

# AL-SHODHANA

ISSN : 2320 - 6292



*A Multi Disciplinary Refereed Research Journal, vol.1 No.2 July,2013*

Title	Page
<b>HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES</b>	
1. The Contentious Domain of Globalization and the Salience of Welfare State - <i>Rose Veera D'Souza</i>	19-36

## **THE CONTENTIOUS DOMAIN OF GLOBALIZATION AND THE SALIENCE OF WELFARE STATE**

Rose Veera D'Souza

### ***Abstract***

*The world has witnessed transformative changes from the last quarter of the 20th century that many regard as paradigmatically different from the earlier phases. These changes are associated with a process called globalization. The process of globalization has gained ground in such a way that very few states are left with any option other than opening up their economy and society to the impinging world. These developments have a special bearing on the developing countries of the world. The dominant discourse of globalization supported swift changes integrating these societies into a world markedly different from the ways they were accustomed to or familiar with. They have made many states particularly in the developing world, redefine their role and create opportunities for the market, new technologies and hitherto unfamiliar interactions and exchanges, or face the danger of being left out. The article attempts to understand the forces of globalization in order to assess its profundity. As such, an effort is made here to understand those aspects*

*of globalization that have their bearing on state that stood as a big supportive welfare state. The discourse and trends of globalization are discussed to acquire a wider perspective on processes affecting contemporary social relations. Is globalization old or new? Is it inevitable? Does globalization help mitigate social and economic inequalities? What are the factors that influence globalization and who are its beneficiaries? These become imperative questions if we wish to assess the salience of welfare state under globalization.*

**Keywords:** Globalization, Welfare, Periodisation, Social Relations, Intensification, Asymmetry,

---

**Dr Rose Veera D'Souza** Associate Professor, Dept of Political Science, St Aloysius College, Mangalore, [roseveera69@gmail.com](mailto:roseveera69@gmail.com)

Three major developments of recent decades have altered the economic, political and ideological context of the welfare state- the globalization of economy, the relative decline of the state and the collapse of socialism. These major developments essentially form the changed economic, political and ideological context of welfare state.

Over the last three decades, the forces of globalization have been influencing the political, social and cultural milieu of the nation-state. It is true that the policies and institutions that the state had nurtured over the years have entered a crisis period. Economic factors have played a major role in this transformation. Nonetheless, this process of transformation encompasses social, political and cultural factors that along with economic and technological links increasingly tend to affect territorial, legal and political spheres that the state nourished for decades.

## **SITUATING GLOBALIZATION**

How do we situate globalization? There are multiple discourses on this issue. Discourses need to be taken seriously as social practices attempt to construct reality.<sup>i</sup> One of the dominant discourses of our time revolves around a phenomenon that they identify as globalization. In the process they advance a particular understanding of this phenomenon. Globalization is explained as the construction of a new reality by the dominant global markets which make "individual actors, companies, agencies and nations" powerless. There are others who see several versions of globalization and distinguish between new and old.

While some feel that globalization is a discordant and highly uneven process others argue that it is coherent, all encompassing and inevitable. Some trace the antecedents of globalization to earlier centuries. Matthias Finger identifies seven steps of the development of globalization.<sup>ii</sup> He traces globalization back to Christianity or Judeo-Christianity, as the first step of globalization. This step suggests the 'unity of God' or unity of religion and the relationship of individual to God. As such, God is presented as one, or a 'global God'. The second step of globalization is the 'global rationality phase' which brings back the erstwhile unified God to temporal existence with the claim that paradise could be created on Earth due to science and corresponding technological engineering. He finds the third step expressed in colonialism with its processes of scientific exploration, evangelization, economic exploitation and military conquest. The next three steps of globalization are linked to revolutions, like the French Revolution, Industrial Revolution and the two-world wars and the cold war. The French Revolution brought nation-states into existence and paved the way for the emergence of an autonomous responsible citizen with defined relationship to political organization. Industrial Revolution developed rationality of the individual and the world wars and cold war furthered the process of industrial growth. Linking all these steps to these historical antecedents Finger locates the seventh step of globalization to the present globalization, marking the world from 1960s.

