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Aims and Objectives

We are living in a fast-changing and exciting world where companies produce international goods and the media carries news, images and cultural products across the globe in massive quantities in an instant. Trade goes across national boundaries, as can money with the click of a mouse. We can communicate instantly with people right across the globe and with travel, trade and tourism experience many cultures and national identities on a continuous basis. Politics also seems to be transforming with states seemingly having to cope with the shift of power to smaller units or to globalised forces such as capital, or global political organisations or alliances or social movements. The drive for profit and new technological developments make spatial distances less important and lead to the interpenetration and spread of cultures. All of this has consequences for our social and individual experiences and identities.

But what are we to make of all this? How can it be explained and what exactly is going on? Are we living in a globalised world? If so what aspects of our lives are affected by globalisation, how, to what extent and for how long has this been the case and why? Is it all as exciting and thrilling as the description above sounds or are there impositions of power and exacerbations of inequalities, conflict and violence which make the whole scene much less attractive? This is the aim of the Globalisation courses in the department – to investigate the causes, nature and consequences of globalisation.

Structure of the course

There are two Globalisation courses. The first in the autumn looks at concepts, history and perspectives on globalisation and then at the case of cultural globalisation.

The second, this term, looks at migration, the economy, inequality, politics and the future of globalisation in the spring, followed by essay supervision in the summer.

Spring 2012: Globalisation – Migration, Economy and Politics

Week 1 – Migration: causes and patterns of migration
Week 2 – Migration: effects of migration
Week 3 – Economy: production and finance
Week 4 – Economy and Inequality: trade and global inequality
Week 5 – Inequality: gender and globalisation
Week 6 – Politics: the decline of the nation-state and national social democracy?
Week 7 – Politics: global politics and cosmopolitan democracy
Week 8 – Global social movements and anti-globalisation

Week 9 – The Decline of American Power?

Week 10 – War and globalisation

Summer 2012

Dissertation supervision

Course evaluation

There will be a course evaluation questionnaire at the end of term for you to assess the course and teaching. It is anonymous and available online via Sussex Direct. The feedback is taken very seriously by tutors so please do help future students and us by filling it in. There may also be a week 5 feedback session. We also welcome your feedback, suggestions or criticism at any point in the course.

Lectures and Seminars

There will be a one hour lecture every week. There will then be a two hour seminar every week on the same topic. We will start straight away in week 1 and will be using all 10 weeks of term.

To prepare for your 6000 word undergraduate thesis you can write a 2000 word unassessed essay or an essay plan and submit this in week 8. You are entitled to up to 30 minutes feedback or help with this – this could be help while writing it and/or feedback on it after it has been marked. You can then use this feedback when you work on the 6000 word undergraduate thesis.

In the summer there will be supervision for your 6000 word undergraduate thesis. I will have office hours every week when you can come and see me about this.

Under each topic there are a list of questions to help with guiding your reading and seminar discussion. Think about how you would answer the questions when you are doing the reading and come along to the seminar with your own answers to as many of the questions as you can.

Reading

Reading every week is necessary to get a good understanding of the course. The seminars will assume you have done substantial reading each week and will be about the reading. You
should read two or three article or chapter length pieces each week. (A note, especially for V & E students - you don’t need to read all of the reading listed each week. More than is necessary is listed to help with availability, choice and essay writing).

Some weeks the reading is divided into main and further reading. Where this is not the case it is listed in rough order of priority.

There will not be a study pack as most of the weeks the reading is available online so everyone should be able to access it. This will save on paper and the save you the price of a study pack.

Unfortunately neither the library nor the department have the resources at present to check whether all books listed in course documents are stocked in the library. However I have checked that the main ones are and if you notice any others that aren’t please do let me know so I can order them.

These are some core books that are relevant to a number of the topics. You can see what these are below. They are also good introductions to the whole area if you wanted to read something before the course.


Frank Lechner and John Boli, *The Globalization Reader*, 2000, collection of many short extracts relevant to a number of the topics.


Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization: a very short introduction*, 2003, as it says, this is a very short introduction!


Robin Cohen and Paul Kennedy, *Global Sociology*, 2000, more relevant to a first year than third year level, but useful as a good basic introduction.

You will see that there are millions of books and articles on globalisation that have been published! So the reading list below is based on those I think you will find the most useful (or that I like best!). But there are many more and of course I have not been able to read the whole literature. So feel free to go beyond the reading on this list if you find other things you think look good and interesting.

**Journals and Electronic Journals**

Journals that are useful throughout the course include:

*Global Networks*

*Globalizations*

*Review of International Political Economy*

*Journal of World Systems Research*

*Millennium*

*International Studies Review*

But there are also many others that will be useful.

**Assessment**

The assessment weightings of courses (ie how much of your degree they are worth) match the credit weighting, and then are weighted so that the second year is worth 40% of your degree and the third year 60%. This course is worth 30 credits.

For this course the assessment will be a 6000 word undergraduate thesis to be submitted in the summer term. There is also a 2000 word non-assessed essay or essay plan for this Part
Il course which you can submit in week 8 of the Spring. You can write this on what will be your undergraduate thesis topic and have feedback on it.

Assessment Guidance

There are suggested essay questions on the course document below, but feel free to narrow, shorten or amend these or come up with alternative ones, as long as you check them with me first.

The emphasis in the assessment is on in-depth work appropriate for a specialist final year course. You should plan ahead and start work on the assessments at an early stage so that you don’t have too much to do all at the end.

During the course please feel free to ask at any time about any ideas you have for the essays or any advice you would like.

See below a ‘Guide to Essay Assessment’ and ‘Criteria for Essay Classification’. You should use these when writing your essays as a guide to the sort of things tutors are looking for when marking.

It is essential you read the handbook for candidates for rules and regulations on assessment.

Plagiarism

You should read the section on plagiarism in the ‘Handbook for Candidates’. The definition of plagiarism in the 2010-11 examinations handbook is as follows (but see the latest handbook for all up to date rules and definitions):

“Plagiarism is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of representing the ideas or discoveries of another as one’s own in written work submitted for assessment. To copy sentences, phrases or even striking expressions without acknowledgement of the source (either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate verbatim quotations), is plagiarism; to paraphrase without acknowledgement is likewise plagiarism. Where such copying or paraphrase has occurred the mere mention of the source in the bibliography shall not be deemed sufficient acknowledgement; each such instance must be referred specifically to its source. Verbatim quotations must be either in inverted commas, or indented, and directly acknowledged”.

Note that accidental as well as intentional plagiarism is penalised, and that plagiarism includes failure to use quotation marks around quotes and includes internet plagiarism. It includes using essays written by other people. Plagiarism is penalised, even if unintentional. You should also be careful to avoid ‘collusion’ which is also defined in the exams handbook.

The library web site has a good area on how to reference:
GUIDE TO ESSAY ASSESSMENT

Below are key questions which guide the assessment of your essay:

Structure and Quality of Argument
Is the essay plan stated in the introduction?
Is the overall structure of the argument clear and coherent?
Are the points made in a logical sequence?
Is the argument sufficiently analytical?
Is there a conclusion?
Does the conclusion address the essay question directly?
Is the conclusion adequately supported by the preceding argument?

Use of Evidence
Are the points made supported by evidence from cited sources?
Are the sources drawn on sufficient and appropriate?
If empirical evidence is used, is it described clearly and in appropriate detail?
Does the evidence presented support the conclusions reached?
Is the interpretation of the evidence presented appropriately qualified (i.e. avoiding overgeneralisations and sweeping statements)?

Contents
Is the writer's argument adequately backed up rather than just asserted?
Are the sources used subjected to analysis and critical reflection?
Has the student researched the topic sufficiently?
Are there any important omissions?
Has the student thought about what they have read or simply reproduced material from sources?
Is there evidence of critical thinking or an original synthesis?
Does the student have an argument?
Has the student gone beyond the essential reading?

Writing and Presentation Skills
Is the essay referenced correctly, including page numbers of passages referred to?
Are quotations and paraphrases of others’ work identified and fully referenced?
Are the ideas presented fully credited?
Is there any evidence of plagiarism?
Is the essay fluent and readable?
Is the grammar and spelling adequate?
Has the writer made an effort to use their own words?

Generic Assessment Criteria
Basis on which marks are awarded

0-19 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is far below the standard required at the current level of your degree programme. It indicates that the work is extremely weak and seriously inadequate. This will be because either the work is far too short, is badly jumbled and incoherent in content, or fails to address the essay title or question asked. It will show very little evidence of knowledge or understanding of the relevant course material and may exhibit very weak writing and/or analytical skills.

