The State and Globalisation

https://www.e-ir.info/2022/05/16/the-state-and-globalisation/

KEVIN BLOOR, MAY 16 2022

This is an excerpt from *Understanding Global Politics* by Kevin Bloor. You can download the book free of charge from E-International Relations.

This chapter provides an overview of the role and significance of the state and globalisation. It seeks to outline the characteristics of the nation-state, national sovereignty and interdependence. The advantages and disadvantages of globalisation will be considered alongside its implications. The process of globalisation has potentially altered how we should understand the role of the state within International Relations. Given the contested nature of the subject matter, this is part of a broader theoretical debate between the two dominant paradigms of International Relations. The chapter ends with an examination of the ways and extent to which globalisation seeks to address and resolve issues within contemporary world politics.

The Nation-State and National Sovereignty

The Nation-State

A nation-state is both a legal and theoretical concept. In a legal sense, a nation-state is an entity in which the majority of its citizens share the same national culture and identity. A nation can be defined as a community of people united by a common language, history or culture inhabiting a particular territorial area. In terms of the state, the sociologist Max Weber (1994) argued that the state has a monopoly on the legitimate use of coercion within a given political entity. In a *de facto* sense, a nation-state can therefore be defined as a political community bound together via citizenship and nationality. Members of nation-states are considered citizens, and such a consideration includes the attachment of rights and obligations.

In terms of the latter, a nation-state is a theoretical ideal in which national and cultural boundaries match up with territorial ones. A nation-state is therefore based on the belief that the nation should be able to define its own borders and thereby exercise control over them. The term is common within political discourse and the idea of a nation-state continues to shape independence movements. Throughout the world, independence movements seek to form their own nation-state, and as such ascertain the dominant mode of sovereign self-determination.

In an era characterised by globalisation, nation-states find it increasingly difficult to protect their borders from external threats posed by non-state actors that operate in the space between states, such as international terrorists. Nation-states can also find themselves relatively powerless against the dynamics of a global financial system. Unsurprisingly, many informed commentators contend that the Westphalian era is in decline due to the wide- ranging impact of globalisation. That said, citizens of a nation-state often hold a deep emotional attachment to their nation, following the ascendance of nationalism and national identity from the Romantic period onwards (Carr 1945). National identity offers a sense of comfort in a world of rapid and sometimes bewildering social change, and globalisation may have led to a revival in nationalism. Indeed, there are several populist parties, figures and movements, such as Fidesz in Hungary, The Law and Justice Party (PiS) in Poland, The United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in the UK, Geert Wilders' Dutch Freedom Party, or even ex-President Donald Trump that gain support based on opposition towards globalisation and the so called 'liberal elite'.

It is also worth noting the distinction between a nation and the state. Crucially, the state is an objective reality, defined whereby a single faction holds a legitimate monopoly of violence and thus bureaucratically administers a defined territory, whereas the nation is a construct. The UK is a state, whereas British identity is difficult to adequately describe in any meaningful sense. In global terms, political tension is surely inevitable when there are numerous nations living alongside each other in any given territory, particularly when there is a substantial minority to accommodate. Equally, conflict may arise when divergence exists between the dominant nation and other national groups with opposing cultural traditions. In the world's most populous democracy, India, Hindus are the majority religious group. However, there are more Muslims residing in India than there are in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Indian society seeks to accommodate non-Hindu religious groups via an official policy of secularism.

The nation-state is also an instrument by which a nation may serve its collective interest. To establish an effective and functioning society, the nation-state may seek to coerce oppositional forces. As such, one of the outcomes of nationalism is the rhetorical construct of 'terrorists' against those who pose a threat to national identity. The nation-state may therefore be a counter against terrorist groups utilising what James Kiras calls the 'weapon of the weak' (Baylis, et al. 2019).

In order to more properly comprehend the meaning of a 'nation-state', a useful comparison can be made with other types of states. For instance, a 'multinational state' is one in which no singular ethnic group is dominant. These are sometimes referred to as 'multicultural states' depending upon the level of assimilation amongst ethnic groups. This may consist of an official recognition from the national government (as in the case of Canada). There are also entities that differ in size to a nation-state. For instance, the city- states of pre-unification Italy were much smaller than a nation-state and were usually dominated by a single ethnic group. In contrast, an empire is composed of several countries under a single monarch or system of government. At its peak, the British Empire was the largest in history with almost one in four of the world's people living under its dominion. A colonised homogenous nation within an imperial system is not a sovereign state, and as such, cannot be thought of as a nation-state.

A contrast can also be made between a nation-state and a confederation with a league of sovereign groups (e.g. Switzerland is a confederation that consists of twenty-six cantons under a common government). From a similar perspective, a federation is a political entity that contains partially self- governing regions under a central government. This is often designed to reflect ethnic diversity. For instance, the federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is delineated along ethnic lines. Two of the most powerful countries in the world (the United States and Russia) are also classed as federations.

Any understanding of a nation-state also requires an examination of the actual meaning of a nation. For instance, the UK consists of at least four separate nations. England, Scotland and Wales are distinct nations within a unitary political system centred upon the sovereignty of the Westminster parliament. Northern Ireland is a far less cohesive nation due to a sectarian division between an Ulster-British culture and an Irish culture.

In essence, a nation is a constructed entity in which people are bound together by a common language, religion, historical narrative and cultural traditions. It is grounded in a palpable yet intangible sense of national identity and belonging. The historian Benedict Anderson (1983) provides a useful insight here with his phrase 'imagined communities'. For him, a nation is a social construct imagined by those who perceive themselves to be members of that group. An imagined community is distinct to an 'actual' community because it is not based upon everyday interaction amongst its members, but upon the perceived and constructed linkages between those members. It is inherently constructed and bound up with sentimental appeals to kinship with others.

A nation is often confused and conflated with the notion of a nation-state, but this is often misleading. A nation is an intangible entity based upon a collective identity, whereas a nation-state is a territorial construct in which the boundaries of a nation overlap with that of the state. The nation-state is, importantly, also a legal concept based upon the principle that each nation- state is sovereign over its defined territory.

A stateless nation consists of an ethnic or identity group that does not possess its own nation-state. Stateless nations are either dispersed across several states (such as the Yoruba people in sub-Saharan Africa) or form the majority

population of a province within a larger state (such as the Catalans and the Basques). There are also stateless nations with some history of statehood. For example, the Tibetan government-in-exile asserts that Tibet is an independent state under unlawful occupation from the People's Republic of China. There are other nations that were always stateless due to domination by another state. For instance, Israeli occupation of Palestinian land is now the longest in modern history.

There are also a number of ethnic (and religious / linguistic) groups who were once a stateless nation that later forged a nation-state (such as the nations of the Balkans that constituted the former Yugoslavia in 1946). There are also situations in which members of a stateless nation may become citizens of the country they reside in despite their oppression. Members of a stateless nation invariably group together to demand greater autonomy or full independence. There are varying degrees of autonomy available such as devolution, full fiscal autonomy and full sovereign independence.

As a case study, 'Kurdistan' presents an interesting example. The Kurdish nation covers four states and Kurds have faced sustained discrimination from the official authorities. Most dramatically, the Kurdish people were gassed by the Saddam Hussein regime during the Iran-Iraq war, and now face discrimination from the Turkish authorities. The Kurdish nation seeks to establish control of northern Syria in addition to its autonomous entity within the Republic of Iraq. Demands for independence are championed by the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK).

National Sovereignty

National sovereignty refers to the ability of the state to impose a system of government upon its citizens. In Weberian language, the modern state is defined by its monopoly over the legitimate use of coercion or force within that given political entity. For realists in particular, this is the very essence of national sovereignty and an unmistakable reminder of its importance.

Under international law, a state is said to be sovereign over a territorial area. International law (following the 1933 Montevideo Convention on Rights and Duties of States) defines a sovereign state as one with a permanent population, a clearly defined geographical scope, a single government and diplomatic recognition from other states. To illustrate the point, there are a number of states that are not recognised as such within the international community. For instance, the Turkish-occupied region of Cyprus is only recognised by the government in Ankara. An unrecognised state cannot engage in diplomatic relations with other sovereign states, and therefore lacks one of the essential characteristics of statehood.