Finger's linear version is not the sole version of this kind. Other versions of its kind abound. *The World Bank Policy Research Report (2001)* also speaks of the 'three waves of globalization'. It suggests that the period between 1870-1914 as the first wave of global integration characterized by falling costs of transport, the reduction in tariff barriers and the dramatic increase in flow of goods, capital and labour. It argues that the total flow of labour in the first wave had been estimated to be 10 per cent of the total population and the export as a share of world income doubled to about 8 per cent.<sup>iii</sup> The share of foreign capital stock of developing countries is stated to have grown from 9 per cent of their income in 1870 to 32 percent of their income in 1914. The second wave of globalization is considered to have taken place from 1950-1980, with the integration of the economies of the rich countries. This phase is considered as the golden age of industrial countries. It was marked by integration of the OECD bloc and a spectacular reduction of poverty within them. The third wave of globalization is

traced to 1980s onwards. It is marked by technological advance in transport and communication. It witnessed spiral growth in technology, integration of trade and a large number of developing countries opened up to foreign trade and investment with increased participation in global trade and took measures to liberalize their economies.

The report argues that historically none of the earlier developments before 1870 can be termed as globalization. According to the report the first wave witnessed a combination of falling transport costs, such as the switch from sail to steamship, and reductions in tariff barriers. Cheaper transport and the lifting of barriers encouraged the utilization of abundant land. Advancement through railways also helped in creating better economic opportunities. However, all these major developments did not sustain for a long time. Though there was a substantial increase in flows of trade due to reduced cost of transport in 1870, between 1914 and 1945 trade had fallen back to the 1870 level.<sup>iv</sup>

The report correlates such a reversal to the great depression, and the two world wars. Though the report considers the integration of the OECD countries in the second wave as significant, such an integration cannot be compared to the convergence that globalization displays today. Seeing globalization in several versions makes the present avatar of globalization as the logical continuation of the developmental process that has been carried on through the various phases of history. They smack of historicism and an underlying evolutionism mark the way they construct their period. Most of them make the west the anchor of the process reducing the rest of the world to passivity. Suggesting, globalization as phenomenon of the past does not allow us to comprehend the intensity of globalization that came to mark this process from the beginning of 1970s. Moreover, globalization is not a linear process and periodization of globalization can never be definitive. Often such an explanation tends to nullify the phenomenon before us and argues that it is similar to any other historical phase.

As such, the above perspectives evade the holistic or multilevel perspective that becomes important to analyze globalization, as a distinct process extending over territories, people and ideas. Though the World Bank report emphasizes the distinctness of the present wave of globalization yet it ends up to be a parameter at best to analyze contemporary context that changed the international scenario

just as the continuation of industrial growth. Moreover, such an explanation only seems to accommodate economic globalization that was the landmark of earlier phases. Globalization, at present, encompasses all spheres of human existence: political, social, cultural. They play as much an important role as the economic sphere.

Often Marxist and post-colonial writers, trace globalization to colonialism and argue that colonization that took place from the 16th century onward, is the systematic extension of the European civilization model on to the new world.<sup>v</sup> Scholars like, Vandana Shiva and Wallerstien subscribe to the view that globalization is a continuation of the imperialistic process that was carried forward through colonialism. Such a perspective, believes that the imperialistic patterns have been continued through new imperialism by Europe and American expansionism. In such a viewpoint the present globalization, becomes a replication of colonialism or at best its extension. Similar perspectives are extended by, world system theorists who maintain that the expansion of European capitalism marks the start of globalization.<sup>vi</sup>

Seeing globalization as a continuation of colonialism does not help to see the new ways in which the former process articulates nation with class, nations and cultures. Further the kind of centrality around which the colonial project was mooted and carried out by colonial powers can hardly be said to be central feature of globalization.