20-39 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is below, but at the upper end is approaching, the standard required at the current level of your degree programme. It indicates weak work of an inadequate standard. This will be because either the work is too short, is very poorly organized, or is poorly directed at the essay title or question asked. It will show very limited knowledge or understanding of the relevant course material and display weak writing and/or analytical skills. Essay work will exhibit no clear argument, may have very weak spelling and grammar, very inadequate or absent references and/or bibliography and may contain major factual errors. Quantitative work will contain significant errors and incorrect conclusions.

40-49 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is of an acceptable standard at the current level of your degree programme. Work of this type will show limited knowledge and understanding of relevant course material. It will show evidence of some reading and comprehension, but the essay or answer may be weakly structured, cover only a limited range of the relevant material or have a weakly developed or incomplete argument. The work will exhibit weak essay writing or analytical skills. It may be poorly presented without properly laid out footnotes and/or a bibliography, or in the case of quantitative work, it may not be possible to follow the several steps in the logic and reasoning leading to the results obtained and the conclusions reached.

50-59 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is of a satisfactory to very satisfactory standard at the current level of your degree programme. Work of this quality will show clear knowledge and understanding of relevant course material. It will focus on the essay title or question posed and show evidence that relevant basic works of reference have been read and understood. The work will exhibit sound essay writing and/or analytical skills. It will be reasonably well structured and coherently presented. Essay work should exhibit satisfactory use of footnotes and/or a bibliography and in more quantitative work it should be possible to follow the logical steps leading to the answer obtained and the conclusions reached. Arguments and issues should be discussed and illustrated by reference to examples, but these may not fully documented or detailed.

60-69 A mark in this range is indicative of that the work is of a good to very good standard for the current level of your degree programme. Work of this quality shows a good level of knowledge and understanding of relevant course material. It will show evidence of reading a wide diversity of material and of being able to use ideas gleaned from this reading to support and develop arguments. Essay work will exhibit good writing skills with well organized,
accurate footnotes and/or a bibliography that follows the accepted ‘style’ of the subject. Arguments and issues will be illustrated by reference to well documented, detailed and relevant examples. There should be clear evidence of critical engagement with the objects, issues or topics being analyzed. Any quantitative work will be clearly presented, the results should be correct and any conclusions clearly and accurately expressed.

70–84 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is of an excellent standard for the current level of your degree programme. The work will exhibit excellent levels of knowledge and understanding comprising all the qualities of good work stated above, with additional elements of originality and flair. The work will demonstrate a range of critical reading that goes well beyond that provided on reading lists. Answers or essays will be fluently-written and include independent argument that demonstrate an awareness of the nuances and assumptions of the question or title. Essays will make excellent use of appropriate, fully referenced, detailed examples.

85 - 100 A mark in this range is indicative of outstanding work. Marks in this range will be awarded for work that exhibits all the attributes of excellent work but has very substantial elements of originality and flair. Marks at the upper end of the range will indicate that the work is of publishable, or near publishable academic standard.

Marks may be reduced by up to 10% for inadequate referencing.

http://www.sussex.ac.uk/s3/ - Study Success at Sussex pages, brings together many of the most useful Sussex links on studying.

Contacts

Important information about the course may be sent to you by email (eg any changes to timetabling arrangements or information which supplements that in this course document). You should check your email every day.

The best ways of getting hold of tutors are either in their office hours or by email or phone. I will have office hours every week and will tell you when they are when the course starts. If you can’t make office hours you can email or arrange another time to meet up that is better.

Tutor and course convenor: Luke Martell, Friston, room 261, phone (67)8729, email l.martell@sussex.ac.uk

Department co-ordinator: Linda Cooper, Friston, LPS school office, room 121, phone (67)8890, email l.cooper@sussex.ac.uk.

Week 1: Migration – causes and patterns of migration
In this topic we will be looking at the global migration of people, something which also has implications for the last topic of last term, the globalisation of culture. Global migration has been happening for a long time and was very intense in the period before the first world war. There has also been a great deal of migration in the last 50 years, sometimes with implications for the cultural identity of societies and raising hard political questions about citizenship, inequality, power, racism, etc as well as having more positive consequences for new forms of cultural experience and interpenetration.

This week we will focus on causes and patterns of migration over time and recently. There are many causes of migration. As Castles and Miller show there have been changing trends and types of migration. For instance they identify trends as the globalisation of migration, acceleration, differentiation, feminisation and politicisation. These trends have resulted from a number of different types of migration with many different causes. Next week we will look more at the impact and reception of migration.

1. Why does migration happen?
2. What types of migration are there?
3. How has migration been different in different historical periods?
4. What types and patterns of migration were there in pre-modern periods, early and late modernity, before the 1st World War, after 1945, and since the 1980s.
5. What do Castles and Miller mean when they say main trends in migration have been globalisation, acceleration, differentiation, feminisation, and politicisation?
6. How is travel and tourism changing and what effect does that have?
7. Was migration more globalised in the past than now?
8. To what extent is migration just another aspect of neoliberal globalisation?

Main reading


David Held et al, *Global Transformations*, 1999, Ch. 6 looks at patterns of migration globally and historically.

Further Reading


Russell King, 'Migration in a World Historical Perspective', ch. 1 in Julien van den Broeck *The Economics of Labour Migration*, 1996, looks at global migrations historically with a focus on economic and labour migration.


Russell King, 'Migrations, Globalization and Place' in D. Massey and P. Jess eds *A Place in the World?*, 1995, similar to the above King chapter.


Anthony Messina and Gallya Lahav, *The Migration Reader*, 2006, recent collection with a political and policy slant. Parts 1 and 2 and ch 13 most relevant this week and Parts 3 and 4 most relevant to next week.


Thomas Faist, *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*, 2000, looks at ways in which migration leads to transnational spaces and links.


Robin Cohen, *Migration and its Enemies: global capital, migrant labour and the nation-state*, 2006, looks at the roles of these three actors in international migration.

International Migration Review, 40, 1, March 2006, special issue on gender and migration, other issues of this journal also useful for this week and next week.

J. Anderson and I. Shuttleworth, ‘A new spatial fix for capitalist crisis? Immigrant labour, state borders and the new ostracising imperialism’ in K. van der Pijl et al eds Global Regulation 2004, a critical perspective. See also chapters by Gabriel and Salter in the same volume.


Philip Marfleet, Refuges in a Global era, 2006, on the refugee dimension of migration.


Hélène Pellerin, ‘The Cart before the Horse? The coordination of migration policies in the Americas and the neoliberal economic project of integration’, Review of International Political Economy, 6, 4, 1999, sees migration as part of a neoliberal project of integration.


Useful Journals

International Migration Systems and Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies are useful journals throughout this and next week’s topics.


International Migration is a relevant journal published by the IOM (see below).

Ethnic and Racial Studies has many articles on migration, including some in special editions on the topic eg the edition 32, 1, 2009.

The journal Global Networks also has many articles on migration and diaspora.

See also the Journal for Refugee Studies
Websites

http://www.iom.int/ - International Organisation for Migration

http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/home/ - Oxford Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.


http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/ - Oxford Transnational Communities programme - relevant to this week, next week and also other parts of the course. Some useful resources here.

http://www.sussex.ac.uk/migration/ - Sussex Centre for Migration Research

http://www.migrationdrc.org/ - migration, globalisation and poverty site, with Sussex links, lots of useful resources and links.

http://www.childmigration.net/ - run by the above Sussex migration centre.

http://www.migrationinformation.org - site run by the Migration Policy Institute

http://www.unhcr.org - UN refugee agency

http://www.opendemocracy.net/blog/migrantvoice-on-refuge - Open Democracy debate on refugees

http://www.migrationpolicy.org/ - Migration Policy Institute

See also some of the reading for next week.

Essay Topics

NB For this topic and others feel free to shorten or narrow essay titles or suggest alternatives of your own, as long as you check them with me first.

‘While movements of people across borders have shaped states and societies since time immemorial, what is distinctive in recent years is their global scope, their centrality to domestic and international politics and their enormous economic and social consequences’. (Castles and Miller 2003: 2). Discuss.

Is global migration just another dimension of neoliberal globalisation?

Week 2: Migration – Effects of Migration
Different societies have had different ways of responding to migration and to adapting to the entry of migrant communities into their countries. There are many different migration systems (eg postcolonial, guestworker, assimilationist, multiculturalist, etc). And some forms of migration are very temporary (eg tourism) while others are more lasting.

Migration has all sorts of impacts on the economy, politics and the state, culture and identity, including national identity and culture, citizenship and belonging, welfare and public services. These are the sorts of areas we will be looking at this week. For some the impact of migration is problematic in such areas. We will be testing this and seeing if there may also be benefits for migrants and sending and receiving societies.