The concept of national sovereignty also refers to the authority exercised by a governing body without interference from external sources or organisations – known as 'external sovereignty'. In a theoretical sense, sovereignty is absolute. In practice, this is never the case as even dominant states are subject to international laws and conventions. In an increasingly interconnected system, the potential for outside interference is a constant feature. Indeed, the Russian and Chinese authorities have proved particularly adept at cyberwarfare.

Any proper understanding of national sovereignty requires a sharp distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* sovereignty. Sovereignty in a *de facto* sense means the ability to act in a certain manner, as the ultimate decision-making power over a defined territory. The latter, *de jure* sovereignty, merely refers to the technical and legal ultimate decision-making power of an actor or agent. The terms political sovereignty and legal sovereignty are also used here. It should be relatively clear that *de facto* (or political) sovereignty is of greater importance than *de jure* (or legal) sovereignty. The Republic of China (commonly known as Taiwan) holds *de facto* sovereignty but is not universally recognised by other states. For instance, the United States does not support full national independence for Taiwan although it does favour Taiwan's membership in various international forums.

In a practical sense, a state is subject to a degree of influence from more powerful states. Whilst the UK is able to determine its own foreign policy, decisions are shaped to a considerable extent by its special relationship with the US. Given its relative power, the UK is unlikely to act in a manner contrary to its strategic and military ties with Washington. On a more straight-forward point, colonies are neither *de facto* or *de jure* sovereign, with ultimate

decisions being made by the colonial power.

From a theoretical standpoint, it has been argued that we have reached a post-Westphalian epoch in which the concept of sovereignty and the nation- state can no longer be sustained. This argument has grown due to the process of globalisation. The phrase post-Westphalian has also gained in salience from usage by prominent political figures and academics (Kreuder- Sonnen and Zangl 2015).

One of the more obvious consequences of the post-Westphalian system is the increased reliance upon humanitarian intervention in order to maintain liberal values. Military intervention from a US-led alliance has been implemented in several parts of the world (such as in Iraq 1991 and 2003, and Afghanistan in 2001). Humanitarian intervention within a failed state may even be coordinated by regional powers. Since 2015, the Saudi-led 'Arab coalition' has offered military assistance to the internally recognised government in Yemen. Humanitarian intervention underlines the extent of global governance within the contemporary era.

From the opposing angle, notions of state sovereignty and non-intervention remain relevant towards our understanding of global politics. There are a number of conflicts in which international organisations (and powerful states) choose not to directly intervene. From a realist interpretation, the dependent factor is the relative standing of the country in question. In the post- Westphalian world, it can sometimes be advantageous for a country to be of little economic or strategic interest to the outside world. In contrast, those with valuable resources (notably hard commodities such as oil or metals) are always more likely to attract intervention from outside forces out of their own policy of self-interest.

Globalisation

The Process of Globalisation as a Complex Web of Interconnectedness

Globalisation can be defined as a complex web of mutual dependence within a multitude of areas (economic, social and political). Globalisation has been driven by a number of interlinked factors such as technological development, economic integration and the movement of people. In terms of theoretical perspectives, the trend towards globalisation is perhaps best outlined via 'the cobweb model'.

In an era characterised by globalisation, the velocity of events has been profound. Events in one part of the world can have an immediate and lasting impact upon another. Technological developments in communication tie the world together in ways unimaginable to previous generations. In the words of the cultural theorist Marshall McLuhan (1964), we inhabit a 'global village' in which the world is getting smaller. Some have even depicted globalisation as concomitant with the death of distance (Cairncross 1997). Either way, globalisation is built upon an intricate web of communication within the political, cultural and economic sphere over the course of the second half of the last century.

If there was to be but one word that summarises the phenomenon of globalisation, it would be that of *interconnectedness*. Globalisation is ultimately a process that generates deeper and wider levels of interaction and integration amongst a plurality of actors (such as Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Multinational Corporations or Companies (MNCs), and states). In an ever-more interconnected world system, transnational networks surmount traditional boundaries and make them largely irrelevant.

Globalisation is conventionally divided into three areas: economic, political and cultural. In each of these areas, the extent to which the world is connected is stark and seems unlikely to be reversed in the foreseeable future. In terms of economic globalisation, the world is analogous to a global marketplace. Local and national economies are embedded within a worldwide market, with the forces of supply and demand transcending national borders. For instance, in commercials for the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ltd. (HSBC) a child attempting to sell or market a homemade product outside their home will take multiple currencies. Such a scenario, no matter how unrealistic, would not have been conceivable prior to globalisation. The spread of economic interdependence has been facilitated by deregulation and technological developments. A clear illustration of this was the 2008 financial

crisis and credit crunch. Instigated by a complex relation between deregulation, investment into 'subprime' mortgage bonds, issuing cheap mortgages, and a lack of consideration for systemic risk by banks in the US, the financial contagion affected virtually all parts of the global economy. The interconnectivity of the markets could no longer be denied by even the staunchest of globalisation sceptics.

In political terms, globalisation has called into question the continued relevance of the Westphalian conception of the nation-state. Traditionally, the principle of national sovereignty lay at the very heart of international relations. Due to the interconnectedness of the global system, nation-states have little choice but to work together to deal with cross-border issues such as terrorism, security and the movement of refugees, to name but three. In an era characterised by globalisation, even the most powerful states co-operate with other actors to achieve their aims, and this has been made absolutely clear with the increased relevance of International Organisations at both the global (the UN, NATO, ICC, etc.) and regional (EU, AU, ASEAN, etc.) levels where such interconnectivity, cooperation and common interest is made manifest.

In order to underline this argument, it seems fittingly ironic that the process of integration has gone further and deeper amongst the European states that gave birth to the nation-state through the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 than any other. Since the Treaty of Rome in 1957, the European Union has formed a set of intergovernmental and supranational institutions. States that once went to war against one another for extended periods of time chose to pool (or share) their sovereignty over certain areas of governance. There are few clearer illustrations of interconnectedness in the political realm than within the EU. On the international stage, the EU repeatedly employs its considerable soft power in an effective manner. In a highly symbolic move, the EU was awarded the Nobel peace prize in 2012 for its role in continually stabilising the region and transforming Europe from a continent of war to one of peace and cooperation.

In a cultural sense, the Internet has brought people together like never before. We are able to connect with others in a manner inconceivable just a couple of decades ago. The statistics are truly staggering here. If Facebook were a country, it would be the largest in the world on the basis of population (Taylor 2016). In addition, the number of monthly users of Twitter now exceeds the entire population of the United States (Statista Research Department 2021). Such unprecedented levels of communication generate yet further interdependence within the economic and political realm. For instance, initial protests in 2011 against the Tunisian regime spread via the use of social media to five other countries, causing the overturning of several long-standing regimes – the effects of which are still observable in Libya and Syria today. This international event is known today as 'The Arab Spring'.

All three elements of globalisation interconnect and overlap in some manner. An understanding of economic globalisation inevitably entails a cultural and political context. For instance, the increased salience of the global marketplace comes with a sense of cultural imperialism. Equally, the growing success of companies from certain countries underlines shifts in the power balance within global politics (such as the continued rise of China).

The Impact of Globalisation on the State System

The political scientist David Held (Held, et al.. 1999, 2) argues that globalisation consists of the 'widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life.' The process itself permeates all facets of international relations including the state system, the economic and the everyday. In order to properly comprehend the meaning of interconnectedness and interdependence, it is first necessary to define the terms.

In the context of globalisation, interconnectedness entails two related elements. The first is the loosening of international borders to facilitate the flow of goods, services and people. Secondly, institutions have either been created or modified to accommodate the new normal. In doing so, globalisation can be said to have created a global village in which we are all connected in some manner. For instance, technological developments enable us to share images and ideas on an immediate and far-reaching basis.