Discourses on globalization link it to varied phases of the 20th century also. Economic historians like Williamson argue that globalization emerged somewhere before the 1930s, as the turn of the 19th century registered accelerated growth in international trade and investment which declined during World War I and the Great Depression. Globalization is also traced to the end of World War II with the coming of nuclear age, the emancipation of colonies and the renewed expansion of trade.<sup>vii</sup> Scholars argue that globalization was set into motion during the beginning of the Cold War. "It was simply unfortunate that this period of great tension and superpower rivalry of nearly 45 years masked this process."<sup>viii</sup> In the book *Re-imagining Political Community*, edited by Daniele Archibugi, David Held and Martin Köhler, it is suggested that the processes of globalization are connected to the end of the Cold War and the assertion of democracy as the sole legitimate

system of governance. These attempts at the historical periodization of globalization may help to claim that globalization is old. However, these claims would not be validated as the present processes of globalization witness stupendous changes that extend to social, economic, political and cultural spheres which could hardly be attributed to the phases suggested by the above scholars. Historical antecedents of globalization, may at the most, help us identify certain tendencies of globalization but not to explain the characteristics of the process as a whole. They fail to explain the pace and scale of globalization which cuts across the dimensions of space and time.

Cumulatively these attempts to historically situate globalization boil down to the following query: Is globalization old or new? Such a query leads itself to either the 'all-change' or 'all-continuity' debate. The 'all-change thesis' suggests that globalization is entirely a recent historical turn. It suggests that the complex of globalization is entirely new in terms of its intensity, scale and scope. The 'continuity thesis' pursues the chronology and periodization of globalization, suggesting globalization as old.<sup>ix</sup> Sometimes, it tends to locate the antecedents of globalization to many centuries back in history as we have seen in the phases outlined by Finger.

If we understand globalization as a mode of large-scale interaction then, such a process can be traced to the past quite easily. But the central characteristics of globalization may not be captured by such interactions. Therefore David Held says 'spread of world religions, the huge development of empires in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the stretch of the British Empire, global cultural and economic phenomenon are not new. But there have been different historical forms of globalization, and the contemporary conjuncture is new.'<sup>x</sup>

Many people feel that the supra territoriality had its substantial beginning in the middle of the 19th century. The telegraph lines and the later development of trans-border telephone connections; radio communications and intercontinental air transport of 1919 have been located in the latter half of the 19th century and first half of the 20th century. However, the present phase of accelerated globalization can be only traced to increasingly proliferating global relations which began to take place in 1970s. As such, the earlier trans-territoriality can never be the same compared with the heightened supra territoriality witnessed today since the latter

half of the 20th century. Even the globalization of markets in the present phase is distinct with its digital computers, advanced telecommunications and electronic mass media. Hence, it can never be subsumed within the kind of marketing that existed in the late 19th and beginning of 20th century. Then marketing was limited to a few products and the sale was limited to a few countries. The transoceanic cables began to be laid in 1956, direct dialing between countries was in 1963 and that helped connectivity through the trans-world direct-dial telephone to over 200 countries in 1990.<sup>xi</sup>

Financial globalization with free flow of capital, with free market ideology of liberalization, deregulation and privatization is distinctly new. Admittedly, there has been always 'footloose' capital and nation- states have often been dependent on the co-operation of international financiers, but the changes that have taken place in the recent decades are quite distinct.<sup>xii</sup> Moreover in traditional trade, agriculture, mining and manufacturing played a predominant role. Globalization changed the phase of trade through 'electronic financial transactions', flows of images and sounds.<sup>xiii</sup>

The markets have developed exponentially in supra territorial coordination of distribution, promotion and sales activities only in the later part of the 20th century. Trans-border production processes and associated intra-firm trade gained substantial proportions only in this period. Moreover, many service industries entered global production during this phase as electronic finance initiated deterritorialization of money. Trans-world institutions also expanded in their competence, membership staff and budget in the last 40 years. Thus, since 1960s, even globality rose continually and inclusively to the large sections of humanity. Marking splendid technological expansion and market mobilizations globalization has become an autonomous process only in recent years.

Globalization in an economic sense derives particularly from a progressive reduction in transaction cost. However, the level and pace of global economic interactions is quantitatively much more than earlier phases of change. It has gone beyond economic dimensions spreading through political, cultural and environmental influences. The present global integration is also qualitatively different from the past because of the scale, intensity and rapidity of the processes involved. Globalization today has brought forth contradictory trends with varying

degrees of pressures on state, society and economy, as was never the case with the supra territorial reach of the past.

