

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES

[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 4 | Issue 3

2021

© 2021 *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com>)

This Article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestion or complaint**, please contact Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication at **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript at submission@ijlmh.com.

Globalized World and Subsequent Conflicts

NOUSHEEN JEELANI¹

ABSTRACT

The creation of a globalized world, where there is an increased interdependence, has made it incumbent on nations to be accountable for their actions so as to maintain their power dynamics in global politics. Amidst such power politics at a global level, nations often try to suppress their internal conflicts by unconstitutional and unfair means. The conflicts within these nations therefore, don't seem to reach an international arena and even if they manage to get discussed in transnational institutions like United Nations the symbiotic nature of globalization helps the country to brush them under the carpet with the help of its economic or political allies. Further, the control of the state over the factors that have led to globalization (e.g. media) seems starkly contrasting to the very idea of globalization where information is said to perforate freely and accurately. This hegemony of state over different sources of information has clearly favored the state and thus, failed to provide a true image of the on-going conflicts to the world. One of the greatest questions then remains whether the globe has truly shrunk or is there a further increase in disparity within the nations though not overtly visible.

The immediate consequence of globalization is the international organizations with the same draft of solutions for every conflict in any region of the world. This ends up drawing extremism in certain sections of the population as a reaction to the impractical implementations. The homogeneity of these policies results in worldwide violence which ironically is left to these organizations to resolve.

Given the restricted portrayal of conflict by the state in international sphere, one can thus argue that the resolving of conflicts inside the territorial boundaries of the nation remains secondary to its sovereignty and the growing violence around the globe is somewhat a result of the globalization.

Keywords: *Globalization, Conflict, Resistance, State, Sovereignty.*

Globalization derives its roots from prehistoric period however, 19th century witnessed the advent of globalization approaching in its modern form - when territorial boundaries became redundant and the protectionist policies adopted by nations were laid off. The initial phase of this modern globalization increased bilateral and multilateral trade agreements; reduced trade barriers and led to the formation of regional trading blocs. Thus, allowing nations to trade

¹ Author is a student at Jamia Millia Islamia, India.

among themselves, uninterruptedly. This trade however, wasn't a balanced one. Increased exports of finished goods from west to east, and raw materials from east to west led to a substantial gain of West. An increase in the flow of goods across the boundaries resulted in a political and social merger among nations. Globalization, therefore, replaced the term 'economic interdependence' and worked as a catalyst for socio-political integration of world. The term 'globalization' is therefore; a very superficial way to denote the geographical extension of social processes or 'the intensification of worldwide social relations' (Giddens 1990). With supremacy in terms of economic and sociological gains, developed nations paved way into the political set-up of developing nations. Nevertheless, this connectedness in turn led to the creation of a soft power in an integrated world by establishing a cultural hegemony of political west. Globalization thus created a larger divide between developed and developing countries with the political west as a yardstick for political east.

Interconnectedness has been at the heart of the debate and there is no doubt in the fact that countries have come closer to each other making a 'global world'. Globalization has received mixed reactions, nonetheless. While some argue it to be an integrating force, others contend that it fuels the conflicts. For instance; liberals are of the view that economic interdependence promotes peace whilst structuralists argue that international conflicts are a result of globalization. The inquiry on globalization and conflict has thus been a tropical debate amongst institutional economists from Keynes to Veblen.

The nature of the trade in global economy incentivizes the nations to manufacture goods they have a comparative advantage in. The growing competition in terms of means of production (e.g., raw materials) or markets to sell finished products drives countries to meddle with others. The economic establishments along with other outcomes of globalization bind countries in a mutual relationship whether economically or politically. In case of an internal conflict or a civil war, allies of a nation abate the issue on an international forum in return for some political or economic favors. The representation of the conflict occurring inside the state in the international arena therefore becomes a faux. The extreme measures adopted by the state to suppress voices in these areas remain unchecked and unrestrained.

The first phase of global restructuring in 1970s resulted in a shift of knowledge-intensive production process to West and labor-intensive production process to developing countries where cheap labor was easily available. The resultant decentralized production in West had a profound effect on the composition of workforce (Mitter 1986). There was an increased employment of women workers in industries. However, this 'feminization' of workforce was intended to reduce the cost of production and resort to the best possible alternative of cheap

labor. Paying women less emanates from ideologically biased theory that women possess the skill naturally as opposed to men who acquire it with the passage of time. The prime motive of including women in such jobs was to involve them in the 'development process'. Their participation in the organized production sector however, didn't culminate into their financial independence and gave birth to a greater disparity between two genders.