Mutual dependence is perhaps most overtly expressed within the realm of economic globalisation. In terms of the

positives, countries that might have once engaged in warfare now have a strong financial incentive to avoid such a scenario. Despite the hyped-up rhetoric of a 'trade war' between the US and China, neither side has any rational interest in implementing complete protectionism. The liberal perspective refers to this as the 'capitalist peace theory' (Gartzke 2007), or sometimes the 'Commercial Peace Theory'. On the downside, economic instability in one region of the world can have a damaging impact upon others, as discussed in relation to the 2008 global financial crisis. Despite some limited level of state regulation, transactions worth trillions of US dollars occur outside of any meaningful government control.

Another area in which interconnectedness holds major implications relates to humanitarian intervention. The normative element of liberalism tends to provide a basis for humanitarian intervention. However, realists remind us that humanitarian and strategic considerations are often meshed together. As such, humanitarian intervention in an era of globalisation can be justified on grounds of self-interest. In some regions of the world, intervention is a useful means of preventing regional instability, which can also affect neighbouring regions. States also have a rational interest in adopting a highly selective definition of humanitarian intervention. For instance, authoritarian regimes that violate human rights are highly unlikely to experience outside interference from a strategic ally.

Globalisation demands that we rethink our conventional view of world politics. As Professor Anthony McGrew (2016, 29) points out 'the sovereign power and authority of national governments…is being transformed but not necessarily eroded' in the twenty-first century. Illustrating this, globalisation has turned traditional assumptions on their head (such as the dichotomy between the domestic and external sphere of politics). 'Power politics', in the established sense of the phrase, also needs to be reconfigured to recognise the importance of economic ties. Due to interconnectedness and mutual dependence, a multitude of actors play an increasingly important role within global affairs. Globalisation has also brought with it an expanded vocabulary of International Relations with terms such as complex interdependence, soft power, global governance, and so the list could go on.

According to liberal theorists like Robert Keohane, interconnectedness and mutual dependence will contribute towards the establishment of a more peaceful world order. As states tend to maximise their own perceived interests, they each have a stake in maintaining the global economic system. The dynamics of globalisation enable states to escape the straight jacket imposed upon them by the Westphalian conception of the sovereign state. Naturally, these normative assumptions about globalisation are not universal. The realist perspective takes a less optimistic view of globalisation. Despite an undeniable degree of connections and interdependence, the state system remains anarchic and states must always ensure their own survival, at least for Realists. Conflict between (and within) states therefore continues to be a feature of contemporary international relations.

The Challenge of Globalisation to State Control Over Citizens

The process of globalisation makes it more difficult for the state to perform the fundamental function of maintaining social order within its borders. There are several cogent illustrations of this point. Most notably, the formation of a shared space between like-minded individuals and organisations undermines the ability of the state to claim a monopoly on the legitimate use of force. When faced with demand for radical change, the legitimacy of the existing regime can buckle under severe strain from the momentum of transnational movements (as witnessed during the Arab Spring).

In the twenty-first century, politics is increasingly conducted on a cross-border level. As people make meaningful and lasting connections on this basis, their loyalty to the state is greatly weakened. This is a particular problem within failed states such as Libya. After forty-two years of Muammar Gaddafi as 'Brotherly Leader and Guide of the Revolution of Libya', in 2011 the demise of Gaddafi's regime caused the emergence of a power vacuum that led to a NATO-led coalition intervening via the installation of a no-fly zone and the assistance of the United Nations (UNSMIL). This was all the more important due to the oil reserves in the country, leading to a number of critics claiming intervention arose out of national interest (Campbell, 2013). However, this cross-border phenomenon also presents a problem for those states with well-established and clearly defined territorial borders. A number of closely connected movements calling for greater regional autonomy makes it much more problematic for the central government to uphold the law.

Globalisation has also made it more difficult for the state to control the movement of goods, services and people within its own borders. The dynamics of globalisation are shaped primarily by the forces of demand and supply, whilst governments are somewhat marginal to the process. In EU countries, for example, the member states must uphold the four freedoms (including the free movement of labour and capital). In the Global South, the state is in a particularly weak position in relation to the demands made by multinational companies. The former is in need of jobs and investment, whilst multinationals are in a position to provide.

Having acknowledged this, the state also retains its importance. The agents of the state remain the most important elements in the maintenance of law and order. The implementation of social order requires a fully functioning government with an effective state apparatus. The state also remains a relevant institution due in part to the public's reaction against the process of globalisation. In countries throughout the world, there has been a resurgence in nationalist feeling via self-styled 'strong men' to deal with the dangers posed by globalisation (such as terrorism and uncontrolled immigration). This is an observation that readily applies to the United States (Trump), Brazil (Bolsonaro), Russia (Putin), India (Modi), Hungary (Orban) and the Philippines (Duterte), alongside many others.

From an academic standpoint, Professor Steve Smith (Baylis et al.. 2019) argues there is a clear paradox at work here. In one sense, the public wants governments to protect them from the chill winds of globalisation. This approach necessitates policies such as increased military spending and tougher border restrictions. Equally, the process of globalisation makes the maintenance of stability and order considerably harder to achieve in practice. Either way, globalisation can be said to have changed how the state exerts control and influence over its citizens.

On the Development of International Law Alongside Globalisation

The impact of globalisation on international law is contested. From one angle, it could be argued that it represents a profound alteration in the behaviour of states. International law is arguably more effective than ever before due to the interdependence fostered by globalisation. These developments have embedded certain norms of behaviour that emphasise diplomacy, cooperation and the maintenance of liberal norms.

In order to support this argument, there has undoubtedly been a major expansion in the scope and efficacy of international law since the 1990s. Tyrants that would at one time have escaped trial by international jurisdiction due to their strategic importance to a Cold War ally are more likely to be held to account for their crimes. Most have welcomed such developments as a positive outcome of globalisation.

From the opposing angle, globalisation has done little to alter the fundamental basis of international law. All too often, international law is merely a servant of the most powerful. For instance, international law undoubtedly has a Western-centric bias towards universal human rights. This often provides a fig-leaf to advance American interests (such as the invasion of an oil-rich country). There are also clear double standards at work that underline the extent to which international law serves as a tool of powerful states. For instance, the United States has never been a member of the International Criminal Court. This may in part reflect the hegemonic power held by Washington.

In theoretical terms, the realist perspective has long viewed international law as ineffective. According to Hans Morgenthau (1948, 21) states are 'continuously preparing for, actively involved in, or recovering from organised violence in the form of war.' The trend towards globalisation has done nothing whatsoever to change this long-standing observation about the anarchic system of international relations. Frankly, the only obligation to behave in accordance with international law are in those rare occasions when the threat of sanctions is both credible and potentially effective. In the case of the US- led invasion of Iraq, this was emphatically not the case.

As one would expect, the liberal perspective takes a more positive view of international law. The creation of a more just system of international relations requires international law. In contrast to the realist paradigm, international law is considered important because it sets the boundaries of acceptable behaviour. It confers legitimacy towards humanitarian intervention and offers redress of grievance for sovereign states. The achievements of international law should therefore be recognised and built upon.

No understanding of international law would be complete without marking out the distinction between *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* that are central to the legal discussion of 'Just War'. The former relates to laws that specify when a state is justified in the use of military force, i.e., the condition on which a war may be considered 'just'. There are two main provisions to consider. Under Chapter 7 Article 42 of the UN Charter, the Security Council may authorise military action in order to ensure peace. This tends to occur for peacekeeping missions in failed states such as Sierra Leone (1999–2006), Bosnia (1992– 1995) and Somalia (1992–1995). Under Article 51, states can also use military force as a legitimate means of self-defence against an armed attack. In addition, Article 2(4) calls on member states to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent state.