The term "globalization", had been first used around 1960 in its world-wide sense.<sup>xiv</sup> The rise of supra-territoriality extending to communications, organizations, trade, finance, ecology and consciousness, across widely dispersed locations simultaneously and their moving between places anywhere instantaneously became its characteristic. In these interrelated spheres globalization unquestionably is a phenomenon of recent decades.<sup>xv</sup>

Restricting the process of globalization to recent years does not necessarily ignore its earlier mappings, however inadequate they may seem today. In fact such mappings help us to see the complexity and nuances of this process better. Media references to globalization became very wide over the last two decades. But, its origins lie in the work of many nineteenth and early twentieth century intellectuals, from sociologists such as Saint-Simon to students of geo-politics such as Mackinder, who identified how modernity was integrating the world. It was only in the 1960s and early 1970s that the term globalization had actually been used.<sup>xvi</sup> In the academic circle the phenomenon of globalization became very significant only about a decade or so.<sup>xvii</sup> In the suggested earlier phases of globalization supra territoriality communications markets production, finance, organization, and social ecology as understood today were not present and the global consciousness touched very few minds. Even among that minority, globality was just a passing and not a focal thought.<sup>xviii</sup>

The magnitude, complexity and speed of globalism also distinguish globalization from the earlier periods. Thomas Friedman calls it the 'democratization of technology, finance and information, as diminished costs have made the erstwhile luxuries available to a much broader range of society'.<sup>xix</sup> The growing transactions and organizational connections across national boundaries is the cornerstone of globalization. Globalization began to take a popular stance in the mid-80s when it began to replace the terms like 'inter-nationalization' with 'transnational' and 'multinational', to refer to the increasing and intensifying networks of cross-border human interaction. International often meant to explain the relationship between nation-states. Robert J. Holton suggests that transnational

comprises the processes that somehow stand above or beyond national jurisdiction or control. And, multinational implies the enterprises operating in many countries and can switch activities among them. Multinational is the preferred term in the academic circles today to explain the processes of globalization.<sup>xx</sup>

## **GLOBALIZATION AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS**

If globalization is a destructive development, irreducible to the processes central to the preceding phases, how do we identify its central characteristics? There are strong contestations regarding the central features of globalization as there are with situating it historically. Generally, globalization implies growing interdependence of regimes and nations, markets and economies, technologies and modes of development impinging upon one another. It also involves intensification of interrelationships of nations and regions. Such intensification is manifest in trans-border interconnectedness in social economic, political and cultural sphere. These features suggest an epoch-defining set of changes that are radically affecting social and economic relations and institutions in the present century. On account of these developments there is a widespread feeling that the very nature of 'world politics is changing'.<sup>xxi</sup>

David Held defines, globalization as a process resulting in cross-border flows of goods, services, money, people, information and culture.<sup>xxii</sup> Three features of these flows are noteworthy. Jan Aart Scholte distinguishes them as, a) increase in cross-border relations, b) increase in open border relations c) increase in trans-border relations.<sup>xxiii</sup> These developments make the impenetrable borders of sovereign states much more porous.

The developments highlighted above profoundly mark social relations and one can discern a trend whereby 'social relations become less tied to territorial jurisdictions'.<sup>xxiv</sup> Having said this we need not rush to the conclusion that social relations under conditions of globalization have to be necessarily dislocated from their local and national contexts. Locality and trans-locality both may get entwined in the articulations of social relations. It comes through in Anthony Giddens characterisation of globalization as 'the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring across space and vice-versa'.<sup>xxv</sup> He regards globalization as 'distanciation', between space and time. For him, globalization is accompanied

with the intersection of presence and absence, the interconnectedness of social events and social relations "at a distance", with local contextual ties' which he calls 'distanciation'.<sup>xxvi</sup> He argues that globalization is not a single process but a

complex of processes which often act in contradictory ways, producing conflicts, disjunctures and new forms of stratification.

We have suggested earlier that information and technology play major roles in articulating globalization. David Harvey and James Mittelman see in the process a 'compression' of space and time, a shrinking of the world.<sup>xxvii</sup> In fact distant places and duration may acquire a sense of here and now and simultaneity like at no time before. Similarly the relationship between hither-thither, now-after may undergo profound transformation. Political Scientist Robert Gilpin defines Globalization as the "increasing interdependence of national economies in trade, finance and macroeconomic policy."<sup>xxviii</sup> Globalization immensely influences cross-national flows of goods, investment, production and technology begetting 'deepened international interdependence'.<sup>xxix</sup> This implies that a development in any corner of the world can have far-reaching consequences elsewhere and neighbourhoods may become strange and distant.