Do the globalisation of culture and the global migration of peoples lead to a loss of national identity? Do they also affect other identities? Is the ‘loss’ of identity the right way to look at it? Is migration a problem or a solution?

1. What effects does migration have?
2. How is migration received differently in different places and times
3. What do the following migration systems entail: classical/permanent, post-colonial, guestworker, imperial, folk/ethnic, assimilationist, multiculturalist, transnational citizenship (Castles and Miller)?
4. What are the effects of migration economically, politically, socially, culturally, on citizenship, on public services, on culture and identity? Is migration a problem or solution?
5. Does globalisation signal the beginning of the end for national identities
6. Are global or cosmopolitan identities replacing national identities?
7. Why does Scholte see national identities having strengthened because of globalisation? (See also Smith)
8. How might different sorts of national identities have grown as a result of globalisation?
9. What sorts of non-territorial communities have grown and why? (Scholte).
10. Is a global culture or identity possible? (Smith)

Also see last week’s reading, journals and websites.

**Main Reading**

Stephen Castles and Mark Miller, *The Age of Migration*, 2003 (also 1993 and 1998 editions), identify 8 migration systems. Chs 1 & 2 especially, but all is useful.

Introduction is online at [http://www.age-of-migration.com/uk/assets/pdfs/sample.pdf](http://www.age-of-migration.com/uk/assets/pdfs/sample.pdf)

Guardian articles on effects of immigration
John Wakeham - Lords report says benefits of immigration exaggerated - 1 April 2008 [http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/apr/01/immigrationpolicy.immigrationandpublicservices](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/apr/01/immigrationpolicy.immigrationandpublicservices)

Legrain replies to Lords report - 1 April 2008
Further Reading

Guy Arnold, *Migration: Changing the World*, 2011, on the consequences of migration across a range of different parts of the world.

Nigel Harris, *Thinking the Unthinkable*, 2003


Anthony Messina and Gallya Lahav, eds, *The Migration Reader*, 2006, political and policy angle, parts 3 and 4 most relevant to this week.


Paul Kennedy and Catherine J. Danks (eds), *Globalization and National Identities*, 2001, series of studies of the effects of globalisation on different national identities from 12 countries across 4 continents. People try to reaffirm their national identities in the face of globalisation, sometimes these disintegrate and make way for new ones in a way that can be disruptive, but also new hybrid identities can evolve.


Nina Glick Schiller et al eds, *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*, 1992


Daniele Joly, ‘Some Structural Effects of Migration on Receiving and Sending Countries’, *International Migration*, 38, 5, 2000, links effects with causes.


*Journal of International Development*, 18, 6, 2006, article by Mackintosh et al on impact of health workers’ migration from developing countries on the source countries, and by Appleton et al, similar theme but on teacher migration.

Also in *Journal of International Development*, 18, 6, 2006, article by Marina Della Giusta and Uma Kambhampati, 'Migrant workers in the UK: social capital, well-being and integration' focuses in gender and social capital angles.

Mariama Awumbila, 'Who Gains? Who is Drained? From worst cases to best practices' Heinrich Boell Foundation, looks at some of the issues of brain drain from developing countries, focusing on Ghana. [http://www.migration-boell.de/web/migration/46_1904.asp](http://www.migration-boell.de/web/migration/46_1904.asp)
Adrian Favell, 'Games without Frontiers? Questioning the transnational social power of migrants in Europe', *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie*, Winter 2003, XLIV, 3, questions whether poorer or more elite migrants have gained transnational power as claimed by some commentators.


Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska (eds), 2005, *International Migration Research*, a stocktaking of multidisciplinary research on international migration, especially chapters by Favell (see above) and Morawska on integration and assimilation.

Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization*, 2005, ch 7 on globalisation and identity (or community in the 2000 edition) looks at the effects of globalisation on national identities and other forms of identity. He says national identities have even strengthened sometimes, but non-territorial communities have also grown as have universalistic cosmopolitanism and hybridisation.

Anthony D. Smith, 'Towards a Global Culture?', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7, 1990, pp 171-91; also in Held and McGrew reader and in Mike Featherstone ed. *Global Culture*, 1990. Argues that national identities are not being swept away by global or cosmopolitan identities.


Sam Pryke, *Nationalism in a Global Age*, 2009, discusses whether globalisation has eroded national identity.

John Urry, *Sociology Beyond Societies: mobilities for the twenty-first century*, 2000, influential social theory perspective on mobilities of people and other things (ideas, images, things, money, etc) and their implications for social life and sociology.

Some of last week's reading will also be useful in parts.

**Essay Questions**

Is migration a problem or a solution?

Is transnational identity taking over from national identity?
‘All these ideal types have one factor in common: they are premised on citizens who belong to just one nation-state. Migrant settlement is seen as a process of transferring primary loyalty from the state of origin to the new state of residence … Transnational theory … argues that this no longer applies for growing groups of migrants who form transnational communities and maintain strong cross-border affiliations … social and cultural identities which transcend national boundaries, leading to multiple and differentiated forms of belonging’ (Castles and Miller 2003: 44-5). What are the implications of transnationality for identity and politics?

‘We are still far from even mapping out the kind of global culture and cosmopolitan ideal that can truly supersede a world of nations, each cultivating its distinctive historical character and rediscovering its national myths, memories and symbols in past golden ages and sacred landscapes. A world of competing cultures, seeking to improve their comparative status rankings and enlarge their cultural resources, affords little basis for global projects, despite the technical and linguistic infrastructural possibilities’ (Anthony D. Smith). Is it true that national identities are still as strong or even stronger in a globalised world?

**Week 3: Economy: production and finance**

For many sociologists the processes driving the sort of changes associated with globalisation are economic and technological. In this topic we will look at the extent to which the economy has become globalised and, if so, what effect this has on our ordinary, individual, social lives. Are the sort of other globalising changes actually based in economic relations which are the key driving force? Or is this too much of an economically determinist point of view?

Some analyses of the globalisation of the economy have to be compared to older ideas about the global spread of economic relations – such as those of Marx who talked about the internationalisation of capitalism, Lenin on imperialism and Wallerstein on world systems. How far do such older analyses adequately explain the nature of globalisation now? Does the presence of these older accounts show that there is nothing new in what has been going on recently in terms of economic globalisation? Or have things changed since then? Writers like Sklair, Rosenberg and Van der Pijl more recently suggest that capitalism structures globalisation, via, for instance, an international capitalist class, hegemonic states which promote neoliberal capitalism, and global consumerism.

We will focus on the globalisation of production – eg, multinational or transnational corporations, and dispersed production networks. How large have changes been in these areas, how much have states become subservient to them, and to what extent have these material changes caused changes in the rest of society? Key markers of economic globalisation are seen to be Multinational Companies or alliances and Foreign Direct Investment, with some big global industries dominated by such global companies. But just how globalised are these?

Finance is the area often most associated with globalisation and seen as the most
globalised, far more so than production where a lot of the main assets are seen to lie in a restricted area. Money can be transferred across the world at the touch of the button – capital mobility. It is also what is seen as having put states in a neoliberal straitjacket, having to follow policies that will attract globally mobile capital to their own countries and leading them to act as a ‘competition state’. This period of neoliberal globalisation based on capital mobility is generally seen to have been with us since the 1970s. It also incorporates ‘offshore’, where finance is beyond state regulation. The East Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s is said to be one instance which shows how precariously interdependent the world’s financial networks have become. And the financial crisis of 2007/8 is another.

What do sceptics like Hirst and Thompson have to say about the globalisation of production and finance – eg the extent of MNCs, trade and FDI and the capacity of state to pursue an alternative economic direction to neoliberalism. From a poststructuralist view how much has economic globalisation got to do with the discourse of globalisation as with globalisation itself?

This week we will focus on production and finance. Next week we will look at trade and at inequalities between richer and poorer parts of the world.

1. How has production been globalised?
2. What makes a company multinational or a multinational allliance? How significant are MNCs as an example of economic globalisation?
3. What do figures on FDI tell us about economic globalisation?
4. What did Marx have to say about economic internationalisation, Lenin about imperialism and Wallerstein on world system which explains economic globalisation?
5. In what way do Rosenberg, Sklair and van der Pijl explain globalisation as linked to capitalism?
6. How has finance been globalised? What are the consequences of this? What did the 2007/8 financial crisis involve and what does this tell us about globalisation?
7. In what ways is economic globalisation tied up with technological change? What technological changes have facilitated economic globalisation?
8. What problems are there with the idea we live in a globalised economy? What doubts are there that this is the case? (eg Hirst and Thompson).
9. Are other forms of globalisation (cultural, political etc) ultimately based in economic globalisation?

