

Plagi

by Plagi Plagi

Submission date: 19-Apr-2023 10:40PM (UTC-0700)

Submission ID: 2070077377

File name: Plagi.docx (16.47K)

Word count: 3113

Character count: 18682

WEEK 8 - GLOBALISATION AND DEMOCRACY

Task 1: Is democracy possible in a globalised world?

1 A social movement seeking an institutionalised system of global democracy is known as democratic globalisation. David Held, a British political thinker, is one of its proponents. Held has written a dozen books in the last ten years about how democracy has evolved from being limited to the borders of nation states to including all of humankind. A variation of democratic globalisation that emphasises the necessity of having citizens all over the world directly elect world leaders and members of global institutions is known as democratic mondialization (from the French term mondialisation). For others, however, democratic mondialisation is simply another name for democratic globalisation. The people should control their own fate in a democracy. But this kind of democracy is rarely accessible. A society that does not strive towards it, however, is less worthwhile and more dangerous to live in. Democracy is a historically and culturally variable practice. The method of governance has undergone considerable changes as a result of globalisation. Globalisation and democracy currently conflict with one another. Each has a number of intrinsic weaknesses. Together with these shortcomings, there is a general lack of knowledge regarding globalisation among the general public, the media, and the government. As a result, there are now significantly fewer options for democratically governing interplanetary interactions (Gilbert, Jeremy, 2013). Citizens' participation in the governance of globalisation is scarcely possible due to deeply ingrained structural inequities. An adaptation of post-territorialist and post-statist democracy is urgently needed.

The limitations of statist liberal democracy are numerous already. Modern globalisation has further damaged the liberal democracy that has developed around the state. Democracy developed when people began to organise themselves into different nations that were governed by sovereign governments and subject to popular control. By 1998, globalisation had spread statist democracy to more than 117 nations. Yet, there have also been opposing forces, such as student activists, NGOs, and rebellion. Nonetheless, many of these nations' democracies are superficial and unqualified. Democracies have not proven to be culturally suitable in many nations. Democratic institutions have intrinsic flaws. Many political parties, regular elections, legislative protections for civil rights, and an impartial bureaucracy are not sufficient conditions for democracy.

These are all moderate democracies. A state where many social ties are largely supra-territorial cannot function as a representative democracy with territorial roots. Being more than just a

democratic state is necessary for global democracy. It is powerless to influence how its territory interacts with international flows. It requires a conceptual shift. The modern "public" of a nation is no longer just the nation-state (Diskin, *et al.* 20005). The "public" or "people" has various facets, both inside and outside the home. Liberal democratic norms have been weakened by globalisation. Its governing style has shifted from statism to polycentrism.

Unaware of this circumstance, people are unable to engage in meaningful self-determination. They lack knowledge of the problems, ideas, guiding ideas, rules, and methods of globalisation. They have limited knowledge of global governance. Even campaigners mix up the World Bank with the IMF. There are no provisions in formal education at the lower and higher levels for teaching students about globalisation.

The majority of young people have been underprepared for global citizenship by school and university curricula. Globalisation and its polycentric governance are still ignored in universities. International studies and global studies are frequently combined. Journalism in print, audio, and visual forms makes an effort to increase public knowledge of these issues. Large conferences on significant global concerns are briefly mentioned in the media. Even journalists themselves lack a basic understanding of world affairs. Only internationally centralised large business profits from privatisation and liberalisation in the communications industries.

They emphasise stories that are in opposition to globalisation. Only the Internet is making a beneficial difference, although it is still quite limited in scope. Civil society organisations have undoubtedly worked to educate the general public on international issues and the policies that are related to them. They schedule teach-ins, lectures, symposia, colloquia, roundtable discussions, workshops, performances by artists, and road shows. Libraries and documentation centres that are open to the public have been established in some nations (Crum, Ben, 20005). Very minimal efforts have been made in this direction. They lack the funding to support long-term initiatives for widespread public education on international politics. It is the responsibility of democratic rulers to inform the governed on how decisions are made regarding global issues, including when, where, by whom, from what options, on what justifications, with what outcomes are anticipated, and with what resources are available.