Sociologist Roland Robertson considers globalization as "both the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole."<sup>xxx</sup> The process of globalization may be accompanied by the encounter of new ideas, fusion of culture and ideas and even hybridisation of cultures and practices. Sociologist Martin Albrow defines globalization as the "diffusion of practices, values and technology that have an influence on people's lives worldwide."<sup>xxxi</sup> Albrow and Robertson refer to 'both the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as whole'. This emphasizes the growing intensity of globalization in the meaningful aspects of societal life including the world images. Both Albrow and Robertson include the political and cultural ideas like human rights, global environmental concern, cosmopolitanism which according to them, support a single humanity. In this sense globalization for them entails 'an essential and inevitable part of the human condition'. For one thing, 'globalization becomes a reference point to those who reject it and also to those who celebrate it'.<sup>xxxii</sup> Globalization suggests a single social field that implies a social world within which social interaction and social change of various kinds take place. Robertson rightly summarizes globalization as process by which a single global field has come to exist with other components which includes particular localities indicating nations, communities and individuals.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

Many people have noted the impact of globalization on the economy without necessarily being sensitive to the new institutions and processes it inaugurates. Critics have seen in globalization the emergence of a 'supra-national', borderless global economy with its own laws of movement, encapsulating and subordinating the various local economies in a worldwide division of labour, reducing national government into municipalities. The other softer version of the concept, considers globalization less as an end-stage and more as a process in which the international economy integrates more closely, with domestic economic agents increasingly oriented to the global market rather than to particular national markets, even as the state continues to remain central to national economic advancement.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Globalization necessarily leaves its mark on the political order and state structures that people have been attuned to including the 'welfare state'. It is a process in which a number of historical world societies are necessarily brought into interaction with one another.<sup>xxxv</sup> It highlights the deepening as well as the broadening of political process, in the sense that local regional, national international and global events constantly interact. While the state and the political system are affected by it, there is also the internationalization of the state and the political processes that simultaneously take place. David Held has argued that, globalization is distinctively new international order involving the emergence of a global economic system that extends beyond the control of single state (even of dominant states). He argues that globalization does not lead to 'the end of state' but in some fundamental respect, it leads to a more 'activist state'.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

In a way, globalization is a unique experience. It is an action at a distance; it makes actions of social agents in one place to have significant consequences for distant others. Through time-space compression, an instantaneous electronic communication takes away the constraints of distance and time on social organization and interaction. It has accelerated interdependence among national economies and societies and thereby leads to the shrinking of the world. It has made borders and geographical barriers fragile to socio-economic interaction. Globalization undoubtedly has provided a fillip to global integration; it initiates the reordering of interregional power relations, crafts a consciousness of the global condition and leads to interregional connectedness.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

The interplay between the medium and the message makes some to view globalization not as reality but a concept of reality. At the same time others argue that globalization is a glaring reality that has impact on almost every aspect of human life.

Debates on globalization, suggest that it is a process far from uniform. It is deeply divided, incomplete, discontinuous, contingent, and in many ways a puzzling and contradictory process.<sup>xxxviii</sup> The direction in which it is heading is uncertain.<sup>xxxix</sup> All of it, however, makes it a distinct phase of collective human predicament having its bearing on the way we have organized our collective life. Therefore, its bearing on the welfare state too is undeniable.

### **IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON WELFARE**

There is a mixed response to the impact of globalization on the concerns of welfare. It is widely accepted today that globalization has raised economic growth, spread technology, and has contributed to better living standards, in both developing and developed countries. A question is often asked as to whether the rapid growth of cross-border economic, social, technological, and cultural exchange is 'civilising, destructive or feeble'?<sup>xl</sup> Further it is important to ask the questions, whom does it benefit and how does it affect structures and institutions extending support to the disadvantaged.

