

INTEGRATED
PERSPECTIVES
IN
**GLOBAL
STUDIES**

Edited by Philip McCarty
University of California, Santa Barbara



Bassim Hamadeh, Publisher
Christopher Foster, Vice President
Michael Simpson, Vice President of Acquisitions
Jessica Knott, Managing Editor
Stephen Milano, Creative Director
Kevin Fahey, Cognella Marketing Program Manager
Marissa Applegate, Acquisitions Editor
Stephanie Sandler, Licensing Associate

Copyright © 2012 by University Readers, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted, or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or in any information retrieval system without the written permission of University Readers, Inc.

First published in the United States of America in 2012 by University Readers, Inc.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

16 15 14 13 12

1 2 3 4 5

Printed in the United States of America

ISBN: 978-1-60927-155-8



www.cognella.com 800.200.3908

Introduction

By Philip McCarty

Global Perspectives

What is Global Studies? Depending on how you approach it the field can be difficult to define. It is commonly thought of as an interdisciplinary academic field that studies political, economic, social and cultural relationships that are either transnational or global in scope. Over the last decade theorists of globalization have typically focused attention on the mechanisms and technologies that have speeded up communications, as well as the movement of things, peoples and knowledge (Held et al. 1999:15). This definition put considerable emphasis on the way new technologies compress the time and space of interactions by increasing the speed, frequency and scale of communications. My objection to this approach is that it tends to lead to the quantification of the speed and frequency of point-to-point relationships. I prefer to think of Global Studies simply as a perspective (or set of perspectives) that looks at human society as a whole. From this point of view human society can be seen as one enormous interconnected process that has, from its earliest beginnings, grown enormously in size and complexity. While current levels of complexity seem radically new, a global perspective assumes that important continuities exist between past and present. The globalizing present must be understood as a continuation of a complex and globalized past.

Global Studies proceeds from the assumption that studying the separate components of society may obscure one of society's most essential characteristics: the massive interconnectivity of all of its parts. In today's world the economic, political and cultural realms of social activity are clearly interconnected. For a global scholar there can be no rich without poor, East without West, economics without politics, present without past. Further, the historical and archaeological records indicate that human civilizations have always been interconnected and that it rarely makes sense to separate human history into distinct geographical regions or specific time periods. Our ingrained habit of dividing up the study of different aspects of society into distinct units is one of the main reasons that scholars find it difficult to see the myriad interconnections that define societies.

One of the main strengths of Global Studies is that it presents an integrated perspective. As a field of study it can be understood as an extension of interdisciplinary efforts that influenced academia in the United States during the 1970's and 80's. At that time it became clear that no single academic discipline was sufficient to describe the economic, social and political changes going on in the world. An array of interdisciplinary programs such as Environmental Studies and Ethnic Studies emerged to address this problem. By the 1990's scholars interested in global processes found themselves falling down the interdisciplinary equivalent of a rabbit hole. They landed in a strange post-disciplinary place and discovered a globalizing world that was much more complex than previously imagined. The world was not simply interconnected, it was changing rapidly and the rate of change was accelerating. Very few of our old ways of thinking could describe the enormous transformations going on in a complicated world system. In this sense Global Studies is one logical extension of an interdisciplinary trajectory, and global scholars continue the search for new ways to describe this rapidly globalizing world.

At this point the reader may well ask, "So what good is it to say that everything is interconnected, and where does that get us?" Or one could say "That everything is connected is just obvious." A global perspective, while a fairly simple thing to grasp conceptually, can actually be very powerful. Shifting to a more global perspective can lead to new understandings and new kinds of questions, as well as some very important and often counter-intuitive insights. For instance, James Ferguson used a global perspective to connect the functions of legitimate governments in Africa to the dysfunction of illegitimate governments, or what he calls "shadow states," and their widespread use of private armies to protect political and economic interests (Ferguson 2006). In another example Anna Tsing argued that wherever legal markets are allowed, for example logging hardwood in Indonesian forests, illegal markets will follow (Tsing 2004). Works like those of Ferguson and Tsing suggest that what we used to call "dysfunction" (problems such as crime, miscommunication, financial crises and failed states) aren't actually dysfunctional. They can be seen as functioning parts of a larger system.

With this in mind we can ask ourselves, do these kinds of "dysfunctional" shadow governments and shadow markets increase the penetration of the global market into local economies and resources? Are they actually part of what makes economic globalization work? Do global markets prefer to work with disabled and dysfunctional governments? In what ways might globalization be disabling the governments of developing countries? If globalizing markets are disabling the governments of

developing countries, then we might want to look at the ways they may be disabling our own governments.