All of this information should be easily accessible to the public. There must be a minimal amount of discretion and secrecy. Extensive websites have been developed by the IMF and the WTO, together with massive plans for press releases, newsletters, publications, pamphlets, audio-visual productions, in-person interactions, and public displays. Governments, meanwhile, continue to keep their interactions with international organisations and corporations under wraps. Trans-governmental ties are hidden from the general population. They scarcely realise the significance of numerous private regulatory frameworks for diverse facets of international trade, investment, banking, and communications. When it comes to their dealings with globalisation, many governance organisations fall short of effective transparency (Hague and Harrop, 2013). The extensive use of technical words, esoteric acronyms, professional jargon, and other specialised vocabulary in documents produced by governing organisations makes them opaque to the uninitiated.

The democratic deficit has been a problem for world governments. The tools, methods, and policies that democracies have to deal with globalisation and trans-planetary and supra-territorial connectedness are inadequate. Democracies lack the procedures necessary to survey the affected population. Sample public opinion polls conducted by polling organisations exist, but they serve no use in promoting democratic participation in international politics. Except for Switzerland, official public referendums do not play a role in the governance of globalisation. In both the parliamentary and presidential elections, there is a lot of discussion about globalisation. The majority of supra-state institutions don't have elected representatives from the general public. NATO, ASEAN, the IMF, and the WHO are examples of macro regional legislative bodies that are not directly elected. Trans-planetary balloting is currently not technically possible. Even international political organisations like the Socialist International lack the resources to run campaigns across international borders. Without any type of public voting, even many private regulatory mechanisms in the governance of globalisation have been in operation. Moreover, democratic monitoring of the globalisation process is not exercised by elected representative legislative institutions. Only a few groups of parliamentarians keep tabs on particular facets of the rules governing international relations. Legislative bodies frequently avoid their responsibilities and ignore international issues.

More democratic control of global governance has not resulted from the devolution of governments. Global regime regulation does not take the form of a treaty, hence it is exempt from requiring congressional approval. Governments make decisions without involving legislators on issues of a global nature. Citizens are mobilised by a very small percentage of the world's population. These civil society organisations are little active and have a modest membership (payment of subscription only). Only briefly and irregularly does the general public support a campaign. A relatively limited number of full-time professional activists run NGOs for the most part. Their actions demonstrate a lack of democratic credentials. They are governed by autocratic top-down management. Sometimes, because they are always travelling to different international conferences, their jet-setting staff barely communicates with their fictitious recipients (Stein, 2001). Elections for their officers are infrequently held on a regular, independent basis. They don't release unbiased assessments of the actions they really carry out.

Some of them are fronts for governments, political parties, and businesses rather than organisations serving the public interest. About who they are, what they aim for, where their money comes from, how they arrive at their policy stances, how they continue, etc., there is a lack of openness. Some of their leaders do, however, question their own democratic procedures. More engagement, openness, and accountability within their own ranks are demanded by their critical voices. Democracy loses to technocracy in the management of globalisation. Bureaucrats who are mostly shielded from public participation and public constraints frequently regulate world affairs. At their own levels, some authorities value "depoliticization of global government." They see themselves as unbiased professionals who run international regimes most effectively without the meddling of an uninformed public. Yet, a few international policy-making processes have included some civil society consultation. Registered organisations do take part in a variety of global governance discussions and include citizen input into the formulation of global policy. A few of the activists agree to accompany state delegations at these occasions. Associations of the civil society also organise public gatherings where people can voice their opinions on globalisation and offer suggestions. Some gatherings take the shape of boisterous marches, protests, campaigns, boycotts, and petition drives.

Task 2: What impact do international organisations have on national democracy?