It is assumed that more integrated economies tend to grow faster and the integration process of economies under globalization benefits poverty reduction. Free flow of capital across the border leads to enormous benefits to the countries involved, in gaining better opportunity of investment and employment, effective use of savings, higher economic growth, better administration etc.

At the same time, the adverse impact on concerns of poverty, equality and social justice have been considered alarming under globalization. Globalization encourages a mechanism of the preponderance of the market over state and as such the erosion of local cultures and prepares the ground for growing economic inequalities. Critics frequently allege that globalization 'increases unemployment' 'worsens working conditions', for those people who retain waged jobs, and thereby threatens social cohesion.<sup>xli</sup> Though it is not possible to clarify such an allegation

given the economic and historical nature of trans-border production, it is possible to draw evidence that contemporary globalization is linked to growing income inequalities and greater job insecurity.<sup>xlii</sup>

It has been argued that globalization reflects the 'political project of an identifiable constellation of dominant social forces' and it is 'politically problematic and contestable'.<sup>xliii</sup> With its free market philosophy globalization is concerned with increasing global wealth without having concern for its just and equitable distribution and has an adverse effect on the welfare state. Critics say that the New Right neo-liberal economic policies attack the post-liberal welfare policies pushing the affected more and more to the margins. Those who view globalization as significant for political economy ignore its implications for welfare states and as such, the welfare functions and activities of the states are ignored altogether.<sup>xliv</sup>

Globalization inherently supports asymmetry as equality in the international market is impossible to build as it requires equal competence. The foreign capital often displaces domestic capital. What is beneficial to the global capitalist need not prove good to the peasant, worker, trader and small entrepreneur. Moreover, the marginalized countries lack capital and as such integration does not benefit them.

There is a question mark today on welfare activities that are the core of human development. In this context it would be good to review the debate of welfare state vis-à-vis advocacy of rights, as its principal rationale is equality and justice for the marginalized sections. The welfare state has been the public policy in a large part of the world after World War II. The contentious character of globalization towards welfare state is visible when it comes to public policy. The collapse of the socialist alternative and the changing character of the nation state both have worked with serious consequences on the concept of welfare state especially in developing countries. The debate on the viability of welfare state under conditions of Globalization hence requires to be placed significant.

## Note:

<sup>i</sup> See, John Clarke, "Globalization and Welfare States: Some Unsettling Thoughts", in Robert Sykes, Bruno Palier and Pauline M. Prior, eds., *Globalization and European Welfare States: Challenges and Change*, New York: Palgrave, 2001, p.25.

<sup>ii</sup> See, Matthias Finger, "People's Perspectives on Globalization", *Development*, vol. 40, no.2, June 1997, pp.15-16.

<sup>iii</sup> See, World Bank, A World Bank Policy Research Report -*Globalization, Growth, and Poverty: Building an Inclusive World Economy*, 2001, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002, p.3.

<sup>iv</sup> It is argued that despite reducing cost of transport, the concerned countries followed increased trade barriers due to "beggar-thy- neighbour policy". As a result, trade did not revive. Ibid., p.24.

<sup>v</sup> Cited in, Finger, *op. cit.*, p.16.

<sup>vi</sup> See, Mauro F. Guillen, "Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble?: A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social-Science Literature", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 27, 2001, p.3.

<sup>vii</sup> See, Robert Gilpin, *The Political Economy of International Relations*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987, pp.341-344.

<sup>viii</sup> Quoted from, Graham Gerard Ong, "Globalization and Its Impact on UN Structural Reform", [http://www.sspp.net/archive/papers/4\(1\)ong.htm](http://www.sspp.net/archive/papers/4(1)ong.htm).

<sup>ix</sup> Such a distinction is made by Jan Aart Scholte. See, Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Macmillan Press, 2000, p. 62.

<sup>x</sup> See, Paul Hirst and David Held, 2002, "Globalization: the Argument of Our Time", <http://www\Welfare state\openDemocracy.htm>.

<sup>xi</sup> See, Jan Art Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Macmillan Press, 2000, p. 75.

<sup>xii</sup> See, Peter Evans, "The Eclipse of the State? Reflections on Stateness in an Era of Globalization", *World Politics*, vol. 50, no. X, 1997, pp. 62-87.