The potential for a global perspective is not purely theoretical and it is possible to outline some important practical applications. A global perspective can have important real-world implications for international development programs and other public policies. For example, we can say that the more the interconnectedness of relevant global issues is underestimated by policy-makers, the more likely it is that their policies and programs will fail to achieve their desired outcomes. However, it is also important to note that as the world becomes more complex and interconnected, we can expect that it will become increasingly difficult to predict the outcomes of international development policies and programs. In such a complex global environment national and international policies that ignore the global context will tend to have fewer predictable outcomes and more unintended consequences.

A global perspective has the power to show us connections we could not have otherwise seen or imagined. It suggests that important connections exist between events and processes even when events appear to be disconnected and separated by time, space, or even our own categories of thought. When we look we find that the local is connected to the global, past to the present, North to South, rational to irrational, legal to illegal, function to dysfunction, and intended consequences to unintended consequences. By changing the way we see connections, by connecting apparent effects back to their causes (see the immigration example in *De-centering Narratives* below), a global perspective has the power to destabilize our modern and linear understanding of cause and effect in the social world.

The field of Global Studies calls for new ways of looking at contemporary issues that are impacting our world. The global themes briefly outlined below are intended to give the reader a sense of some of these new ways of looking at the world. These themes cross the globe, run through the ages, and end up winding their way through every chapter in this book.

Crossing Boundaries

In order to develop a global perspective it is necessary to cross boundaries. One of the first steps in creating the field of Global Studies was crossing the borders of the nation-state to look at international and transnational issues. However, Global Studies scholars cross more than obvious geopolitical boundaries. They routinely study issues that breach the boundaries between national economies, languages,

cultures, and regions (Brettell 2008:10). They assail the boundaries between academic disciplines such as political science, economics, sociology and religious studies (Klein 1996:19). They bridge the temporal boundaries between historical periods. And they challenge basic categorical distinctions such as those between the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. This border crossing includes many other kinds of categories as well, such as the boundary between global and local, us and them, self and society (Molony 2010).

As a global scholar I say the more borders crossed the merrier. The list of boundaries that must be traversed is long, and reconnecting that which has been artificially separated by modern habits of thinking is an enormous task (Weingart 2010:8). It leaves me asking, “How did we end up with a view of the world that was so thoroughly broken up by artificial boundaries in the first place?” Or better, “What will we find when we reconnect the disjointed parts?”

De-centering Narratives

Beyond simply connecting the dots, or reestablishing connections across boundaries, the global perspective has an important de-centering impulse (Nayak and Selbin 2010). Economic globalization has a strong tendency to decentralize everything from financial markets to information networks, from political power to labor power (Desai 2009). Partially in response to this kind of decentralization, the field of Global Studies is learning to decentralize its analytical frames and categories of knowledge. Decentralized ways of thinking and knowing can sometimes clash badly with modern ways that have for centuries depended on clear boundaries, distinctions and dichotomies. We find that many social phenomena don't just have one center or even multiple centers. Some of the processes we observe may have no center at all.

As an example, take the controversial issue of immigration. Even a cursory study reveals that the migration of people no longer happens from one point to another, from Third World to First World, or vice versa. Immigration, transmigration and return migration have become so widespread and complex that immigration can no longer be said to have a clear directional flow. The sense of violation that accompanies the massive cross-migration of people fleeing war and poverty is not limited to one nation or another. The borders of all nations are impacted by this problem and the crisis is being felt *simultaneously all over the world*. The Third World is no longer somewhere “out there,” safely far off as it may once have seemed. Wherever

it may have been, globalization has brought it home to all the cities of the world. It already lives next door and in many ways the First World is starting to resemble the Third World.

From a global perspective the flow of peoples can be seen to be less a problem and more a symptom of deeper changes in the global economic and political system (Kaye 2010). Globalization is not just the flow of capital, manufacturing and jobs. Foreign investment comes with foreign immigration. The flow of refugees and undocumented laborers are an unavoidable part of the same economic process, the other side of the same coin (Sassen 2011). This is one reason why building bigger detention center and higher fences at state borders won't stop immigration. A de-centered analysis shifts our focus to larger processes that produce the symptom some call "illegal immigration." A global perspective on the issue of immigration calls for new approaches and solutions that are very different from those currently making headlines in places such as the United States, Europe, and Australia.

The concept of de-centering also helps us appreciate that the phrase "global perspective" should properly be pluralized. A crucial part of an interdisciplinary and de-centered Global Studies paradigm is the ability to see things not just from one perspective, but from multiple perspectives. There isn't just one history. Depending on who gets to write the history books there can be multiple histories. Inclined toward a cosmopolitan rather than fundamentalist perspective, global scholars acknowledge that in every community there are multiple histories, cultures, legal and ethical systems. We recognize that each worldview makes sense when understood from its own perspective and may appear "true" from that perspective. Global Studies scholars acknowledge the obvious differences in these perspectives, but more importantly they look past these differences to try to find commonalities in human experience.

