the dynamic of financialisation and the anonymity that is guaranteed to those who operate through the numerous off-shore financial centres, and the corruption of banks and politicians are closely connected. In this framework, the massive privatisation programmes that have been imposed on Mexico by the international institutions and the United States has provided a real Trojan horse for drug barons, alongside commercial transactions and property investments. We will see that it is in the name of the fight against the drug trade that the United States has launched the Plan Colombia which appears as the first stage of the implementation of the defence of its vital interests.

Chapter 6 : Peter Mandelson: In defence of globalisation | Opinion | The Guardian

In the passionate debate that currently rages over globalization, critics have been heard blaming it for a host of ills afflicting poorer nations, everything from child labor to environmental degradation and cultural homogenization.

Advanced Search Abstract This presidential address challenges IR scholars to reflect on their scholarly responsibility in what some have termed a new age of empire and in which critics of US foreign policy—academics and otherwise—are increasingly under attack. Using the metaphor of frontlines and sidelines, the question is raised as to whether we can or should engage directly in the policy world or remain at a critical distance from it. This essay focuses on some ways in which feminist scholarship is responding to these questions and challenges. Claiming that knowledge and practice cannot be separated, feminists argue that the foundations of modern knowledge, built during an earlier age of empire, are implicated, often unconsciously, in the ways in which scholars and policymakers construct and respond to global events today. The divisive gendered dimensions of the clash of civilizations and the gendered workings of the global economy and the way we analyze it are presented to illustrate this claim. The essay presents some feminist reformulations that could contribute to more inclusionary theory and practice. Senior Adviser to President George W. Definitions belong to the definers—not the defined Toni Morrison quoted in Eisenstein The role of the intellectual is to say truth to power, to address the central authority in every society without hypocrisy, and to choose the method, the style, the critique best suited for these purposes. This is so because the intellectual produces a kind of performance that continues for years, whose main goal is to give utterance not to mere fashion and passing fads but to real ideas and values Edward Said Empire has spawned a new wave of scholarship that, according to Ronald Steel Indeed, Steel claims that there is widespread acceptance of the idea that the United States is an empire, defined not in terms of formal acquisition of territory, as was the case with the earlier European empires, but in terms of economic and political control see also Hardt and Negri ; Harvey ; Ikenberry He traces this imperial legacy back to the early days of US history and argues that it became global after Nevertheless, the last 5 years mark a new stage in US global reach. Following the events of September 11, , the United States has been engaged in a global war against evil that has demanded a full-spectrum global response to any imminent threat. As many of us in the academy look from the sidelines at this new age of empire with which many of us feel a profound discomfort , we are also witnessing an erosion of academic freedom and a silencing of dissent on critical policy issues. She holds these dangerous politicized forms of knowledge accountable for everything from grade inflation to flawed tenure decisions. In a stinging indictment of the US academy, William Bennett In a recently published book, David Horowitz has compiled a list of the most dangerous professors, seven of whom are current or past members of the International Studies Association. Whatever sites we scholars of international relations occupy with respect to the diffusion of knowledge and exercise of power, we must all ask ourselves what we see as our role as responsible scholars, policy advisers, activists, and educators in these difficult times. With some notable exceptions, many frontline scholars in the United States, accustomed to the exercise of power in the policy world, find themselves sidelined by an apparent disregard for expert knowledge and a refusal to listen to dissenting opinions Featherman and Vinovskis Although this practice seems to have increased under the Bush Administration, the erosion of the influence of the academic social sciences dates back to the rise of conservatism in the s, which was accompanied by the rapid proliferation of generously funded conservative Washington-based think tanks. Suspicious of the liberal orientation of university scholars, these conservative think tanks have relied less on in-depth scholarly research and more on disseminating policy positions to sympathetic legislators Featherman and Vinovskis In the United States, it has been a topic of considerable debate since the influential heyday of the s and s when international relations scholars moved freely in and out of the frontlines of Washington policy circles, offering their expertise on matters ranging from nuclear strategy to development and counterinsurgency. In a barely veiled reference to his Harvard colleagues, most notably Henry Kissinger, Stanley Hoffmann But Morgenthau understood that disinterested knowledge was not possible. He strove to construct a rational theory of international politics—to create knowledge in the service