Jus in bello, however, refers to the conduct of warfare, i.e. what sort of action is 'just' during warfare. For instance, the use of chemical weapons is prohibited under international law. The treatment of captured military personnel, medical staff and non-military civilians is covered under four separate Geneva Conventions. Whilst there is considerable evidence to suggest that states adhere to the principles of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*, powerful states have ignored these fundamental tenets of international law. During the Iraq war, for instance, the US-led coalition failed to gain full authorisation from the UN Security Council prior to the invasion of Iraq. The treatment of 'enemy combatants' at Guantanamo Bay is also a clear violation of what should constitute the just conduct of warfare.

Humanitarian and Forcible Intervention in a Globalised World

Humanitarian intervention can be defined as the use or threat of force with the express goal of bringing the violation of human rights to an end in a specific locality. Non-military forms of intervention may also be included – such as the provision of aid and the imposition of diplomatic sanctions. There is often an absence of consent from the host state, although a functioning government might be lacking in the case of a failed (or failing) state. Humanitarian intervention often occurs in response to a scenario that does not pose a direct threat to the strategic interests of states involved in the intervention.

There is of course an unyielding tension between the Westphalian principle of state sovereignty and the use of humanitarian intervention. The concept of non-interference in the affairs of a sovereign state is a central feature of international law. Article 2(7) of the UN Charter clearly states that nothing shall authorise intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Yet, having said this, the UN Charter facilitates the use of force in order to establish peace and stability in Article 51. There is also a degree of consensus over the essential characteristics of humanitarian intervention. According to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, there are four principles that provide the foundation for humanitarian action: humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence.

Humanitarian intervention can at times bring together an unlikely alliance of hard-headed realists and idealistic liberals. The former may support intervention in order to rid the world of a geopolitical threat to regional or national security whereas the latter tend to support intervention in order to uphold universal human rights and to seek justice. There are several illustrations in which both realists and liberals could comfortably identify some degree of justification. One of these examples would be NATO's intervention within Kosovo in 1999.

The background to humanitarian intervention in Kosovo is one of Serbian nationalism, ethnic cleansing and genocide. In the aftermath of the Bosnian war (1992-1995), Yugoslav forces sought to eradicate the Albanian population in Kosovo. The Kosovo Liberation Army was formed as a reaction to human rights abuses by Serbian forces in Kosovo and the region broadly, abuses which were denied by the then Serbian President Slobodan Milošević, such as the Srebrenica Massacre in 1995 where over eight-thousand Bosnian Muslims were murdered by the Serbian aligned army. After diplomatic attempts to end the killing, NATO sought to intervene on behalf of Kosovan Albanians. Although the Security Council failed to authorise intervention, NATO engaged in a campaign of air strikes in an attempt to defeat Serbian forces. The short-lived Kosovo war was fought between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Albanian rebels. The war was brought to an end via a peace treaty that ensured the withdrawal of Yugoslav and Serb forces in order to provide space for an international presence. According to official estimates, almost 1.5 million Kosovo Albanians were forced to leave their homes.

Another revealing case study to consider here is the multi-state NATO-led 2011 coalition in Libya. Unlike Kosovo, the military organisation gained official authorisation for humanitarian intervention in order to protect civilians in the midst of the civil war that broke out at the start of the Arab Spring. The UN Security Council was committed to the clear and achievable aims of bringing an immediate ceasefire to the civil war in the failed state (including an end to crimes against humanity in terms of attacks against civilians). The Libyan intervention was part of a broader attempt by NATO to reinvent itself in a post-Cold War era. It was a largely successful intervention partly due to the lack of an effective response from the Gaddafi regime. NATO countries managed to utilise their military hardware in terms of enforcing a no-fly zone, a naval blockade and an arms embargo.

In a strictly legal sense, Chapter 7 of the UN Charter allows the Security Council to take action in those situations where there is a 'threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression' (United Nations, 1945). The exact meaning of what constitutes a 'threat' has been broadened since the end of the Cold War, which has led to the authorisation of force in situations that at one time would have been considered either an internal conflict or one firmly within a superpower's sphere of influence.

On pragmatic grounds, humanitarian intervention can be justified in order to prevent genocide. The 1948 Convention of the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide defines the term as those acts 'committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national ethnic, racial or religious group.' If this definition is met, those states and organisations tasked with the mobilisation of resources face a number of practical dilemmas. Perhaps the most important of these is how to avoid further instability within the country affected. Examples of *jus post bellum* to consider include political reconstruction, financial reparations and restraining conquest. Another additional concern is how to construct an effective strategy on the ground in terms of gaining public trust.

In regards to global governance, gaining authorisation from the UN Security Council can at times be problematic. In order for action to be effective, the five permanent members need to adopt unanimity. Given the moral dilemma posed by potential intervention, agreement can at times be difficult to achieve. For instance, in November 2002, Washington interpreted UN Resolution 1441 as a justification for intervention against the Iraqi regime. Although the resolution was passed on a unanimous basis, at least three of the permanent five voiced grave doubts about the wisdom of military intervention. In other situations, a member of the permanent five has used their veto powers to prevent any planned intervention on humanitarian grounds (such as the Syrian Civil War).

The 'Responsibility to Protect' (R2P) also bears some relevance towards our comprehension of humanitarian intervention. Endorsed in 2005 by General Secretary Kofi Annan as official policy of the UN, R2P is a global political commitment to recognise the obligations that arise from the concept of sovereignty. R2P is therefore based on an understanding that sovereignty imposes a positive duty upon the state to protect those housed within its borders. When a state fails to do this, the responsibility shifts towards the international community. The responsibility to protect entails three stages (to prevent, to reach and to rebuild). Supporters claim that the doctrine of R2P will, in time, replace the right to intervene. The international community has a duty to intervene when a state has failed to meet its obligations. R2P has also been praised for its reliance upon non-military measures, and for changing the contours of the debate over humanitarian intervention.

The Debate Between Hyper-globalisers, Globalisation Sceptics and Transformationalists

When considering the theoretical debate concerning globalisation, the obvious starting-point is the dichotomy between the two main theoretical perspectives discussed in the previous chapter – i.e. realism and liberalism. As a conventional starting-point, realism stipulates that globalisation has done little to change the fundamental conduct of international relations. The Westphalian system may have changed, but it's far from buried. It is also possible for the major powers to impose economic protectionism and exercise populist language. From a less dramatic perspective, the decision to leave the European Union by the UK also demonstrates the continued relevance of national sovereignty within the contemporary era. In time, globalisation itself may perhaps be viewed as a passing fad.

The traditional theoretical opponent of realism is that of liberalism. Liberals claim that globalisation represents an irreversible and profound change in the dynamics of international relations. There are two aspects to consider here.

The first is a direct challenge to the realist paradigm. Liberals point out that the borders of states are now more porous than ever before. The sovereignty of states has been compromised beyond recognition and the billiard-ball analogy now looks one-dimensional. Whilst realists cling to an out-dated statism, we now have a disaggregated state in which various agencies pursue their own departmental interests. The second is the prescriptive element of globalisation. Liberalism is built upon the assumption that human nature is perfectible. Institutions can therefore provide for an effective system of global governance as an extension of this will to perfect our human condition, and eradicating war is part of this process. Liberal thinkers undoubtedly have a more optimistic outlook than their realist counterparts.

Outside of the liberal-realist debate are a number of other theoretical perspectives that hold a perspective on globalisation at their centre. Three of these will be discussed, namely: Hyper-globalisers, Globalisation Sceptics, and Transformationalists. Each will be addressed in turn. As the term implies, hyper-globalists such as Kenichi Ohmae (1995) predict that globalisation represents the gradual demise of the sovereign state. Governments around the world can no longer manage their own domestic affairs as international interdependence has become a fact affecting both domestic and foreign affairs. Instead, governments must negotiate with non-state actors in order to achieve their aims. This is shown most dramatically within the economic sphere.

Globalisation Sceptics however stipulate that the hyper-globalist argument is little more than 'globaloney' (Veseth 2006). The sceptical position proclaims that there is nothing inherently new in the current mania for globalisation. Far from being a profound transformation in global politics, the process of globalisation occurs in waves and there is little to stop the tide turning against globalisation (an argument supported by the rise of populism). In recent years, there have been a number of 'strong men' who have sought to present themselves as opponents of globalisation. Alongside this, Stephen Krasner (1999) adds that states and geopolitics remain the principal agents and forces that shape world politics.