Main Reading

Peter Dicken, *Global Shift*, an accessible and clear, critical and balanced overview, less intimidating than it looks because many of the pages are tables and graphs. In the most recent 5th edition 2007 look especially (but not only) at chs 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13 all on the economy, TNCs, economic policies and finance. Companion website is at [http://www.sagepub.co.uk/dicken/](http://www.sagepub.co.uk/dicken/)
To access lecturer resources at this site username is Global Shift (drop down) and password is 9sh554f
David Held et al, *Global Transformations* 1999 ch 4 on global finance and ch 5 on corporate power and global production. Quite systematic, argue that globalisation has changed the economy more than sceptics claim but by radically transforming old structures rather than abolishing them altogether. Extract in Held and McGrew ch 25.

**Further Reading**

Malcolm Waters, *Globalization*, 2000 2nd edn chs 2 and 3 ‘Trading Places’ and ‘Open Spaces’ on first the international economy and then the global economy. In the 1995 1st edn it is ch 4 on economic globalisation.


Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization*, 2000, ch 5 ‘Globalization and Production’, accessible, balanced introduction says that globalisation has strengthened capitalism, facilitated profit making to new areas of the economy and led to changes in the structure of capitalism.


*Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 20, 1, 2004, issue on globalisation. Glyn argues against the idea that international economic integration has been proceeding faster.

Frank J. Lechner and John Boli (eds), *The Globalization Reader*, 2000, book of short extracts from readings, Part IV, some empirical illustrations of economic globalisation which look at Malaysia, Nike, women, the effects on the USA and the treatment of workers. See also chs 1-4 which differ on whether global markets are a good thing, ch 10 Wallerstein on world systems, and ch 11 by neo-marxist Sklair.

Wayne Ellwood, *The No-Nonsense Guide to Globalization*, 2006, by editor of the New Internationalist, relevant to this week and some of the subsequent topics also.


UNCTAD World Investment Reports often have data which is very relevant to this topic, on MNCs, FDI etc. [http://www.unctad.org/Templates/Page.asp?intItemID=1485&lang=1](http://www.unctad.org/Templates/Page.asp?intItemID=1485&lang=1)

[http://www.josephstiglitz.com/](http://www.josephstiglitz.com/) website of leading global economist, relevant this week and next week.

**Essay Questions**

Is the world economy globalised?

Is economic globalisation the cause of cultural and political globalisation?

‘The theory of the global system being developed here proposes that the primary agent in the political sphere is a still-evolving transnational capitalist class. The institutions of the culture-ideology of consumerism, as expressed through the transnational mass media, are the primary agents in the cultural-ideological sphere’ (Leslie Sklair). Discuss.
‘The present highly internationalized economy is not unprecedented…. [it] is less open and integrated than the regime that prevailed from 1870-1914… genuinely transnational companies appear to be relatively rare. Most companies are based nationally and trade multinationally… Capital mobility is not producing a massive shift of investment and employment from the advanced to the developing countries …. trade, investment and financial flows are concentrated in the Triad of Europe, Japan and North America… the G3, thus have the capacity, especially if they co-ordinate policy, to exert powerful governance pressures over financial markets’. Have Hirst and Thompson succeeded in debunking the myth of economic globalisation?

**Week 4: Economy and Inequality – trade and global inequalities**

Last week we looked at production and finance. This week we will look at a third area concerning the global economy, world trade. This area is often linked to debates about global inequality, a very contemporary issue we will also be discussing this week.

As we saw in the autumn term, when looking at premodern globalisation, transnational trade is ages old, and in the topics on culture we saw how the consumption that arises from trade has cultural implications for everyday life. There was premodern trade over long distances, global trade that expanded in imperialist ages, and the rolling back of trade in more protectionist times such as the inter-war years. World trade expanded after the 2nd world war and there are institutions such as the WTO whose aim is to liberalise and promote world trade, although not always successfully, with many actors still choosing to maintain protectionism where it suits them. One of the debates over global inequality is whether this is best tackled by opening up free trade (eg Wolf, Dollar and Kraay, the Washington Consensus, etc), or maintaining protectionism (or regionalism) in some areas to promote development (eg Wade, Kaplinsky). In many debates, free trade is basically what people mean by globalisation.

One important thing to distinguish when looking at global inequality is the difference between inequality and poverty as these are not the same thing and trends in both areas do not always go up and down in tandem. There are also issues about how you measure poverty and inequality best and what factors you include when measuring them. Even if you can agree on whether inequality or poverty are getting better or worse there are then differences on the extent to which globalisation is responsible. Dollar and Kraay are some of those who argue that the extension of free trade is the solution to poverty; and as you can see in the reading list below there are others who have responded to them who disagree. Some discussions are skewed by the remarkable growth in large countries like China and India. Many analyses have come to the conclusion that there are new stratifications in global inequality these days, partly because of the growth of such countries. The question is whether more globalisation is a solution to these inequalities, or whether globalisation is the problem.

1. What is trade? What historical forms of it are there?
2. What implications for culture does world trade have?
3. What factors have led to greater world trade or greater protectionism in different periods or places?
4. What changes in world trade have there been since 1945?
5. In what form do protectionist tendencies remain?
6. Inequalities of what? What sorts of resources are distributed unequally globally?
7. What is the Washington Consensus? How does it see global poverty being resolved?
8. What is the evidence on trends in global poverty? Is it getting better or worse?
9. What are the differences between trends in poverty and inequality globally?
10. What is the evidence on global inequality? Is it getting better or worse?
11. What new forms of stratification seem to be emerging in global inequalities?
12. Is more globalisation the solution to global poverty?
13. In what ways might globalisation make things worse?
14. In what ways could protectionism or regionalism be a solution?

**Main Reading**

Raphael Kaplinsky, *Globalization, Poverty and Inequality*, 2005, esp Pts I and III, outlines the problem and says that in some parts of the world an alternative to free trade is the solution.


There are a number of replies to Dollar and Kraay listed below.

**Further Reading**


World Bank, Globalization, Growth and Poverty, accessible report with a position similar to

Kraay responds to Nye et al at: [Link to Kraay’s response]

Dani Rodrik, ‘Comments on “Trade, Growth and Poverty” by D. Dollar and A. Kraay’. Another critique of Dollar and Kraay. [Link to Rodrik’s comments]


Francisco Rodriguez and Dani Rodrik, Trade Policy and Economic Growth: a skeptic's guide, *NBER Working Paper 7081*, a critique of studies that show openness leads to more growth, online at [Link to Rodriguez and Rodrik's critique]


Debate on Dollar and Kraay, *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2002, includes some criticisms and a reply by D & K, [Link to debate]


N. Birdsall et al, ‘How to Help Poor Countries’ The Nation, July/August 2005, argues that factors in development are as much internal as to do with liberalisation of the economy. [Link to Birdsall et al’s argument]

Jay Mandle, *Globalization and the Poor*, 2003, tries to steer a line between advocates and critics of globalisation as a solution to world poverty.


Ankie Hoogvelt, *Globalization and the Postcolonial World*, 1997 and 2001 editions, argues that in core-periphery relations social divisions have taken over from geographical ones, and that globalisation is a process of ‘involution’ rather than expansion, which involves exclusion rather than incorporation as in the past. Extract in Held and McGrew *Global Transformations Reader* first edn. ch 33.


Frank J. Lechner and John Boli, eds, *The Globalization Reader*, 2000, book of short extracts from readings, Part IV, some empirical illustrations of economic globalisation which look at Malaysia, Nike, women, the effects on the USA and the treatment of workers. See also chs 1-4 which differ on whether global markets are a good thing, ch 10 Wallerstein on world systems, and ch 11 by neo-marxist Sklair.


Guardian summary - http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/may/29/1


Peter Singer, *The Life You Can Save: acting now to end world poverty*, 2009, accessible look at some of the moral and philosophical issues to do with helping the global poor.

**Websites**

http://www.networkideas.org/
http://www.citizen.org/trade/
http://www.worldbank.org/
www.wto.org

**Essay Topics**

Is globalisation good for the poor?

Critically assess Dollar and Kraay's case that globalisation is good for global poverty.

‘Much of the discussion of global inequality assumes that there is a growing divergence between the developing world and the rich world, but this is simply not true. The most important development in global inequality in recent decades is the growing divergence within the developing world, and it is directly related to whether countries take advantage of the economic benefits that globalization can offer … If globalization proceeds, its potential to be an equalizing force will depend on whether poor countries manage to integrate themselves into the global economic system’. (Dollar and Kraay, Spreading the Wealth).