of power, in his case the power of the United States, his refuge from the irrationalities of fascist Europe. Problem-solving theory in the Coxian sense has dominated international relations scholarship in the United States. Morgenthau, Kissinger, and Hoffmann would all fit this definition; all were and still are in the case of Hoffmann on the frontlines of US academic international relations, and all were deeply involved in the practice of, or critical reflection on, the foreign policy of their adopted country. Yet, like so many postwar realists, each was an exile from his own land. For the rest of this address, I will leave the hallowed halls of power, academic or otherwise, that these scholars have occupied and pursue the metaphor of intellectual as exile in a rather different sense. Claiming that there is no such thing as disinterested objectivity, a position with which Morgenthau would probably agree, Edward Said, a prominent target of the conservative criticisms that I described earlier, saw the intellectual as an exile in his or her own society, as one who raises embarrassing questions, is unsettled, unsettles others, and stands on the side of the weak and unrepresented. Although the early US realists were reacting against the restrictions of totalitarian Europe, Said warned about less overt threats that exist in societies that reward intellectual conformity, a warning that seems apt in our present times. Although acknowledging the important contributions of international relations scholars who are pursuing knowledge that can be incrementally reformist in the Coxian sense both within the academy and the policy world, I want to turn my focus to those who are challenging intellectual conformity, often at considerable professional risk. These are scholars whom Cox Motivated by transforming the system rather than reforming it, they occupy more radical frontlines. By way of illustrating the concerns of those on these new frontlines, I shall draw on some feminist international relations scholarship, an approach still on the sidelines of the discipline. Seldom advisers to princes, international relations feminists are pushing and redefining the boundaries of knowledge in new ways. As scholars and activists, they are defending the importance of listening to new voices against the backlash generated by critics of multiculturalism such as those mentioned earlier. Feminists remained morally engaged at a time when, under the conservative attacks of the s and s, many social scientists were retreating from public life into more narrowly defined disciplines. Committed to interdisciplinary scholarship, many feminists see themselves as scholar-activists, and much of feminist scholarship is avowedly political. Feminists in all disciplines have been acutely aware of the relationship between knowledge and power and the ways that traditional knowledge has been constructed in the interests of the powerful. Feminist scholarship has emerged from a deep skepticism about knowledge that, even though it claims to be universal and objective, is not. Sensitive to gendered differences in these regards, feminists see their scholarly responsibility as creating new knowledge that is less androcentric, more genuinely universal, and that produces research that is useful to women. Yet, as Said acknowledged, the intellectual, however skeptical, always enters already existing structures of power and speaks within the framework and history of already articulated values and ideas. Woolf was writing in the s, but her sense of exile from male-dominated knowledge structures is still a concern for contemporary academic feminists for whom a reflexive understanding of modern knowledge construction is an important aspect of redressing the androcentric biases of our knowledge traditions. I shall now offer some reflections on these biases, which feminists link to the earlier imperialist era in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and are associated with European expansion. Analyzing the foundations of modern scientific knowledge construction, feminist philosopher Sandra Harding She traces the relationship between the development of modern Western science and the history of European expansion. Challenging the claim to value-neutrality that modern science makes with respect to the questions it asks, she argues that the European voyages of discovery went hand in hand with the development of modern science and technology; Europeans who were colonizing the world needed to know about winds, tides, maps, and navigation as well as botany, the construction of ships, firearms, and survival in harsh environments. He claims that five centuries of learning, although generally helping humankind, has divided it in ways that give certain people and places agency and authorship while denying them to others. The Cartesian revolution of the seventeenth century shifted knowledge based on resemblances to knowledge based on difference—such as the differences between mind and body, men and women, West and East, and colonizers and colonized. This is the knowledge base that is at the root of gendered and racial structures of inequality see also Keller ; Toulmin It was men who went to the colonies to collect and name