A further research into an integrated global political economy gives us an insight that a rapid growth of sex tourism or prostitution has led to the growth of tourist industry in many nations. Cities where prostitution has increased exponentially are major centers for multinational companies or regional centers for global organizations. Although, these regions serve a lucrative and rewarding destinations there is a considerable lack of analysis into the prerogative dimension. Globalization hence appears to be concerned about the shift in the consumption production pattern and not about the processes that are detrimental to women rights.

History is evident how developing nations were an easy prey for colonizing countries due to the easy movement of the latter into the former. This movement gradually paved way for different social variables of a region to perforate into other territories giving rise to an increased awareness about social heterogeneity. These newly arrived social variables don't seem to amalgamate well within the existing ones and become a point of contention in these areas. It becomes mandatory for the indigenous groups to establish their collective identity, make their discontent known and resist the predatory nature of the globalization that sets into motion a forceful homogenization. As a result of which asserting one's group identity especially the religious one is seen as a symbol of competing for power and authority in global world (Beyer 1994).

Globalization has had a significant impact even on the tribal population of world especially India. Various known as Aborigines, Scheduled Tribes, Adivasis, Girijans and, of late, Vanwasis, numbering above 10 crore, are geographically located in the hill regions of the central belt of the country, India, extending from Gujarat to Arunachal Pradesh. India, with opening up of the mining sector to foreign players is trying to woo foreign investment in the extractive industries. This has multiplied the pace of devastation, marginalization, displacement and pauperization of tribal people. The indigenous people of the concerned areas having lost their control over the natural resources are heading towards total extinction. Along with the changing global scenario, India's developmental strategy has shifted towards the liberalization and privatization of its markets which has further commercialized the natural resources they highly rely upon. The attitude of avoidance and non-recognition has further alienated them. All this is vehemently opposed by these people in a violent and militant form

of struggle. Their struggle, naxalite movement, is inspired by the Marxist Leninist ideology that seeks to establish an equitable and egalitarian society even for those who have been suffering silently in the name of economic reforms. Indian state however, has from time to time banned these outfits instead of framing any consistent policy which is an evidence of state failure. Any international community or organization hasn't taken forward their appeals which makes one rethink whether the benefits of globalization have been overstated.

There is no doubt that globalization has transformed traditional policy making but essentially the power lies with few. Therefore, the vastness that the globalization promises robs the nations of their authority to make decisions freely. There has been a distribution of authority from state to different local bodies and associations with an emergent inequality between larger states with 'structural power' and those without it (Strange 2005). In present times, nations are caught between two parallels. Inside their territorial expansion they mostly seem to be guided by the norms of democracy while internationally they practice power politics to yield huge benefits. The main purpose of the policies and regulations is superseded by the intention to maintain an influence in international arena. One of the problems then arises whether these policies truly serve the people of a country or intend to create a bogus image of the nation globally. Amidst all the power politics that continues, emergence of a conflict whether inside or outside a nation and its subsequent portrayal globally plays a key role in placing a nation with regards to others. It is therefore clearly against the state to be called for anything that is deemed to be conflicting on global platforms. The states try their best to limit the issues to their boundaries so that they remain out of the purview of global community and are never addressed to.

This can also be concluded that there has been a substantial increase in inter-country conflicts due to globalization. Apart from the traditional border issues, modern states are facing new challenges in terms of trade agreements, migration issues, and environmental concerns etc. The way in which countries deal with these issues has also went through a major change. The conventional methods of dialogue and deterrence have been replaced by international intervention through organizations such as United Nations. The means of deterrence have also transformed due to a lot of factors such as economic allies, trade agreements, aviation routes etc. which might not have been the case earlier. The way countries, that are party to the conflict, act is also influenced.

One of the global organizations that have had a key role in maintaining the peace and security in world is United Nations. United Nations is an international body which brings all the countries to a common platform. In other words it is the 'parliament of nations'. However, all

the nations are not equal in terms of power in international arena. United Nations therefore, has to maintain an approach that can bring all the countries under its band irrespective of the power dynamics. It is evident from the way United Nations works that special provisions are made to favor certain countries which were considered powerful in past. These favors have institutionalized themselves as norms and are difficult to amend even in the contemporary times. For example, the five permanent seats in Security Council are reserved for US, Britain, Russia, China, and France. These five members have a right to veto any decision. There has been a constant debate with regards to change in the permanent membership of Security Council and to include representation from certain other countries of Asia, South Africa and Islamic world. Yet, one of the important skepticism that emerges is that for United Nations policies to come to effect, unanimity of great powers is required. But in order to provide a space to other countries of the world, United Nations has a General Assembly wherein each country has a single vote which it can use to express its choice. Given the way United Nations has structured its working, it is clear that it takes into account the demands of the powerful countries and extends only a sympathetic approach to others.