The sceptical argument is supported by patterns of global trade. The most significant trading links are concentrated within the relatively wealthier economies. Trading links are also increasingly formalised on a regional rather than truly global basis. From a more sceptical position, Justin Rosenberg depicts the term globalisation as a 'conceptual folly' which acts as a self- serving myth (2000). Globalisation is only meaningful for the rich and powerful. For the majority of people, the term is largely without substance. This is an argument that seems pertinent to the Global South (sometimes called the 'majority world' because the majority of the earth's population inhabit developing countries).

Transformationalists such as David Held and Anthony McGrew (2002) claim that both hyper-globalists and sceptics exaggerate their arguments. Transformationalists seek a half-way position between these two polar opposites. Whilst they accept that globalisation has undermined traditional notions of International Relations (such as the distinction between the domestic and the external), predictions about the demise of the nation-state are premature. Given its position within the broader debate concerning globalisation, it could be said to offer the best of both worlds. It also helps us escape the blunt dichotomy of the realist-liberal debate.

Debates Concerning the Impact of Globalisation: The Pros and Cons

The Impact of Globalisation

When seeking to evaluate the impact of globalisation, there are a number of clear advantages worth highlighting. Perhaps the most obvious benefit of globalisation exists within the economic sphere. Globalisation entails free movement of goods, services and, to a more limited extent, people. The world economy is often analogous to a marketplace in which prices are determined by the forces of demand and supply, often just referred to as 'market forces'. This helps to ensure that scarce resources are allocated in an effective manner. Economists such as those from the Chicago school (Friedman 1980) argue that free trade creates wealth and opportunities that benefit everyone. The impact of 'trickle-down economics' can be seen most dramatically in China. As a result of free-market reforms, China has witnessed the largest number of people lifted out of poverty in world history. However, it is important to remember that the efficacy of 'trickle-down economics' is heavily contested by economists also.

Secondly, globalisation facilitates a shared global social space forged by a heightened sense of cross-border solidarity. This shared social space is most evident in transnational movements supportive of democratic values, such as freedom of assembly. During the early 2000s a wave of peaceful protests engulfed authoritarian regimes in the former Soviet Union, for example, prompted by the spread of values from such a global social space. The demand for change was characterised by a series of colour revolutions during the noughties. Calls for democratic reform spread from Yugoslavia (2000) to Georgia (2003), Ukraine (2004) and Lebanon (2005). A similar phenomenon also occurred some years later during the Arab Spring, beginning in Tunisia in December 2010.

Thirdly, the technological dimension of globalisation prevents authoritarian systems acting in a manner that seeks to suppress dissent within their own borders – at least theoretically. Images of human rights violations can now be uploaded and disseminated at the click of a button. For instance, during the Umbrella Revolution in Hong Kong, protestors shared pictures of the police using tear gas against them. This led to even more people joining the movement. Non-governmental organisations, pressure groups and civil society expose the treatment of dissidents in a manner scarcely imaginable in previous generations.

In the political realm, globalisation enables states to pool their resources and thereby tackle cross-border problems in a more effective manner. Environmental degradation, cyber-terrorism and global pandemics have no respect for national borders. The nature of these problems is such that sovereign states must work together and coordinate their efforts. This entails the added benefit of encouraging a sense of cooperation to advance a worthy cause (such as banning chemical weapons via the Chemical Weapons Conventions (1997)).

In addition, economic liberalisation provides greater opportunities for less developed countries to specialise in certain goods and services. This enables those lesser economically developed countries to engage in export-led growth, generate wealth and improve their balance of payments. The subsequent increase in living standards will therefore assist with the process of economic development. This is based upon the old adage that 'a rising tide lifts all boats'. From a similar angle, globalisation makes it easier for people to emigrate in order to gain better prospects in life, which benefits both themselves and the host economy. Immigrants tend to fill job vacancies based upon highly-skilled occupations such as premiership footballers and so-called 'McJobs' such as cleaning (Bloor 2019).

Finally, globalisation may result in more openness over financial transactions which should help combat the twin problems of tax evasion and tax avoidance. There are growing calls for tax justice in order to ensure that the wealthy 1% contribute more. Schemes advocated by progressives (such as the Tobin tax on currency conversions) would also raise tax revenue in order to improve public services. This is a particularly acute problem within less developed countries.

Given the nature of political debate, there are clearly a number of drawbacks with globalisation. The main argument of the anti-globalisation (or alter- globalisation) movement is that developing countries are locked in a desperate 'race to the bottom' in order to entice powerful multi-national organisations. MNCs are able to relocate and outsource employment to those less economically developed countries with the least regulation and the lowest level of corporation tax. This is the inherently exploitative situation presented to the world's most disadvantaged people. For example, Apple has been accused of using sweatshops in the Chinese city of Shenzhen. Images of suicide nets, shared on social media, designed to prevent employees from escaping their working situation is emblematic of the dark effects of globalisation. Workers in much of the developing world are also prevented from joining a trade union by oppressive regimes.

Secondly, the rampant consumerism and unregulated capitalism facilitated by globalisation does lasting damage to the environment. Although globalisation raises awareness of our connection to nature, this does not always translate into effective action. This is particularly noticeable within developing countries reluctant to accept restrictions on economic growth. For instance, gaining agreement to tackle the global environmental emergency has been curtailed by the reluctance of the world's largest emitter of CO2 emissions (China) to accept the international consensus in this particular area. Globalisation thereby contributes to negative consequences for us all due to the heightened depletion of natural resources.

From a geostrategic perspective, globalisation may also result in an increasingly unstable international system, due to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nuclear proliferation can be characterised as either horizontal (with more states gaining a nuclear capacity) or vertical (with more weapons accumulated by existing nuclear powers). For example, India and Pakistan are both nuclear powers with a historic rivalry over the disputed state of Jammu and Kashmir. Despite pressure from the international community, neither state is a signatory to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (1968). Globalisation also enables terrorist groups and violent non-state actors to proliferate in the cracks between states in the global space that it creates. This argument also applies to extremist groups capable of threatening innocent lives throughout the world.

In an economic sense, cross-border agreements designed to facilitate the process of globalisation present a number of disadvantages for workers in wealthier economies. For instance, outsourcing has resulted in lower wages and an erosion in job security. In the US, the phrase 'being Bangalored' is commonly used when people in sunset industries lose their jobs (such as the so-called 'Rust Belt' in the US). Companies can also threaten to take their operation overseas and thereby ensure that workers comply with a deterioration in pay and working conditions.

There are a number of figures on the left of the political spectrum who claim that globalisation tends to benefit the wealthy. The world-wide Occupy movement points out that the wealthy 1% have captured the political process to the detriment of the remaining 99%. Rather than wealth trickling down to benefit everyone, economic liberalisation enables the rich to hoard their wealth in offshore accounts. Globalisation also enables the transnational elite to evade / avoid paying tax and thereby escape their obligations as citizens of communities. In addition, the removal of trading barriers tends to benefit those with existing economic resources. The result is a system tilted heavily towards those with money and influence. Ultimately, globalisation has led to greater levels of inequality within society.

Another inherent problem with globalisation is that it makes it easier for the spread of fatal diseases to cross territorial borders. During the Ebola virus outbreak in 2013, 11,000 people died from a disease originating from near the Ebola River in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The source of the Ebola virus was thought to be bats that then transmitted the virus to humans (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2021). The freedom of movement associated with globalisation undoubtedly poses a greater risk of an outbreak turning into a global pandemic. We are closer to one another than ever before, but contained within that is a heightened risk to our health and wellbeing. The Covid-19 pandemic is the perfect illustration of this and the manner in which globalisation has sped up the possibility of the spread of disease-based crises.