**Week 5: Inequality: gender and globalisation**

In the course so far we have touched on inequalities to do with economics and class and, to some extent, ethnic or cultural inequalities (eg in the experience of migration). We have looked less at gender inequalities that result from globalisation and this is a topic we will focus on this week.

The literature on this area has looked at the way that global restructuring and globalisation have had gendered effects, especially the consequences for women. Some of the research focuses on women in developing countries and their experiences of structural adjustment
policies or changes in the international division of labour.

Other parts of the literature look at the globalisation of some traditionally female dominated industries, such as sex work and domestic labour, the way these have changed with globalisation and migration, and the effects this has had on the lives of women involved in them. To some extent there is an emphasis in some work on the effects of the development of capitalism on women, as such focusing on the economic and capitalist causes of global gender inequalities.

Other parts of the literature have looked at the growth of a transnational and global dimension to the women’s movement, something that links with our later topic on global social movements.

- In what ways have studies of globalisation been gender-neutral?
- How have changes in production, trade and finance specifically affected women?
- What have been the gendered effects of development strategies, global free trade, MNCs, structural adjustment policies, and global organisations like the World Bank and IMF?
- How is globalising capitalism gendered?
- What is specific about unpaid labour and how has it been affected by globalisation?
- Why has globalisation led to women being drawn into the labour force?
- What industries and sorts of work have women tended to be drawn into? What have their experience of these forms of work been?
- How have women been drawn into informal and household work and what is specific about the experience of such spheres?
- Why have women been drawn into export production, sex work, domestic work by globalisation and what have their experiences been in such sectors?
- Why has female migration increased?
- How have changes to the nation-state and welfare state due to globalisation specifically affected women?
- Is globalisation ‘masculine’? What is gendered about organisations behind globalisation?
- How does the gender experience of globalisation cross-cut with other forms of stratification?
- How is women’s experience of globalisation contradictory? What benefits have there been for women?
- How has the women’s movement been affected by globalisation? What aspects of globalisation have led to the globalisation of the women’s movement?
- What problems are there with the literature on gender and globalisation?
- To what extent are problems identified to do with capitalism rather than globalisation?
- How specific are these problems to women?

There is no distinction between main and further reading here, but the reading is listed in rough order of priority.

And at: http://jwsr.ucr.edu/archive/vol5/number2/v5n2_split/jwsr_v5n2_moghadam.pdf

Critical Sociology, 30, 1, 2004. Special issue on gender and globalisation. Gottfried introduces the articles; Acker’s overview discusses the capitalist basis of gender inequalities in globalisation; others like Salzinger discuss specific case studies.

International Sociology, 18, 3, September 2003, special issue on gender and globalisation. Chow overviews some main themes; Pyle and Ward discuss women in global production networks; Moghadam discusses the women’s movement as global; see also other pieces.


Signs, 26, 4, Summer 2001, special edition on globalisation and gender with a more cultural/discourse emphasis.


Marianne Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds, Gender and Global Restructuring, 1999, looks at gendered experiences of global restructuring, and resistances.


Saskia Sassen, Globalization and its Discontents, 1998, chs 5 and 6, expert on global cities looks at gender experiences in these two chapters.

June Nash and Maria Fernandez-Kelly, eds, Women, Men and the International Division of Labour, 1984, discusses how the changing international division of labour affects gender inequalities.

Kamala Kempadoo and Jo Doezema, eds, Global Sex Workers, 1998, looks at women sex workers in the context of globalisation and migration and workers organisations.


Annette Fuentes and Barbara Ehrenreich, Women in the Global Factory, 1985, looks at women working for MNCs.


*International Migration Review*, 40, 1, March 2006, special issue on gender and migration


Special issues of these journals on international dimensions of gender inequality

Open Democracy section with a gender/global dimension
http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-fifty/debate.jsp

**Essay Topics**

Is globalisation gendered?

What is specific about women's experience of globalisation?

Are gender divisions in globalisation to do with capitalism or globalisation?

How has globalisation contributed to the global women's movement?

‘[W]omen have been incorporated into the global economy as a source of relatively cheap labor... The simultaneous emergence and expansion of formal and informal employment among women can be explained in terms of labor-market segmentation, various management strategies to extract surplus-value or increase profitability, and (thus far) the depressed status of unions. I have argued that the global economy is maintained by gendered labor, with definitions of skill, allocation of resources, occupational distribution, and modes of remuneration shaped by asymmetrical gender relations and by gender ideologies defining the roles and rights of men and women and of the relative value of their labor’. (Moghadam 1999). Discuss women’s experience of globalization in relation to a specific example.

**Week 6: Politics - The decline of the nation-state and national social democracy?**

In this topic the key questions are about the implications of globalisation for political life.
Historically nation-states are seen as the key political agents of the modern era, controlling national economics, social policy, law and the military. The globalisation argument nowadays is that many of these capabilities no longer hold. As we have seen already some argue that economies are no longer national and so no longer controlled by national governments. Social policy is limited by global constraints, laws are made by supra-national bodies and wars are no longer simply between nations (we will come back to war at the end of the course). Human rights, environmental problems, terrorism crime, etc are all seen as global issues in relation to which politics must be (or already is) organised globally. The nation-state has declined. And we have also seen how some people see our cultural identities as less and less simply national (making allegiance to the nation-state more problematic). To what extent then does it make any sense to see the nation as the key level at which political power is held? In real empirical terms what powers have been lost by nation-states and to whom?

One area in which debates have focused especially is on the prospects for national social democracy. Social democracy is traditionally associated with high taxes, high public spending, large welfare states and a working class base, all of which are seen to have been eroded by globalisation or made impossible due to the pressures of mobile international finance. These are said by some to have led governments (like New Labour) to construct neoliberal ‘competition states’. Some of the reading and questions below focus on whether national social democracy is no longer viable under globalisation because of the rise of the ‘competition state’.

There are, of course, various points of view. Some argue that the key new forms of politics are in fact regional or subnational rather than national or global. Others suggest that nations are unevenly affected by the globalisation of politics (ie some more than others), or even that they are the key actors in it and ultimately benefit rather than losing from it. Others say that nations at new levels (eg smaller nations, sub-nations or diasporic nations) have been encouraged by globalisation or that nationalism has grown as a response to globalisation. And social democracy is seen to work very well in some places which are very globalised and the neoliberal competition state to be something we think we have to go along with, rather than something we really have to.

Next week we will discuss whether global regulation, global governance, a global form of government or cosmopolitan democracy (eg Held) are realistic possibilities for the future.

1. What does it mean to say that the nation-state is sovereign?
2. What global and supra-national (and sub-national) forces are said to have undermined the sovereignty of nation-states?
3. What examples are there of the growth of INGOs and IGOs and what state functions have passed on to these?
4. In what way are environmental and social problems global and how do they require global rather than national action to solve them?
5. How has human rights been globalised and how did this start off?
6. How might cultural globalisation undermine political globalisation?
7. To what extent is the emergence of similar sorts of nation state world wide actually an example of globalisation?
8. Why has globalisation led to the ‘competition state’? What pressures from neoliberal globalisation are there on the state?
9. Why do nation-states choose to adopt a competition state model and is this the only path that is possible under globalisation?
10. Is national social democracy made impossible by globalisation and the pressure to neoliberal competitiveness?
11. Is there any evidence against the competition state thesis?

Reading

The reading this week has been organised not by ‘main’ and ‘further’ but more according to types of debate, as described below.

1. The first few readings are on the whole (if not all) more recent, focus mostly on the issue of social democracy and the neoliberal competition state, and are mostly (but not entirely) sceptical about this thesis:

   Layna Mosley, ‘Globalisation and the state: still room to move?’, New Political Economy, 10, 3, September 2005, neat, compact article that says states still have ‘room to move’ under globalisation and do not have join a ‘race to the bottom’. Online at: http://www.unc.edu/~lmosley/NPEmosleyfinal.pdf


   Eric Shaw, Losing Labour’s Soul?, 2008, introduction especially sections page 5 onwards on globalisation (which outlines the competition state thesis) and varieties of capitalism (which raises some doubts about it). This book focuses on New Labour and social democracy.

   Tore Fougner, ‘The State, international competitiveness and neoliberal globalisation: is there a future beyond “the competition state”’, Review of International Studies, 32, 2006, says that the state does not have to be a competition state in response to globalisation and that the pressure to be so is more a product of neoliberal hegemony than something necessary.


   Evelyn Huber and John D. Stephens, ‘Globalisation, Competitiveness and the Social Democratic Model’, Social Policy and Society, 1, 1, 2002, argue that globalisation does not compel states to become neoliberal competition states and that in fact social democracy is a better model under globalisation in many ways, including in terms of competitiveness.