It is obvious that a supra-territorial organization like that of United Nations cannot work without the support of key state actors. There have been certain incidents in past which show that although United Nations has emerged somewhat successful in realizing the dream of a peaceful world but the powerful countries still have an influence and authority to create havoc in any part of the globe. This can be seen in Iraq where in March 2003, US led coalition launched a full-fledged war which removed Saddam Hussein from power. There is still a controversy whether United Nations approved a military attack on Iraq or not but the entire world witnessed the United States' power to act without United Nation's authorization. Also, United States and some other powerful countries are the major contributors to United Nation's budget. Therefore the entire functioning of the organization is depended on them which in a lot of cases undermines the core values that the organization stands for.

Similarly, the fundamental problem of international economic organizations like World Trade Organization (WTO) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) is essentially the question of governance. While they continue to perform their lending functions in some of the most underdeveloped nations of the world there is a tacit agreement that the heads for these institutions are from industrialized countries with no need of prior experience in developing countries. Therefore, these institutions are not representatives of who they serve (Stiglitz 2005). Further, these organizations seem to cater to the demands of all the countries with just one draft of solutions disregarding the distinct differences between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'.

The nature of these international organizations doesn't make them accountable to anyone and due to their partial representation a vast majority of the population in world is left voiceless. These institutions have advocated the policies that benefit a few at the expense of many, the well-off at an expense of poor. In many cases the commercial and economic motives overtake the concern for social justice, environment, equality and human rights. Left with no other alternative, the 'have-nots' react violently to express their concerns, demand their rights and press for a change. Violence can never be a prime reaction to misery or suffering. It is only with the realization that justice has been denied one resorts to violent methods without taking a cognizance of consequences. It is sometimes the only way to express the human emotions and 'set the scales of justice right' (Arendt 1969).

The growing extremism throughout the globe therefore, is a reaction to the negative consequences that have emerged in different spheres of life due to globalization and inept functioning and policies of these institutions that arise because of the amalgam of nation with international. Ironically, the institutions that were to act as peace-keepers and bind the globe into one single entity provide no platform to these resistance movements and conflict to be portrayed in a genuine and authentic fashion as a result of which they remain underrepresented and on-going.

The very fact that the factors which have led to an increase in interconnectedness among nations (e.g. media) happen to be under the state jurisdiction helps nations to present a narrative that suits their interests whereas the other side gets completely muffled. As far as the information transmission across the borders is concerned media cannot be relied upon. The general understanding that global conglomerates can, at times, have a positive effect on the culture and conflict movements of a particular nation is also flawed. The stringent policies adopted by the states to check the quality of the information perforating out of their borders hamper to present a true and accurate picture of the ongoing unrest. Also, the commercial global media is also radical that it will respect no tradition, culture or even a conflict with a cause if it stands in its way of profits. In this regard economist Edward S. Herman and American public intellectual and linguist Noam Chomsky have put forward a 'propaganda model' as a framework for analyzing and understanding how the mainstream US media works and depends heavily on elite information sources, and participates in propaganda campaigns obliging elite interests. Even the non-conventional means of mass communication such as internet are under state regulation. Under such scrutiny, mass uprisings, in some nations, are often dealt with internet bans which fetter the mobilization of masses. This can be seen as a major attack on the rights of the people to assemble and agitate in peaceful ways. What is worth

noting is that amid such an internet ban and restricted access of international media into an area of conflict the state as an entity remains intact and the borders no more obliterated.

The entire rhetoric of globalization has been fervent regarding the creation of a borderless globe where everyone is given a platform and adequate representation however the entire process seems to have done more bad than good in terms of creating a peaceful world. This telescoping of a colossal planet both in terms of governance and mobility has given birth to bigoted organizations and policies which themselves become a reason for marginalizing certain sections of the population. With no avenues to present themselves on any global forum, violence thus becomes the only way out. Sometimes, these miniscule acts of violence become a global crisis and ironically, are left to these institutions to settle. The creation of a peaceful world therefore still remains a distant dream when globalization is to be blamed for annihilation of the indigenous socio-cultural fabric, increase in the gendered and other inequalities, creating consciousness of heterogeneity, not providing with either a policy or program to represent whole of the population it claims to now have been integrated.

I. REFERENCES

1. Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. London: Allen Lane, 1969.
2. Beyer, Peter. *Religion and Globalization*. London: Sage, 1994.
3. Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, 1990.
4. Mitter, Swasti. *Common Fate, Common Bond: Women in the Global Economy*. London: Pluto, 1986.
5. Stiglitz, Joseph. "The Promise of Global Institutions." In *The Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, by David Held and Anthony Mc Grew, 479. Polity Press, 2005.
6. Strange, Susan. "The Declining Authority of States." In *The Global Transformations Reader, An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, by David Held and Anthony Mc Grew, 128. Polity Press, 2005.