Democracy undoubtedly has flaws of its own, but no form of government is perfect or a cure-all for all human issues. Compared to other types of governments, this is better. Oligarchy, dictatorship, and aristocracy. Because democracy still provides greater prospects and some glimmer of optimism, it is favoured by the frustrated and disillusioned people of the world. It is folly to return to a farm cart, no matter how romantically Burns said it: "No one argues that existing representative assemblies are faulty but even an automobile does not perform properly." says John Stuart Mill. "After carefully weighing all of the evidence that I felt was well-founded in the arguments against Democracy, I made an instant decision in its favour." Hitler in Germany and Mussolini in Italy formed dictatorships after World War I, but they turned to violence, conflict, and victory to achieve popularity, which led to the start of the World War in that they were defeated and destroyed. "West Germany, Italy, Japan, Austria, India, Sri Lanka, etc." all created democratic regimes following World War II. Numerous African nations have attained freedom and created democracies.

Although military coups resulted in the establishment of dictatorships in Pakistan, Turkey, Egypt, and Syria, these countries are also moving towards democracy. Political parties were once prohibited there, but the prohibition has since been overturned. The freedom to criticise the government has now been granted to the press, the general public, and political parties. The Communist regimes take great pride in referring to themselves as democracies. Russians assert that socialist democracy has been created in their nation. Even though we disagree with this viewpoint, we can still claim that democracy has a bright future and that the world is moving in its direction because alternative kinds of governance do not protect such rights. Obtaining official paperwork regarding international issues is challenging. Few members of parliament bring personal knowledge to bear on international concerns. There aren't many expert advisers and researchers to support and direct them (Fukuyama, Francis, 2014). "Global Legislators Organization for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE)", was founded in the year of 1989, Parliamentarians for Global Action, founded in 2004, Parliamentary Conference on the WTO, founded in 2000, are a few examples of increased legislative engagement in relation to globalisation. Such bodies, however, are few in number, powerless, and irregular. Without the involvement of democratically elected assemblies, regulations for governing interplanetary links have multiplied.

On the judicial side, there are typically no channels for obtaining justice in the administration of international affairs. Often, citizens are unable to file complaints with their national and local tribunals about international issues. The actions of the state outside of its borders or the actions of supranational organisations are not subject to judicial review. Direct citizen petitions regarding the governance of globalisation cannot be heard in global courts since they are either nonexistent or inaccessible. Only cases brought by states are considered by the Hague-based International Court of Justice. The WTO Dispute Resolution System is no different. Even for public inspections, unbiased assessments, and official investigations, there are no official channels. Accountability is still minimal. There is a lack of an open, external, independent, and published evaluation of the performance of the international organisations. Civil society organisations promote public involvement in global governance from both the inside and the outside, but their action is still limited. In their own actions, these organisations have occasionally fallen short of democratic norms of responsibility and participation. According to their supporters, democratic globalisation aims to increase globalisation and bring people together closer. As opposed to economic globalisation, this expansion should "bring people closer, more united, and protected." Nevertheless, given the diversity of viewpoints and suggestions, it is still unclear what this would actually entail and how it might be accomplished. Have it encompass all governmental and economic spheres of endeavour and knowledge, the latter being particularly important for advancing the welfare of global citizens.

Provide global citizens democracy access to and a voice in such international affairs. For instance, direct elections for members of the United Nations Legislative Assembly and presidential voting by citizens for the position of Secretary-General of the organisation. Supporters of democratic globalisation argue that by participating in international democratic institutions, citizens of the world should be free to choose their political inclinations (Graeber, 2014). Not everyone who supports the anti-globalization movement disagrees with this viewpoint. For instance, George Monbiot, who is typically associated with the "anti-globalization movement" (although he prefers the term "global justice movement"), has proposed the similar democratic reforms of the majority of important global institutions in his book *Age of Consent*. He also suggests "direct democratic elections" for these bodies and a system of global governance. Economic and financial globalisation are encouraged by the expansion of political democratisation. It is predicated on the notion that "unrestricted international trade benefits the entire world community". They support

“financially open economies”¹ where the central bank and government need to be transparent to maintain market trust since openness is fatal for authoritarian regimes. By removing limitations on such transactions, they support democracy that increases leaders' accountability to the people.