   Colin Crouch, Post-Democracy, 2005, more pessimistic and sociological perspective, says the decline of the working class and rise of the global firm has led to political elites being oriented around links with business at the expense of social democracy. See also his Fabian Society publication Coping with Post-democracy, 2000.

2. Mostly (if not entirely) older reading on the decline of the nation-state and globalisation more generally:

Larry Ray, *Globalization and Everyday Life*, 2007, chapter 3 ‘Beyond the Nation State?’, critical assessment of the thesis that globalisation has undermined the nation-state, with an emphasis on sociological themes.

Peter Dicken, *Global Shift*, in the 5th edition chs 6, 7 and 8 on state responses to economic globalisation.

James Fulcher, ‘Globalisation, the nation-state and global society’, *Sociological Review*, 2000, more general article that says globalisation has not undermined the nation-state, in fact quite the opposite in some ways.


Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalization*, ch. 3 'After the Nation-state'.

David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*, 2003 edn., Part II on the reconfiguration of power. Readings from those who see the nation-state in decline and the rise of global politics and some who see the nation-state as still the key building block in world politics.

David Held et al, *Global Transformations*, 1999, ch 1 on the nation-state and global politics, ch 8 on environmental problems as global.

Manuel Castells, *The Information Age: economy, society and culture*, 3 volumes, 2004 second edn., takes a network/ information society perspective, volume II, ch. 5 focuses on the nation-state as a powerless state or a network state.

Malcolm Waters, *Globalization*, 2001, second edition, ch 4 on the international politics and ch 5 on globalizing politics. Also ch 8 on criticisms of globalisation especially the sections on the elaborating state and Americanisation. 1st edn ch 5 on political globalisation.

David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order*, 1995, chs 4, 5, and 6 discuss the effects of
international and global factors on national politics.


Jan Aart Scholte, Globalization, 2005, ch 6 on globalisation and the implications for national governance, ch 11 on limits of our readiness for global democracy, and ch 12 on a more humane sort of global politics.


Linda Weiss, ‘The state augmenting effects of globalisation’, New Political Economy, 10, 3, 2005, says that globalisation enables as much as constrains the state.

Susan Strange, The Retreat of the State: the diffusion of power in the world economy, 1996, esp ch 1, also in Held and McGrew reader ch 12, argues that governments are losing authority and power in face of world markets so leaving a gap of ungovernance.

Sylvia Walby, ‘The Myth of the Nation-State’, Sociology, 37, 3, 2003, says that nation-states are myths, there are more nations than states, they are sometimes empires, there are other forms of polity (eg supranational), and polities overlap. Tries to emphasis gender and ethnicity more.

Essay Questions

Is social democracy impossible in a global era?

Has the nation-state been undermined by globalisation?

‘Nations benefit, in aggregate terms, from trade and financial openness, but openness forces them into competition with one another. Competition reduces governments’ abilities to provide goods and services to their citizens and renders governments more accountable to external economic agents than to citizens. This hypothesis implies not only a convergence of national policies, but also a convergence toward the lowest common denominator’. (Mosley 2005). Discuss.

‘Today it seems that the heads of governments may be the last to recognise that they and their ministers have lost the authority over national societies and economies that they used to have. Their command over outcomes is not what it used to be. Politicians everywhere talk as though they have the answers to economic and social problems, as if they are really in charge of their country’s destiny. People no longer believe them’. (Susan Strange). Discuss.

‘Members of the global corporate elite do nothing so blatant as taking away our right to vote…. They merely point out to a government that, if it persists in maintaining, say,
extensive labour rights, they will not invest in the country. All major parties in the country, fearing to call their bluff, tell their electorates that outmoded labour regulation must be reformed. The electorate then, whether conscious of the deregulation proposal or not, duly votes for those parties, there being few others to choose from’. (Crouch 2005: 33). Does corporate globalisation mean that governments have little choice but to follow the interests of business?

Week 7: Politics - Global Politics – cosmopolitan democracy

Last week we looked at the idea that politics at national level may be less important than it used to be and more subject to global forces. Many authors argue that politics needs to be (or already actually is) organised at a more global level. People like David Held and Ulrich Beck are keen advocates of a global or what is sometimes called ‘cosmopolitan' democracy. This is seen to be more appropriate to problems such as environmental damage, economic regulation, crime, terrorism, human rights, war etc. It is also seen to be based on more global and cosmopolitan senses of citizenship amongst people and a greater culture of shared risk or responsibility in the world that has grown in what Beck calls the ‘second age of modernity’.

However cosmopolitan democracy is not without its critics. Marxists emphasise conflict more than global commonality, realists say that cosmopolitan democracy underplays the continuing role of states and hegemonic power in world politics, liberals and pluralists have worries about individual rights and freedoms where there is a world government. Sociologists sometimes question whether there is a global culture and sense of citizenship or responsibility in society that could underpin global government.

1. Why is a global democracy said to be necessary, according to its advocates?
2. In what way does global politics already exist?
3. How has a cultural, social or citizenship basis for global cosmopolitan democracy grown?
4. In what ways is there a global consciousness which provides the basis for cosmopolitan democracy? What does Beck say about World Risk Society or Risk Consciousness in this regard?
5. Where does cosmopolitan democracy relate to human rights according to advocates like Beck?
6. Why does Beck advocate war for peace, or humanitarian war and how adequate is his analysis here?
7. What limits are there to the possibility or desirability of global cosmopolitan democracy?

Reading is listed in rough order of priority. Quite a few of Held’s contributions say similar and overlapping things, so if you’ve looked at one or two of his maybe skip on to a different author.


Fine, Robert, Cosmopolitanism and Violence: Difficulties of Judgement. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57, 1, 2006, based on philosophical sources, says there are ambiguities in cosmopolitanism but defends it. See also his 2007 book *Cosmopolitanism*.

*British Journal of Sociology*, 57, 1, 2006, special edition on Cosmopolitanism.

Robert Holton, *Cosmopolitanisms*, 2009, especially but not only ch. 6 on legal and political aspects of cosmopolitanism.

Danilo Zolo 1997 *Cosmopolis: Prospects for World Government* and 2002 *Invoking Humanity: War, Law and Global Order*, two strong critiques of cosmopolitan democracy written in relation to the first Gulf War and the Kosovo war respectively.

David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*, 2000, Part VI looks at whether global governance is a possibility for the future.

Ulrich Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision*, 2006, esp chs 4 and 5, advocates global cosmopolitan democracy, discusses its critics, and its relation to issues such as war and human rights.


Ray Kiely, ‘Comment: the global Third Way or progressive globalism?’, Contemporary Politics, 8, 3, 2002, criticises the third way view of global political intervention.


Anthony McGrew, The Transformation of Democracy?, 1997, conclusion (which is also in Held and McGrew reader) outlines the main issues, part II discusses whether democracy can re-establish regulation at new levels in a global world, eg in human rights, over MNCs, in the EU in the UN. Accessible book. See also McGrew at http://www.polity.co.uk/global/transnational-democracy-theories-and-prospects.asp

David Held, Democracy and the Global Order, 1995, Part IV advocates a global cosmopolitan democracy


Jan Aart Scholte, Globalization, 2005, ch 11 on our unreadiness for global democracy, and ch 12 outlines a humane form of global politics.


Chris Brown, ‘International Political Theory and the Idea of World Community’ in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds) International Relations Theory Today, 1995, also in Held and McGrew reader ch 42, discusses whether there can be a world community that would form the basis for world government.

Robert Holton, Globalization and the Nation-State, 1998, ch. 5, says that global politics exists but nations and states are still important.

David Held et al, Global Transformations, 1999, ch 1 on the nation-state and global politics, ch 8 on environmental problems as global.

Paul Hirst, War and Power in the 21st Century, 2001, includes a critique of cosmopolitan democracy.

**Essay Topic**

Critically assess the cases for and against cosmopolitan democracy.

‘Transnational states are thus strong states, whose power to shape politics develops out of cooperative answers to globalization. This is why they may be treated as ‘realistic utopias’ … Against the mental block of the national political monopoly, and against the nightmare vision of an imperial world state whose claim on power could never be escaped, this reformulation
and reformation of international political space is intended to facilitate a complex architecture of sovereignty and identity’. (Beck 2000: 108-9). What does Beck mean by cosmopolitan democracy and how convincing do you find his case for it?

‘Some [argue] that everyday political events demonstrate that any form of transnational democracy is an impossible dream. For our part, we believe, despite being aware of the cynical and often brutal methods which characterize many foreign policy decisions, that the extension of democracy to the international sphere is not only desirable but also feasible – in fact more feasible than at any previous historical moment’. (Archibugi and Held 1995: 8). Discuss.