<sup>xiii</sup> Citing an example in this context Jan Aart Scholte says, "...less than 5 per cent of foreign exchange transactions in the 1990s is directly connected to trade between countries in 'real goods'." See, Jan Aart Scholte, "Global Capitalism and the State", *International Affairs*, vol. 73, 1997, p.436.

<sup>xiv</sup> See, M. Waters, *Globalization*, New York: Routledge, 1995, p.2. Also see, Scholte, *op. cit.*, 2000, p. 74.

<sup>xv</sup> See, Scholte, *op. cit.*, 1997, pp. 431-32.

<sup>xvi</sup> See, David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds., *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000, p.1.

<sup>xvii</sup> See, Anthony Giddens, *Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998, p. 28.

<sup>xviii</sup> See, Scholte, *op. cit.*, 2000, p.65.

<sup>xix</sup> See, Thomas Friedman, *Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux, 1999, p.50.

<sup>xx</sup> See, Robert J. Holton, *Globalization and Nation-State*, London: Macmillan Press, 1998, p.10.

<sup>xxi</sup> See, Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And So What?)", *Foreign Policy*, 2000, p.104.

<sup>xxii</sup> See, David Held, Anthony G. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton, *Global Transformations*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999, p.16.

<sup>xxiii</sup> See, Scholte, *op. cit.*, 1997, p. 430.

<sup>xxiv</sup> Ibid.

<sup>xxv</sup> See, Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Stanford: Stanford University, 1990, p.64. Also see, Anthony Giddens, *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*, Oxford: Polity Press, 1994, p.4.

<sup>xxvi</sup> See, Giddens, *op. cit.*, 1990, p.64.

<sup>xxvii</sup> See, Guillen, *op. cit.*, 2001, p.3.

<sup>xxviii</sup> Quoted from, Gilpin, *op. cit.*, 1987, p.389.

<sup>xxix</sup> See, Scholte, *op. cit.*, 1997, p. 430.

<sup>xxx</sup> Quoted from, Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage Publications, 1992, p.8.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Quoted from, Martin Albrow, *The Global Age*, Stanford: Stanford University, 1997, p.88.

<sup>xxxii</sup> See, Holton, *op. cit.*, p.16.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Ibid., pp.16-17.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> See, Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson, *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, pp. 7-16.

<sup>xxxv</sup> See, Modelski George, "Globalization", in David Held and Anthony McGrew, eds., *op. cit.*, 2000, p. 55.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> See, David Held, "Regulating Globalization? The Reinvention of Politics", in Anthony Giddens, ed., *The Global Third Wave*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001, p. 395.

<sup>xxxvii</sup> See, Held, et al., *op. cit.*, 1999, pp. 429-431.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> *Ibid.*, 431.

<sup>xxxix</sup> Cited in, Nicola Yeates, *Globalization & Social Policy*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001, p. 4.

<sup>xl</sup> See, Albert O. Hirschman, "Rival Interpretations of Market Society: Civilizing, Destructive, or Feeble?", *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 20, pp. 1463-1484.

<sup>xli</sup> See, Scholte, *op. cit.*, 1997, p. 435.

<sup>xlii</sup> *Ibid.*, p.436.

<sup>xliii</sup> Cited in, Atul Bharadwaj, "Understanding the Globalization Mind Game", *Strategic Analysis* vol.27, n0.3, July-September, p.310.

<sup>xliv</sup> See, Nicola Yeates, *Globalization & Social Policy*, London: Sage Publications, 2001, p.1.

## REFERENCES:

- Albrow, Martin, (1997): *The Global Age*, Stanford, Stanford University
- Amin, Samir, (1997): *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization: The Management of Contemporary Society*, New Delhi, Madhyam Books
- Basu, Kaushik, (Ed.), (2004): *India's Emerging Economy: Performance and Prospects in 1990s and Beyond*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press
- Bhaduri, Amit and Deepak Nayyar, (1996): *The Intelligent Person's Guide to Liberalization*, New Delhi, Penguin Publications
- Bhagwati, Jagdish, (2004): *In Defense of Globalization*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press
- Bharadwaj, Atul, (2003): "Understanding the Globalization Mind Game", *Strategic Analysis* vol.27, no.3, July-September, pp.309- 331.
- Burden, Tom, Charlie Cooper and Steph Petrie, (2000): *'Modernising' Social Policy: Unraveling New Labour's Welfare Reforms*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited
- Clarke, John, (2001): "Globalization and Welfare States: Some Unsettling Thoughts", *Globalization and European Welfare States: Challenges and Change*, Edited by Robert Sykes, Bruno Palier and Pauline M. Prior, Palgrave, New York, Palgrave