When the “New York Times” reported on a demonstration of protest at the “World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle, Washington”, in 1999, the democratic globalisation movement began to get national notice. This event was held to denounce unfair practices of trade and undemocratic globalisation by⁷ the World Trade Organization (WTO), “the World Bank, the World Economic Forum (WEF), and the International Monetary Fund”. Its main strategies included civil disobedience, street theatre, and public rallies. The creation of “democratic global institutions” and the transformation of international organisations—that are recently governed by the nation-states,¹ into the global organisations governed by all people -- would enable democratic globalisation, according to proponents (Huntington, Samuel, 1968). The movement recommends achieving so¹ gradually by establishing a small number of the democratic international organisations in charge of a select few really important areas of shared interest. Its long-term objective is for these institutions to eventually unite to form a fully functional, democratic global government.

The idea that democratisation can be sparked by globalisation has persisted after the conclusion of the Cold War. According to one interpretation, globalisation makes democratisation inevitable because democratic principles spread (or even just gradually spread) across borders into authoritarian regimes. They note that despite the North Korean population's lack of electronic connectivity to the outside world, even the Totalitarian regime has cautiously entered the online realm. These broad tendencies, however, do not yet support a clear and direct link between democratisation and globalisation. The evidence is conflicting and probably always will be. A different culture is growing more global while upholding traditional (and frequently authoritarian) customs for every one in which a “people's power” revolution is aided by worldwide cheerleaders and satellite television. In terms of cross-border interaction, the city-state of Singapore is considered to be the “most global on the A.T. Kearney/Foreign Policy magazine Globalization Index”. However, over the past 30 years, Singapore has steadfastly maintained a semi-authoritarian system and exhibits few signs of further democratisation.

The process of globalisation is complicated and contentious. It has impacted the world in a variety of ways and unified numerous nations. In addition to uniting nations in some ways, it has also

pushed them apart. The political cultures of many nations around the world have undergone one of the most contentious shifts as a result. The consensus among many academics, including David Held, is that democracy is the ideal form of government. As it has already been mentioned, globalisation has given international corporations more clout. Contrary to what has been believed, international companies advocate for increased democracy. ³ For businesses to grow, peace and stability must be firmly established in all potential investment countries (Rodrik, 2011). ⁵ As a result, there is an increase in the demand for a democratic system of government because democracies rarely engage in war with one another. Transnational corporations put more pressure on authoritarian governments to liberalise their political systems as "economic ties between states deepen". These authoritarian countries are less motivated to uphold their extreme policies or keep their positions of power as a result of globalisation. Globalisation forces authoritarian countries to decentralise power as they give up sovereignty to advance the market, which is basically democratic. The concept of laissez-faire, which translates from French as "leave it be," is to permit economic fluctuations.

It permits industries to operate without interference from the government, which would otherwise impose restrictions like taxes and state monopolies. Numerous other benefits of globalisation support the development of democracy. Due to decreased information and travel costs, access to information from governments and other sources is much greater currently. Hence, because authoritarian governments no longer have total control over media, democracies may now freely promote their values and goals in those countries. One of the extra advantages of the lowering of borders brought about by globalisation is the increasing of the dissemination of democratic values across borders. The more democracies that border a country, the more likely it is that it will become democratic. It is obvious that globalisation is not a political cure-all. It offers no quick fixes, but is at best a long-term ally in advancing democracy. It is important to review the optimistic correlations put forth by the policymakers in the early years of post-Cold War, particularly with regard to the connection between expanded commerce and democratisation (The Economist, 2015). Advanced democracies can start the globalisation process, but they shouldn't expect to control it or see results right once. In fact, it might take at least a generation for the most long-lasting effects of globalisation to materialise. Policymakers should be equally prepared to acknowledge globalisation's costs to democratisation as they are to extol its benefits up until that point.



Plagi

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

en.wikipedia.org

Internet Source

1%

2

Submitted to ICM (Institute of Commercial Management)

Student Paper

1%

3

Submitted to Royal Holloway and Bedford New College

Student Paper

<1%

4

Submitted to Mahidol University

Student Paper

<1%

5

Submitted to Southern New Hampshire University - Continuing Education

Student Paper

<1%

6

www.politics-dz.com

Internet Source

<1%

7

ep3.nuwm.edu.ua

Internet Source

<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off