Finally, globalisation can be said to have eroded our sense of national and cultural identity. That which once made us distinct has been replaced by a monocultural world dominated by Western-based multinational companies such as Starbucks and Facebook. Cultural globalisation is actually a misnomer for a bland and homogenised form of Westernisation that, ultimately, erodes cultural pluralism. The magnitude of the issue was brought home when it was found that more people recognise the golden arches of McDonalds than the Christian Cross (Lubin and Badkar 2010).

Having considered both sides of the argument, it is worth noting that the future course and direction of globalisation is an uncertain one. At the present time, even its most enthusiastic supporters would have to concede that globalisation is a deeply uneven process. According to the sociologist Manuel Castells, the term 'variable geometry' describes the asymmetrical nature of globalisation (1996). It is however conceivable that the future course of globalisation could serve all members of society and even the ecosphere. It should also be said that the process is not irreversible and may in time subside due to the forces of nationalism and populism.

The Implications of Globalisation for the Nation-State and Sovereignty

Globalisation entails a compression of the world and a transformation in our conception of self and identity. The world appears to be getting smaller due to technological developments, the affordability of travel and the impact of market forces. Globalisation also influences the integrity of national borders and their economic development. For better or worse, we are now all connected in a multi-layered system of mutual dependence. It is therefore undeniable that globalisation has had a deep and lasting influence upon the nation-state and national sovereignty.

According to the Japanese academic Kenicki Ohmae, globalisation has weakened the nation-state. The apparatus of the state no longer adequately protects a nation from the forces of globalisation (1995). From a similar angle, the noted sociologist Michael Mann (1997) identifies four threats to the nation-state: identity politics, post-nuclear geopolitics, global warming and global capitalism. Whilst the extent of each threat differs, they all offer a direct challenge to the sovereignty of the nation-state. If their arguments are accurate, then globalisation spells the death knell of the nation-state. Given the overwhelming impact of globalisation, territorial borders no longer offer a meaningful demarcation by which to comprehend the complex interactions of the modern era. The Westphalian conception of national sovereignty faces a slow but steady slide into permanent irrelevance.

In order to substantiate this argument, globalisation can be said to have had a profound impact upon the nation-state in three key areas: political, economic and cultural. In the political realm, globalisation undermines the ability of the nation-state to chart its own path. Given the interconnected character of the international system, it is simply impossible for states to retain absolute sovereignty in the economic realm (an argument made manifest by the great recession of the late noughties). However, the most symbolic argument to consider here is that of deeper European integration. Since the 1950s, the nation-states of Europe have formed an 'ever closer union' that renders the

traditional conception of national sovereignty increasingly obsolete, as the characteristics that constitute a nation (singular common language, culture, history and social norms) become weakened or less concrete as individuals of different nations mix. Whilst member states still retain a degree of political legitimacy within their own borders, they are tied together in a complex web of mutual dependence. Member states work together to advance their national interests and are subject to sanctions for failing to impose EU-wide rules and directives.

In the economic realm, the world is interconnected like never before. Symbolically housed in Washington D.C., the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank regulate the macroeconomic policies of those countries in debt to the global banking system. Structurally assisted programmes impose crippling repayment schemes upon many of the poorest countries in the world. Moreover, the sovereignty of the nation-state is undermined by multinational companies (MNCs). When the combined GDP of leading MNCs is greater than certain developed countries, it is hard to deny that the nation-state has lost some of its relative status.

The global financial and currency system can also determine the economic policies and objectives of even the most developed economies. States therefore have no choice but to pool resources and work alongside transnational organisations. This loss of direct control can only be interpreted as a loss of national sovereignty.

In the cultural realm, globalisation is often called Westernisation due to the spread of western norms. From the perspective of the non-Western world, this represents a modern-day version of cultural imperialism. For instance, the dominance of English-language programmes and American films undermine the national identity that lies at the very heart of the nation-state. The cultural element of globalisation has grown in significance, paralleling the rise of soft power in the global system. The threat is considered so significant that some countries have implemented protectionist measures to prevent their cultural way of life from being undermined, and this of course comes with political and social consequences, as is the case with all 'nationalist' protectionism.

Having said all this, there are those who claim that the nation-state is a robust concept that retains its relevance. In order to support this view, it could be argued that nation-states throughout the world have not been greatly affected by globalisation. Indeed, even the smallest countries retain their *raison d'etre*. For instance, the nation-state is defined by territorial boundaries. It also preserves a monopoly on the legitimate use of political violence in accordance with Max Weber's conceptualisation. Indeed, this definition has become more salient in the modern era as a means of distinguishing the legitimacy of the nation-state from that of terrorist groups. It should also be noted that the nation-state remains the most salient actor on the world stage when compared to international institutions, NGOs and sub-state actors. Based on such arguments, Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson (1996) claim that the nation-state remains a powerful entity in an era of globalisation, overlapping with a number of the arguments presented by globalisation sceptics or even some transformationalists.

It could also be argued that globalisation has contributed towards an expansion in the power of the nation-state and

national sovereignty. Far from being washed up with the tide of globalisation, states have adapted and prospered accordingly. National sovereignty can be viewed thus as a bargaining tool which can be bartered in order to advance the national interest. This could explain why nation-states have willingly joined regional forums designed to foster trade and cooperation. It's worth noting here that power is exercised in a somewhat different manner than ever before due to globalisation. One illustration of this argument is the transformation of the UK from having the largest empire in history to one of the leading proponents of soft power. Globalisation thereby encourages states to achieve their foreign policy objectives via the use of such power.

Whilst globalisation undoubtedly presents challenges for the nation-state, the concept remains a powerful force for three reasons. Firstly, the rules that govern globalisation are largely determined by nation-states – something that can be seen by the machinations of statist obligation construction UN resolutions. Secondly, sovereignty is retained when a member of an international organisation that requires the cessation of a certain degree of individual decision-making capability of its member-states chooses to leave that particular organisation (as in the case of the UK's 'Brexit' from the EU). More importantly, the process of globalisation has actually contributed to a revival of nationalist sentiment. There are few better illustrations of this point than in the United States. In 2016, the Republican candidate Donald Trump was elected on a mandate to 'Make America Great Again', implying that America's 'greatness' had been lost in the contemporary global era, and thus a reversal of such global processes was necessary. During his presidency, he took decisions contrary to the ethos of globalisation: such as a travel ban imposed on majority-Muslim countries or withdrawing the US form the 2015 Paris Climate Accords. Although it is fashionable to claim that globalisation renders the Westphalian system irrelevant, this is far from given. In reality, globalisation has done nothing to prevent states from putting their own interests first, or indeed utilising globalisation for their own ends – a realist argument.

In this vein, economic globalisation also brings undoubted benefits to nation- states. For instance, multinational companies provide governments with added tax revenue. In other words, as multinationals grow larger, they spread globally and largely accumulate wealth (which the state collects in corporation tax). The location of such companies also creates jobs within the host economy. An increase in international trade also requires the existence of global regulatory bodies. The enhanced flow of goods, services and people can only occur via an institutional framework provided and managed by national governments. Such factors ultimately strengthen the ability of nation- states to implement policies that meet their specific national interests.

Finally, the nation-state has in some areas reasserted its ability to control events and implement actions as a response to globalisation. We are bound together in security matters like never before as a result of the threat posed by organisations with a distinctly global reach. Whilst few would contend that globalisation entails a heightened sense of risk, the response to such threats underlines the continued relevance of national sovereignty. The global response to the COVID-19 pandemic is a particularly salient example to consider. Far from being passive victims of globalisation, it is entirely possible for sovereign states to impose differing and unprecedented restrictions upon people's movements and thereby reasserting themselves as an ultimate decision-making power within a given territory.

The Extent to Which Globalisation Addresses Contemporary Issues

In an increasingly interconnected world characterised by a complex web of mutual dependence, the process of globalisation can be utilised to address contemporary issues. Equally, it also presents a series of intricate barriers towards conflict resolution and the threat of global warming. In each dimension, there are both positives and negatives to consider. There are also several dependent factors to highlight when seeking to evaluate the manner and extent to which globalisation addresses these pressing issues.