**Week 8: Global social movements and anti-globalisation**

Ideas of globalised power have brought about discussions of corresponding features in oppositional movements – some of the most significant of these are now organised at a globalised level in civil society. To what extent is, or can, oppositional and protest politics be organised globally? What examples are there of this and what do these tell us about the politics of global civil society? How are we to make sense of the anti-globalisation or anti-capitalist movements? What other examples are there of global social movements?

This topic will focus on the more grass-roots, radical side of things which is usually neglected but offers interesting alternatives. Some types of network coordination are more institutionalized, like the World Social Forum, and, on the other hand, some like the network Peoples’ Global Action is trying to keep a more radical, horizontal, maybe even anarchist nature. More recent examples include the Occupy movement.

Readings vary from those like Graeber, Gill, Holloway and mason that are very sympathetic to global civil society protests and see them as exciting and mould-breaking new forms of non-state politics. Those like Scholte have more critical and sceptical contributions to make. Others like Kaldor and Worth and Abbott are sympathetic, but see the picture as complex and open and can see a variety of both progressive and reactionary possibilities.

**Characteristics**

* What is the anti-globalisation movement opposed to? What are its main concerns?
* What elements are there to the anti-globalisation movement? What is it composed of?
* In what way is the anti-globalisation movement anti-globalisation or not? What is global about the anti-globalisation movement?
* How are GSMS about life/ identity/ symbolic issues but also materialist/ economic/ political movements? How does this relate to distinctions made between old social movements and new social movements?
* What characteristics have examples such as the Seattle protestors, the Zapatistas and Occupyhad?
* In what way do GSsMs involve non-western inputs more than previous internationalisms or SMs?
* What have the internet and NCTs got to do with GSsMs? What is their class basis? Who are
the ‘precariat’?
* How has Gramscian analysis been used to explain the antiglobalisation movement? Why is it significant that Gramsci has been such an influence? What are the dangers of transformismo?
* In what way is the anti-globalisation movement ‘anarchist’?
* What is ‘prefigurative’ about the anti-globalisation movement?

Evaluation
* Is it a movement? Is it too diverse and fragmented to be a movement?
* What is it in favour of? Is it only oppositional with no positive alternative agenda?
* What are the political dangers of being too fragmented and not having enough of a positive agenda, and how might the reactionary right or governing forces exploit this?
* If there is a positive coherent agenda, what is it?
* What has the impact of the anti-globalisation movements been? Is it right to say it has been very modest in policy terms?
* What are the limits of the anti-globalisation movement?
* Is it a global movement? In what ways may it be less than global?
* In what way do global social movements provide an example of ‘network’ organisation?
* How do criticisms of global social movements match with criticisms of the global civil society literature?
* Is it the face of progressive politics in the future?

Reading
Paul Mason, Why it’s Kicking off Everywhere: the new global revolutions, journalists account of recent global protests and uprisings, taking into account communications technology and the social composition of the movements, 2012


Further Reading
Alessio Lunghi and Seth Wheeler, Occupy Everything: Twenty Reasons why it’s Kicking off Everywhere, 2012

David Harvey, Rebel Cities: from the right to the city to the urban revolution, section II on rebel cities, 2012


Anarchist defends 'anti-globalisation' movement against criticisms that it is against globalisation, is violent and has no positive agenda.


In the same issue of *Millennium* see:
- J. Aart Scholte 'Cautionary reflections on Seattle', critical piece warns that the global civil society protests should not be overestimated or over-romanticised.
- M. Kaldor 'Civilising Globalisation? The implications of the Battle in Seattle' outlines some of the changing political cleavages that the Seattle protests brought out.
- Fred Halliday 'Getting Real about Seattle' says that historically it is not social movements that have changed things, that the anti-globalisation movement lacks both agency and structure and that states and democratic governance are what is important.


O. Worth and J. Abbott, 'Land of False Hope? The contradictions of British opposition to globalisation', *Globalizations*, 31, 1, March 2006, using Britain as a case study, they argue that anti-globalisation is diverse and includes reactionary as well as progressive elements. The latter need to recognise the role of reactionary elements and develop more of an alternative agenda.

DIY-world area on the *Open Democracy* website with many articles on the World Social Forum and other related global fora and activities. [http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-world/issue.jsp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-world/issue.jsp)


Dense use of Marxist concepts by Zapatista supporter to outline a non-state perspective. There are many reviews and discussions of this book on the internet that a web search will bring up. For instance see the debate with Callinicos at [http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=8520](http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=8520)


Pierre Bourdieu, *Firing Back*, chapter titled 'Against the Policy of Depoliticisation', section on 'An Open-ended Co-ordination', good brief outline of aspects of GSMs by key radical French sociologist


J. Boli and G. Thomas, *Constructing World Culture: international nongovernmental organizations since 1875*, 1999.

Helmut Anheier et al (eds), *Global Civil Society* annual volumes include data on aspects of global politics especially on INGOs and also articles on global social movements and civil society.

*New Left Review* articles on the ‘The movement of movements?’ in various editions from issue 9 onwards, including articles by Klein, Wallerstein and others.

http://www.nadir.org/nadir/initiativ/agp/ - peoples' global action site

http://www.nadir.org/nadir/initiativ/agp/free/wsf/ - one of a number of World Social Forum sites

**Essay Questions**

Are anti-globalisation movements just negative and lacking coherence?

Are anti-globalisation movements new and different from previous forms of social movement?

What is the relation of anti-globalisation movements to globalisation?

Do you see anti-globalisation movements primarily as reactive or is there a

**Week 9: The Decline of American Power: from US to Europe or Asia?**

In this topic we will look at the question of hegemony and power in the world order of the 21st century (not just political power – economic, military and cultural power also). During the 20th century the hegemony of one world power – the British empire – declined and was surpassed by American power. In the postwar period the world was divided between two superpowers – the USA and Russia – and the cold war between them. As well as an East-West divide there was a North-South divide, cross-cut with East-West cold war conflicts; or, for some observers, a world split into core, periphery and semi-periphery.

After 1989 some saw the world order as changing from a bipolar to a unipolar one. More recently characterisations of the world order as a ‘triad’ have emerged and forces in Europe and Asia (especially China) have been seen as challenges to American power. Some have seen the new global order as involving the ‘end of history’ (with the ideological triumph of liberal capitalism) or a ‘clash of civilisations’ (with cultural clashes replacing ideological ones).

There is the possibility of new superpowers arising or the world becoming more multilateral.
Will America remain the world’s leading superpower or is it in decline with other powers rising to take its place? Why might American power decline? What global order might follow its decline?

There have been some important writings on American power. Cooper sees America as a modern state, in counterposition to premodern states (like failed states) and postmodern states (as in Europe). This is not unlike Kagan’s view (from a more neocon perspective) of the USA as the global Mars while Europe is more like Venus, stemming from two different psychologies to do with strength and weakness, in which US strength is needed and will continue. Nye thinks the US is a hegemonic power but needs to use soft power more and hard power less. Mann sees the US as a failing imperial state. There is much discussion of what might replace the USA if it loses its pre-eminent global position, maybe a world without a hegemonic power, or perhaps China or Europe.

**Main Questions:**
1. How is American power exercised and why?
2. In what way is American power a sociological issue?
3. What is the difference between pre-modern, modern and postmodern states? (Cooper).
4. How have the US and Europe ended up like Mars and Venus, and is this desirable or likely to endure? (Kagan).
5. What does Nye mean when he says the US needs more soft power rather than hard power?
6. Is Mann right that the US is a failing imperial state?
7. Is American power in decline? If so, why? What will replace it? If not, why not?
8. Will Europe or China or some other entity be the next superpower?

**Some Further Questions:**
9. What are the differences between state-centred, multilateral (or multipolar), global, dualist, hegemonic, imperialist, triadic models of the political world order?
10. Which of these labels best captures the current or emerging world political order and does that make it globalised?
11. Is globalisation, rather than one of these other categories, the best one for describing modern global politics?
12. What is the best way of characterising the distribution of power in the current and emerging world order?
13. To what extent does the new world order involve ‘the end of history’ (Fukuyama) or a ‘clash of civilisations’ (Huntington) or ‘Jihad versus McWorld’ (Barber)?
14. What problems are there with the ‘end of history’ and ‘clash of civilisations’ theses?