- Dworkin, Ronald, *Taking Rights Seriously*, (1999): New Delhi, Universal Law Publishing
- Evans, Peter, (1997): "The Eclipse of the State? Reflections on Stateness in an Era of Globalization", *World Politics*, vol. 50, no. X, pp. 62-87.
- Finger Matthias, (1997): "People's Perspectives on Globalization", *Development*, vol. 40, no.2, pp.15-16.
- Friedman, Thomas (1999): *Lexus and the Olive Tree*, New York, Farrar Straus and Giroux.
- Giddens, Anthony, (1994): *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*, Cambridge, Polity Press
- \_\_\_\_\_, (Ed.), (2001): *The Global Third Way Debate*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, (1990): *The Consequences of Modernity*, Stanford, Stanford University, 1990 Anthony Giddens, (1994): *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics*, Oxford, Polity Press,
- Gilpin, Robert (1987): *The Political Economy of International Relations*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, pp.341-344
- Guillen, Mauro F., (2001): "Is Globalization Civilizing, Destructive or Feeble?: A Critique of Five Key Debates in the Social-Science Literature", *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 27
- Held, David and Anthony McGrew, (Eds.), (2000): *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Anthony G. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton, (1999): *Global Transformations*, Stanford, Stanford University Press
- \_\_\_\_\_, (Ed.), (2004): *A Globalizing World? Culture, Economics, Politics*, New York, Routledge Publishers
- Hirst, Paul, and David Held, (2002): "Globalization: the Argument of Our Time", viewed on 16 September 2005, <http://www\Welfare state\openDemocracy.htm>
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Grahame Thompson, (1996): *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*, Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 7-16.
- Hirschman, Albert O., "Rival Interpretations of Market Society: Civilizing, Destructive, or Feeble?", *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 20, pp. 1463-1484.

- Holton, , Robert J., (1998): Globalization and Nation-State, London: Macmillan Press
- Keohane Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye Jr., (2000): "Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And So What?)", Foreign Policy,p.104
- Koshy, Ninan, (2002): Globalization: The Imperial Trust of Modernity, Mumbai, Vikas Adhyayan Kendra
- Lechner Frank, J., & John Boli, (Eds.), (2004): The Globalization Reader (Second edition), Oxford:, Blackwell Publishers
- Lopez, George A., and Stohl Michael, (1987): "Liberalisation and Redemocratisation in Latin America, New York, Greenwood's Press
- Modelski, George, (2000):"Globalization", David Held and Anthony McGrew, (Eds.), op. cit., p. 55
- Offe, Claus, (1984): Contradictions of the Welfare State, London: Hutchinson
- Graham Gerard Ong, "Globalization and Its Impact on UN Structural Reform", viewed on June 2005, [http://www.sspp.net/archive/papers/4\(1\)ong.htm](http://www.sspp.net/archive/papers/4(1)ong.htm)
- Rapley, John, (2004): Globalization and Inequality, Neoliberalism's Downward Spiral, Boulder, Lynee Rienner Publishers
- Roland Robertson, (1992): Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture, London, Sage Publications, 1992
- Robertson, Roland (1992): Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture, London, Sage Publications
- Scholte, Jan Aart, (1997): "Global Capitalism and the State", International Affairs, vol. 73, p.436.
- Scholte Jan Aart, (2000): Globalization: A Critical Introduction. Hampshire, Macmillan Press
- Stiglitz, Joseph E., (2002): Globalization and Its Discontents, New Delhi, Penguin Books
- Yeates, Nicola, (2001): Globalization & Social Policy, New Delhi: Sage Publications
- The World Bank,(2002): A World Bank Policy Research Report -Globalization, Growth, and Poverty: Building an Inclusive World Economy, 2001, New York, Oxford University Press