The very character of globalisation offers opportunities for state and non-state actors to address issues of a transnational character, such as a reduction in global poverty and environmental protection. In these cases, the role of international organisations has proved an increasingly important one. This observation also applies to human rights alongside conflict prevention and resolution. Globalisation similarly enables like-minded individuals to work together and promote worthy goals, such as the protection of human rights. Equally, the process of globalisation

accentuates threats of a cross-border character. For instance, technological developments make it easier for terrorist groups and violent non-state actors to promote their cause.

Poverty

Attempts to address the problem of poverty incorporate states, non-state actors and sub-state actors. In a particularly clear illustration, the G8 Summit held at Gleneagles in 2005 agreed to write off the entire debt owed by 18 'Highly Indebted Poor Countries'. It was a decision influenced by campaigns from prominent pressure groups such as Make Poverty History, and it was implemented by a number of progressive political leaders. It remains symbolic of the manner in which globalisation frames our approach to issues that affect billions. In 2021, an estimated 9% of the world's population lived on less than $1.90 a day.

In terms of eradicating poverty, the main focus of the United Nations has centred upon targets agreed by the member states. In the year 2000, the Millennium Declaration was signed, committing countries to combat poverty (along with other related goals such as fighting hunger and disease). The eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) entail specific targets and indicators that member states agreed to achieve by the year 2015.

The Millennium Development Goals sought to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, implement universal primary education, promote gender equality and empower women, reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, ensure environmental sustainability, to develop a global partnership for development and to combat HIV/AIDS alongside other diseases. In 2015, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) replaced the MDGs. There are 17 global goals in total designed to be the 'blueprint to achieve a better and more sustainable future for all' (United Nations 2021). Revealingly, the first goal is that of eradicating poverty and malnutrition. It is also worth noting that the language used is more purposeful than that adopted for the MDGs. In an attempt to ensure these goals are met by the year 2030, data is available in an easy-to- understand manner. The emphasis upon sustainability also reflects the growing salience of environmental issues and sustainable development.

Another aspect of tackling poverty is to open up national economies towards free trade. The so-called Washington Consensus consists of a set of policies based upon deregulation, privatisation and marketisation. The basis of the Washington Consensus is therefore centred firmly upon a free-market philosophy. There are powerful arguments to support the Washington Consensus. Supporters claim that the free market is the best system available for lifting people out of poverty. Liberal theorists are highly supportive of global capitalism as they claim that free trade enhances the level of cooperation between states. According to the World Bank (2021a), more than a billion people have escaped extreme poverty since the early 1990s and poverty rates in 2019 were lower than they had ever been, although rising slightly in 2020.

From the opposing angle, the alter-globalisation movement is heavily critical of the Washington Consensus. They claim that policies imposed upon national governments serve the interests of the wealthy and exploit those marginalised within the global economy. The invisible hand of Adam Smith (1999; 2009) actually prevents those at the bottom from escaping a structure systematically biased against them. The recent coronavirus pandemic also has a disproportionately negative impact upon the world's poorest people.

As with much else within the field of International Relations, a great deal depends upon the perspective taken. From the predominant Western viewpoint, globalisation is often viewed as a welcome economic development. There is undoubtedly much merit in this argument. However, for those who exist at the periphery of the world economy globalisation is clearly an uneven process with several adverse effects over which they have little control. Whilst there has been some progress in lifting people out of poverty, globalisation also tends to exacerbate inequality between wealthy states and those in the Global South. In theoretical terms, this is often heard from dependency theorists (Prebisch 1950) and the world systems approach (Wallerstein 1979).

Another issue to consider is the provision of foreign aid from wealthy governments. Those in favour claim that financial assistance can be targeted towards poverty reduction schemes. Opponents however argue that foreign aid is routinely misappropriated by powerful elites, particularly within authoritarian and dictatorial regimes. In addition,

the level of corruption within a recipient state prevents aid from reaching those most in need. The provision of foreign aid also results in a dependency culture that undermines self- reliance and initiative. It could also be argued that foreign aid actually contributes further towards global inequality.

It must be acknowledged that there is little evidence to suggest that aid has a positive impact upon poverty levels. Given the realities of international relations, states tend to pursue their own interests via foreign aid. For instance, the UK government has been accused of providing aid to Malaysia to fund a project linked to arms sales. Political considerations are also central towards the provision of aid from the Chinese government. Furthermore, wealthy governments have failed to meet the guidelines laid down in the 1987 Brundtland Report – which introduced the concept of sustainable development and how it could be achieved.

Conflict

There is a glaring contradiction that lies at the very heart of globalisation. In one sense, globalisation contributes towards a more peaceful world order. The spread of democratic norms underpinned by economic interdependence reduces the number of conflicts between states. Equally, globalisation can exacerbate conflict and contribute towards heightened levels of political instability. This can entail several related problems such as an influx of refugees, armed insurgencies against the ruling government and inter-ethnic conflict.

One of the most interesting case studies to consider here is that of global terrorism. In an age of globalisation, terrorism has shifted from an essentially state-bound or regional problem to a global phenomenon. Its method of funding, communication and expansionist objectives have all become globalised over time. For example, Islamic State (also known as ISIL/ISIS/IS/ Daesh) broadcasts its message to a potential audience of billions via social media. Indeed, despite its historical connections, the goal of an Islamic state under the leadership of a caliph (a political-religious ruler and considered a successor to the Prophet Muhammad) has been symptomatic of the globalised era.

Regarding terrorism, globalisation enhances the threat posed throughout the world. Due to the erosion in conventional state boundaries, terrorist groups find it easier to target states and other actors. However, this is not a one- sided process. Globalisation also allows states to co-ordinate efforts to combat terrorism. Sovereign states continually exchange information on known terrorists and their associated activities, a great illustration of this being the 'Five Eyes' intelligence alliance between Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the US and the UK. The international fight against terrorism can at times lead to an unlikely alliance between countries with apparently little in common. Just as terrorist groups have become globalised, so too has the response from states to the threat of global terrorism.

The impact of globalisation is particularly evident in regards to the spread of information. At one time, states had a near monopoly on the use of propaganda whilst terrorist groups had restricted means by which to spread their message. More importantly, the agents of the state often had effective means of censorship. However, due to technological developments, governments throughout the world find it almost impossible to control the flow of information and the 'spin' placed upon it. New social media provides the oxygen of publicity for violent and extremist groups to disseminate their worldview and gain support. This provides the added benefit of gaining funding, recruitment, and the platform to offer a spectacle for all the world to see.

Terrorist groups have also become more problematic for states to deal with because of changes in their structure. Terrorist cells now operate locally which means that states can only tackle the spread of terrorism one cell at a time. This tactical change has made it more problematic for governments to defeat extremist groups. This is particularly notable within ISIS strongholds in Syria and Iraq. Such groups endorse the unofficial maxim of globalisation in theory and practice: 'think locally, act globally'.

Human Rights

The international human rights agenda can be dated back to the UN Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), signed on 10 December 1948. For the very first time, a common standard for universal human rights was agreed upon by

the signatory nations. It marked a unique moment in world history and was indicative of a new world order determined to avoid another period of turmoil, persecution and genocide.

The UDHR demonstrates that sovereign states are both willing and able to specify fundamental human rights. This has since been extended towards protecting the most vulnerable, such as refugees, prisoners, and children. With the benefit of hindsight, the UDHR helped lay the foundation for further treaties that broadened the concept of human rights. There is even a sufficient body of international human rights law to justify the use of the phrase International Bill of Rights. Once hailed as 'a Magna Carta for all humanity' (Klug 2015), the International Bill of Human Rights seeks to bring together a number of rights into one codified document (United Nations General Assembly 1948). It consists of the five core human rights treaties of the UN that function to advance the fundamental freedoms and to protect fundamental human rights.