specimens from the animal, plant, and even the human world and who brought them back to the West to display in museums or study in laboratories. This collecting and renaming, which resulted in forgetting how much knowledge actually originated outside the West, was, for the most part, done by men. Like science and history, geography, particularly mapmaking, was also an important aspect of imperial knowledge. Geography played a large role in dividing the world in ways that objectified those who are not white and who reside outside the West Willinsky For a revisionist history on the origins of ideas and technology outside the West, see John Hobson Cartesian divisions between subjects and objects, observers and observed, the West and the rest, men and women, white and non-white that were used in the construction of Eurocentric imperial knowledge are still with us today, albeit in more muted form. In this new age of empire, the civilizational clashes and the struggles between good and evil that are driving our foreign policy are obvious political manifestations of these divisions of the world. Although most of us in the academy decry such oversimplified Manichean divisions, all of us must ask ourselves how the deeper epistemological divisions that I have described affect our scholarship and teachingâ€”often in ways that are unconscious. Given that, as mentioned earlier, women have rarely been the constructors or the subjects of knowledge, feminists studying international relations have had cause to reflect on the gendered implications of these divisions. Their scholarship has frequently been motivated by linguistic and empirical efforts to deconstruct these divisions and to look beyond themâ€”at those on the sidelines of international relations where women and gender are hauntingly present. Like Said, such feminists see their task as raising embarrassing questionsâ€”including questions about those on the underside of empire whose lives have not been part of the subject matter of the discipline but who have been deeply affected by global politics and whose presence has been constitutive of imperial projects and scholarship. Answers to these embarrassing questions have, I believe, yielded some important new insights into how we might envision an international politics that does not divide the world. I shall now present two examples of how feminists are deconstructing and trying to get beyond these divisions. The first will focus on civilizational divisions that inhere in the war on terror and the background knowledge that such divisions presuppose. The second will focus more directly on knowledge building itselfâ€”examining how we construct our analyses of liberal international political economy. Gendered Dimensions of Civilizational Divisions Feminist scholars in international relations draw our attention to how the resurgent dividing discourse of a clash of civilizations has been framed in gendered and racialized terms that, they believe, reinforces mutual hostilities and delegitimizes less conflictual alternatives Tickner ; Agathangelou and Ling In the United States, the attacks of September 11 reinforced the legitimacy of a militarized national security strategy. Feminists claim that the use of gender symbolism, implicit in gender and racial profiling, has important implications. By gender symbolism is meant the characteristics such as power, strength, protection, rationality, and warrior that are typically associated with masculinity. Their opposites such as weakness, protected, emotionality, and passivity are associated with femininity. Both women and men place a higher value on masculine characteristicsâ€”at least in the public sphere and certainly with respect to international politics and security. A muscular type of strong masculinity, certainly not characteristic of all men, is a powerful legitimator of war and national security. At times of uncertainty and crisis, we look to male heroes to protect us, and we feel safer when our men are protecting us against other dangerous often non-white men. But the gendered implications of divides between protectors and protected extend beyond their negative effects on women. Efforts to appear tough produce foreign policies more consistent with an imperial role than with hegemonic consensus-building. They severely limit the US capacity to play a useful role in creating a more genuinely secure international community Enloe And what if we look beyondâ€”to the other side of this divide? Just as we see dangerous men, we also see helpless women. These dual images portrayed a sharp divide between Western enlightened democracy, in which women are afforded their human rights, and the rest of the world, where they are not. Women were banned from employment, from education, and from going into public places unless accompanied by a close male relative. As is often the case, restrictions on women were imposed in the name of defending the cultural purity of the nation Hans Since the overthrow of the Taliban, conditions have not changed for a majority of women living in rural areas of Afghanistan. In addition to continued cultural restrictions and the decrease of security, the war has left many women in extreme poverty

and often as the sole providers for their families. Nevertheless, the portrayal of Afghan women and Third World women more generally as helpless victims who lack agency is a further illustration of the way in which we divide our neo-imperial world; it raises a number of important issues about how we objectify those on the other side. Less well acknowledged in the Westâ€™by the academic community as well as by the policy worldâ€™are the human rights struggles in which women themselves have been engaged worldwide. These struggles have resulted in the passage of various conventions that have changed the meaning of human rights to include violence against women and issues associated with gendered structural violence. For example, one of the earliest attempts at emancipation and social reform for women took place in Afghanistan at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries. Continuing to work underground in Afghanistan after the advent of the Taliban and in the refugee camps of Pakistan, RAWA brought education and health care to women and mobilized them in defense of their rights. During the Taliban era, burqa-clad women went into Afghanistan from Pakistan on dangerous missions with secret cameras to document abuse. Indeed, most feminists believe that all conservative religions, including Christianity and Islam, are bad for women. Recently, both Christian and Islamic feminist theologians have begun to challenge this monopoly. Islamic feminists believe that Islam can be progressive for women; it was radically egalitarian for its time and remains so in some of its scriptures. Coleman Gendering International Political Economy Not only are the confrontational politics of the war on terror and the religious passions it ignites dividing the world, the consequences of neoliberal economic policiesâ€™an important component of the National Security Strategy discussed earlierâ€™are also responsible for the growing gap between rich and poor, both within states and between them. Although much of the analysis carried out on the international political economy IPE focuses on the world of production, trade, and finance, feminist IPE has looked at the underside of the global economyâ€™at what feminists describe as the global division of labor. First is the structurally integrated world of global finance, production, and tradeâ€™the world of marketsâ€™populated primarily by men. The second process is more explicitly sexualized, racialized, and class-based and consists of low-wage, low-skilled menial service, provided by mostly female migrant workers who perform intimate household services.

Chapter 7 : For globalisation of compassion - Frontline

In Defense of Globalization Jan 17, Jim O'Neill Thanks to globalization, economic inequality among countries has declined sharply in the past 20 years, reflecting not only China's rise, but also economic development across Asia, Latin America, and elsewhere.

Chapter 8 : The Fractured Alliance - Of Martians And Venutians | Blair's War | FRONTLINE | PBS

Globalization's impact on the defense industry will be addressed in subsequent sections. However, there is an abundant literature aimed at advising business and.

Chapter 9 : frontline 3 - Imperialism and Globalisation

We will look back on the banking crisis of September as a defining moment for economic globalisation. It may have started in the US mortgage market and on Wall Street, but through an.