**Main Reading**

David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi, *American Power in the 21st Century*, 2004, a reader on this theme including extracts from some other authors on this reading list, eg Kagan, Cooper, Mann, Nye.
Robert Kagan, *Paradise and Power*, 2003, view from the Right says that the histories of Europe and America have led them in diverging paths, the former is weak and the latter is strong and must use its power, if necessary unilaterally. See also his piece in Held and Koenig-Archibugi. See online version at http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3460246.html

**Further Reading**

Joseph Nye, *The Paradox of American Power*, 2002, post-9/11 liberal book argues that America cannot go it alone and has to rely on soft power as well as hard power. See also his more recent Soft Power. See also his piece in Held and Koenig-Archibugi.

Michael Mann, *Incoherent Empire*, 2003, says US imperialism is militarism but otherwise incoherent and making the world a more dangerous place. See also 'The First Failed Empire of this Century' in Held and Koenig-Archibugi and also in *Review of International Studies* 30, 4, October 2004.


Robert Cooper, *The Breaking of Nations*, 2003, especially Part I describes a world order of premodern states, modern states and postmodern states in which the USA's position is not yet clear. Earlier version published as *The Postmodern State and the World Order*, Demos, 2000 which is online at: http://www.demos.co.uk/files/postmodernstate.pdf. See also his piece in Held and Koenig-Archibugi.


Barry Buzan and Rosemary Foot eds *Does China Matter?* 2004 collection of articles assessing whether China's importance has been overestimated.


Peter Nolan, *China at the Crossroads*, 2004, on the challenges facing one contender for the next superpower, argues China needs to follow a third way between state and market.


Jeremy Rifkin, *The European Dream*, 2004, says Europe is taking over from America as the world's next superpower.

Timothy Garton Ash, *Free World: why a crisis of the West reveals the opportunity of our time*, 2004, says American and Europe need to work together. See also [http://www.freeworldweb.net/](http://www.freeworldweb.net/)

David Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, 2003, discusses the rise of the USA's coercive approach in maintaining its role.


Stephen Haseler, *Super-State*, 2004, on Europe's challenge to America and the effects of this on the US.

Mark Leonard, *Why Europe will run the 21st century*, 2005, short book says Europe's inclusive and oppositional approach is better suited to influence than the USA's.


Paul Hopper, *Living with Globalization*, 2006, chs 5 and 6 on China and USA. Also 2-4 on Europe and global terrorism.

Hutton-Desai debate on whether China needs to be more westernised to be successful [http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=8174](http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=8174)

Will Hutton, 2007, *The Writing on the Wall: China and the West in the 21st Century*


[http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-americanpower/debate.jsp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-americanpower/debate.jsp) - articles on the topic on the Open Democracy website.

Vladimir Putin on American power
http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2007/feb/13/comment.russia

US National Intelligence Council Report on decline of US power
http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/nov/20/barack-obama-president-intelligence-agency

The Economist Oct 2009, special report on China and the US
http://www.economist.com/specialreports/displayStory.cfm?story_id=14678579

Guardian series on China at the Crossroads
http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/series/china-at-the-crossroads

Essay Topics

Is American power in decline?

What are the main threats to American power?

‘Cosmopolitan America has an affinity with Amnesty International … American mega-power throws its weight behind the global realization of human rights and democracy’ (Beck 2006: 125). Discuss.

‘The problem is that the United States must sometimes play by the rules of a Hobbesian world, even though in doing so it violates European norms. It must refuse to abide by certain international conventions that may constrain its ability to fight effectively in Robert Cooper’s jungle. It must support arms control, but not always for itself. It must live by a double standard. And it must sometimes act unilaterally, not out of a passion for unilateralism but, given a weak Europe that has moved beyond power, because the United States has no choice but to act unilaterally’ (Kagan). Discuss.

‘The question remains whether the means have focused too heavily on hard power and not taken enough account of soft power’ (Nye). Discuss.

‘[E]ffective power requires a combination of four more specific powers: ideological, economic, military, and political. Most regimes wield unequal combinations of them, and some regimes may be quite light on one or two of them. But the new imperialists relied overwhelmingly on military power alone – and indeed on only one part of military power, offensive firepower – and this is insufficient to create Empire’ (Mann in Held and Koenig-Archibugi: 52-3). Discuss.

Week 10: War and globalisation

War was a major feature of the 20th century especially in Europe but also globally, with the first and second world wars. In this topic we will also look at power and military conflict in the
21st century. Are wars about nations and national territories still or are there other bases for the conflicts of the 21st century.

Held et al discuss the globalisation of war over the centuries through the spread of military technology globally (the arms race), the impact of wars on a global scale (eg imperial powers in conflict, the world wars), international alliances and the mobilisation of global resources for war, the cold war and the political repercussions of wars. There are many perspectives on the shape that war and peace has taken after the cold war, about who is the most militarily powerful, who fights who and over what, the development of military technology and the effects this has, the development of security agreements, and the governance of arms and security. Others focus on the future of war, the RMA, WMDs and what new sources there will be for conflict and between whom.

One perspective is that rich societies are now ‘post-military’ (Shaw). Another is that there has been a shift from more total old wars to new wars which are carried out in new ways with new objectives (Kaldor). New wars are sometimes linked to cosmopolitan ideas about humanitarian intervention (Kaldor, Beck). For some the new military conflicts will not be between states and new threats to security are not only military. For others quite old wars are likely to continue throughout the 21st century as a consequence of environmental problems and over resources, with states still important (Hirst). For some, wars will no longer be between democratic states but with (or within) weaker states or non-state or non-national actors. The globalisation of the arms trade and the proliferation of arms will change where military threats come from.

1. How have military relations and actions been globalised? Is war now more global and less national?
2. How has the arms trade and the proliferation of arms changed? What effect does this have on the origins of military threats?
3. How has war changed?
4. Are wars now new wars?
5. Is cosmopolitan democracy the solution to new wars?
6. What form are future military conflicts likely to take? What will people fight over? And who will fight who?

**Main Reading**


Paul Hirst, *War and Power in the 21st Century*, argues that wars are still quite old, states the main actors and that the new wars will be resource wars driven by the consequences of global warming.

See also his article here: [http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-war_on_terror/article_180.jsp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-war_on_terror/article_180.jsp)

Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars*, 1999, discusses changes in war in the era of globalisation.
Further Reading

Tarak Barkawi, *Globalization and War*, 2006, good book that draws the connections between war, globalisation and society.

Mary Kaldor, ‘Old Wars, Cold Wars, New Wars and the War on Terror’, *International Politics*, 42, 4 2005.

Mary Kaldor, *Global Civil Society: an answer to war*, 2003, ch 5. Discusses network warfare, spectacle war and neo-modern warfare as types of new war to which the answer is international humanitarianism.

Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and New Wars*, 2001, links new wars to issues of development and governance.

Ulrich Beck, *Cosmopolitan Vision*, ch 5, War is Peace, sees new wars as about cosmopolitan humanitarian intervention.

Martin Shaw, *The New Western Way of War: risk transfer war and its crisis in Iraq*, 2005. Western states minimise risks to their own soldiers and displace it on to civilians, where casualties are explained as accidents, but this strategy brings its own political risks. Conclusion online at: [http://www.martinshaw.org/newwesternwayofwar6.pdf](http://www.martinshaw.org/newwesternwayofwar6.pdf)

Other writings by Shaw on related issues are at: [http://www.martinshaw.org/](http://www.martinshaw.org/)

Martin Shaw, *Post-Military Society*, 1991, looks at sociological aspects of war and argues that wars are less total now and societies demilitarised.

Zygmunt Bauman, 'Wars of the Globalization Era' *European Journal of Social Theory* 4, 1, 2001,

Naomi Klein, 'Forget the Green Technology - the hot money is in guns', *The Guardian*, 30 November 2007, states are investing in military technology to protect them from reactions to them as a result of the environmental problems they cause, rather than in solutions to the problems. [http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,2219566,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,2219566,00.html)

Max Boot, 'The Paradox of Military Technology', *The New Atlantis*, Fall 2006, discusses the new technologies and whether they maintain asymmetry or not.

Herfried Münkler, 2005, *The New Wars*, on a similar theme to Kaldor’s work.


Robert G. Patnam, ed, *Globalization and Conflict*, 2006, collection on how the national security state is becoming more not less important under globalisation.


**Essay Questions**

Are new wars different to old wars?

How is war changing?

Has war been globalised and do the solutions to it need to be global?

‘The end of the Cold War probably meant the end of wars of the modern type – wars between states and groups of states, like the World Wars or the Cold War, in which the aim, to quote Clausewitz, was “to compel an opponent to fulfil our will”’. (Kaldor 2003: 119). Discuss.

‘Perhaps the most hopeful approach to the contemporary problem of controlling war, today, is through the extension and application of international humanitarian law (the ‘laws of war’) and human rights law’. (Kaldor 2003: 128). Discuss.
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Hope you enjoyed the course!