Perhaps the clearest illustration of globalisation in the context of human rights is the UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC). Created in 2006, the UNHRC investigates allegations of human rights violations within member states. The UNHRC replaced the UN Commission on Human Rights, which had been previously criticised for allowing countries with a poor record on human rights to join the organisation. However, the UNHRC has not been without criticism. For instance, the US has accused the organisation of holding an anti-Israeli bias. To support this claim, the Council has passed more resolutions condemning Israel than the rest of the world combined. Washington objects to the focus upon Israel, although this ignores the point that the use of veto

powers in the UN Security Council shields Israel from their actions in Gaza and the West Bank. The Trump administration withdrew the United States from the UNHRC – the first country ever to do so. Having said this, the UNHRC has taken steps to defend rights in despotic regimes such as Myanmar, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The UNHRC could therefore be seen as an illustration of globalisation and its impact upon the protection of human rights from both a positive and more critical angle.

The effectiveness of human rights within the contemporary era is subject to heated debate. Despite globalisation helping to raise and promote awareness of human rights, ensuring compliance remains highly problematic due to various reasons. First and foremost, the international organisations responsible for implementing global governance lack sufficient resources to enforce compliance upon rogue states. For instance, the international community has been unable to exert any lasting influence upon North Korea. The Kim dynasty has violated human rights for several decades. Having chosen isolation and rejected globalisation, the regime in Pyongyang remains largely impervious to pressure from any form of global governance.

Another illustration of this argument concerns the International Criminal Court (ICC). Established with the Rome Statute of 1998, the ICC deals with the violation of human rights with a remit to cover areas such as genocide, land grabs and war crimes. However, the effectiveness of this legally independent (albeit UN-associated) institution is constrained due to relatively powerful countries refusing to join. This includes China, Israel, Iraq and of course the United States. Even the Philippines left the organisation under President Duterte in protest at the ICC launching an investigation in their country.

Secondly, the effectiveness of the human rights agenda is undermined by its Eurocentric (or Western-centric) bias. In some parts of the world, the concept of individual rights lacks legitimacy. It is revealing to note that the continent of Asia lacks a regional human rights organisation comparable to the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). In addition, the Arab League has long taken the view that national sovereignty should apply on a literal basis. It could even be said that the documents that specify universal human rights are largely 'paper rights' in certain parts of the world.

In contrast to the flowery rhetoric of global governance, there is no international court to administer human rights law. In reality, only a handful of quasi-judicial bodies exist within the umbrella of the United Nations. Although the aforementioned ICC has expanded its jurisdiction, it still leaves a wide remit of human rights abuses free from investigation. It is also problematic to circumvent the principle of national sovereignty. This is a particular problem when faced with populist leaders, especially in the current age where illiberal democratic norms appear to be

becoming increasingly popular (Mudde 2019, Müller 2016). Furthermore, globalisation has increased public demand for social protection whilst decreasing the capacity of the state to provide it. Some states genuinely find it difficult to protect human rights due to the immense power of multinational companies, global markets, and the IMF/ World Bank. Globalisation could therefore be said to undermine the ability of a hollowed-out state to ensure adherence to human rights.

From a more positive angle, international institutions are able to nudge recalcitrant states towards better behaviour. International human rights law provides a framework by which to govern the actions of states. As with people, most states follow the law because it is the law. This tautology is made more effective when reinforced with a veneer of legitimacy and a set of effective sanctions (e.g. trade and diplomatic restrictions). Globalisation has also increased the salience of human rights within the international community.

As a process, globalisation undoubtedly sheds greater light upon human rights abuses. The ability of authoritarian regimes to cover up a violation of human rights has been greatly curtailed by the spread of technology. Protestors and dissidents can upload and share images throughout the world in a manner unimaginable in the past. Technological developments also enable like-minded groups to work together to enforce social change. That said, the problems of monitoring and implementing international human rights law remain largely unresolved.

The Environment

International cooperation in this area emerged during the growing awareness of environmental issues in the 1970s. The UN Environmental Programme (UNEP) was established in 1972 to co-ordinate the environmental activity of member states. However, the UNEP is institutionally weak and provides ineffective protection. As with much else provided by the United Nations, its effectiveness is hampered by a constrained mandate and a lack of funding.

In an era of globalisation, there have been a series of multilateral agreements that seek to address environmental issues. In 1992, the UN Conference on Environment and Development (also known as the Rio Summit) provided a forum in which member states could collaborate on issues such as sustainability. It established a global environmental agenda that has since been developed during subsequent conferences. The UN Conference on Sustainable Development created the Climate Change Convention. It was also agreed that signatory states would not carry out any activity on the lands of indigenous peoples that might cause environmental damage. Finally, the Rio Summit instigated a process that led towards a firmer commitment towards the Convention on Biological Diversity.

In the specific area of environmental protection, the international community has often been prepared to reach agreements and demonstrate a common show of unity. According to the WTO, there are over 250 multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) currently in force dealing with a multiplicity of environmental issues. Some of those agreements have been truly historic. For instance, due to the 2015 Paris Agreement, signatories pledged to reduce their carbon emissions. However, it has proven difficult to persuade the most powerful countries to take the required action. Most notably, the United States failed to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. Partly because of this, global emissions were on the rise in 2005 (the year the Kyoto Protocol became international law). China has also been reluctant to deal effectively with carbon emissions, whilst the Trump administration withdrew from the Paris Agreement – although later re-joined under the Biden administration in 2021.

Given the pressing nature of climate change, there have been proposals to implement a truly effective governing body or centralised institution. Even the strongest defenders of national sovereignty recognise that international agreements are neither legally binding nor effective enough to tackle the climate crisis. There have, for instance, been proposals for a World Environment Organisation (WEO). However, the US prefers voluntary initiatives to ensure that economic interests are protected. This also matches the national interests of several emerging economies, such as the BRICS.

It has also been proposed that environmental issues should be directly incorporated into the WTO. The WTO can apply legal pressure and resolve trade disputes. However, critics claim that this would fail to address underlying market failures or improve rulemaking in terms of environmental protection. Providing greater power for the WTO is

also problematic for those critical of the Washington Consensus and its adverse impact upon the Global South.

Perhaps the main problem posed by environmental degradation is that states are often reluctant to cast aside the advantages provided by retaining the status quo. Whilst creating a more effective system of global governance is laudable, there is insufficient political will to surrender national sovereignty. Environmental degradation is a problem for all countries and demands a complete rethink of the Westphalian system to be resolved in an adequate manner. There is also to some extent a trade-off between economic development and environmental protection.

When it comes to the international community and the environment, the narrative has typically been 'too little too late'. Given its gathering pace and irreversible character, the society of states has a clear interest in resolving the problem. However, this has proved immensely difficult to implement. More than any other issue, environmental degradation demands effective collective cooperation from the international community on an unprecedented global scale. Globalisation has not yet managed to circumvent the barriers presented by sovereignty and national interests.

Conclusion

This chapter sought to provide an overview of the role and significance of the state and globalisation. It provided an outline of concepts such as the nation- state, national sovereignty and mutual dependence. The impact of globalisation was weighed up in terms of both positives and negatives. Whilst it is arguably too soon to provide a definitive conclusion, globalisation may well hold significant implications for the future of the nation-state. According to some, the nation-state needs a radical rethink in an era characterised by globalisation.

It must however be acknowledged that globalisation provides the means by which transnational issues can be addressed. It is surely important to note that there is nothing deterministic about globalisation and the future of the state. Change is a constant within global politics. Hence, given the evidence outlined, there seems little to suggest that the notion of 'the state' will be any different. The following chapter will provide a consideration of global governance. Taking forward some of the themes explored in this chapter, the implications of globalisation will be examined in regards to its political and economic dimensions. This will lead towards a consideration of human rights and the environment.

About the author:

Kevin Bloor is an author, Principal Examiner and teacher. He has over twenty years of experience in the social sciences and is the author of several texts and educational resources such as*Understanding Global Politics*, *The Definitive Guide to Political Ideologies, Understanding Political Theory* and *Sociology: Theories, Theorists and Concepts*. He holds a BA in Politics and International Relations and an MA in International Relations, both from Staffordshire University, and an MPhil in Government from Manchester University.