The above should make it clear that the need to de-center our thinking reaches well beyond issues of geography. We all live in a period of hyper-immigration, radical multiculturalism and religious pluralism, and do well if we de-center our ways of thinking and learn to look at things from multiple perspectives. We must get comfortable with the knowledge that some perspectives are very different from our own. Perspectives that are different don't have to be declared right or wrong—they can just be different and respected on that basis even if we don't understand them.

Re-reading Histories

The boundary-crossing, de-centered perspectives described above call for a thorough re-thinking of history, or at least a thorough re-reading of the story of history as it has been told. In telling the story of history from a modern and Western perspective, time and space have been dissected into ever smaller artificial periods and regions. As a result, we have often misled ourselves (Hobson 2009). Looking at the rise of the earliest civilizations makes it clear that societies have developed not in isolation but at the crossroads of trade routes, where empires meet and cultures mingle. Global perspectives disrupt the neat categories of our historical narratives and highlight the interconnection between multiple histories, regions, periods, cultures and realms of activity.

Take for example the grand narratives of Western civilization including that of discovery, progress, development, democratization and globalization. These narratives have long been cherished and repeated by the West. As will become clear, the scientific revolution we hold so dear was neither Western nor essentially European in any real sense (Hobson 2004:22). Once we bother to look we find that much of what we think of as “Western knowledge” was actually borrowed from other cultures in China, India, the Middle East and many other parts of the world. The European scientific revolution wasn’t simply European and it didn’t start at any one place or at any one time. The long lineage of ideas that led to the development of the modern sciences goes all the way back to Sumer and the beginnings of the historical record. Europe’s increased contact with other cultures, to say nothing of the wealth brought in from the colonies, had a dramatic impact on the development of Western thought and culture. Yet these dimensions are conspicuously absent from the stories that we in the West tell ourselves. We continually look for clear-cut starting points, defined centers, and tidy endings to a single historical narrative that positions the West as superior to the rest of the world.

The early sections of this book begin the process of re-reading history and de-centering the “Western Civilization” narrative. One of the key points that this re-reading of history should bring home is that the interconnections we find in the present are not entirely new. Most contemporary interconnections can, in one form or another, be traced back to the very beginnings of human civilization. What may appear as a completely new state of hyper-connectivity may just be a new configuration of old social behaviors. It could be argued that hyper-interconnection is less a product of human development than it is a prerequisite.

Change and Continuity

In many ways our “new and improved,” high-tech consumer society seems to be obsessed with change. This is not surprising since modernity has always understood itself as a sharp break from the past. Take the old saying “Everything changes but change itself.” This is one of several sayings attributed to the Greek philosopher Heraclitus. It is also a very telling misquote. He never really said that. Those looking for linear logic may *wish* Heraclitus had made that statement, but what he actually said was something much more sophisticated; “The waters are always changing, the rivers stay the same.”¹ In other words, from one perspective everything appears to change, and from another perspective we can see that some things don’t change.

As turns out, it is not so easy to break with the past. By focusing so much of our attention on change, we often fail to see those things that remain constant. On several occasions, particularly after long discussions about technological change in the modern world, I have asked my students to name some things about our society that have not changed. Long quiet pauses ensue. Sometimes I hear “Death and taxes!” Occasionally some eager and obliging student will respond “Change itself!” Then I give my most creepy smile and reply “How about poverty, inequality, racism, sexism, genocide, and war?” Returning to Heraclitus’ point, who the poor are at any given point in time may change, but the fact of poverty itself remains constant. Similarly, the subjects of discrimination may change, but discrimination persists. We need to ask ourselves why realities such as poverty and discrimination don’t readily come to mind as constants in our society.

By taking a long view of history and re-connecting the dots it becomes possible to discern important continuities that serve as landmarks in the sea of historical change. Learning to hold both change and continuity in focus simultaneously is an important part of using global perspectives to understand the world. It is also a necessary prerequisite for understanding the concepts of *social structure* and *transformation*.

Structure and Transformation

Classical theorists Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim and Max Weber introduced modern scholars to competing ideas of social structure. The social structures these theorists

¹ Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy <http://www.iep.utm.edu/heraclit/>.

described are patterned social relationships (e.g. social class, economic inequality, institutions, beliefs, values and norms) that influence the behavior of individuals that are socialized into that society. In this sense social structures are pre-existing conditions and institutions that shape our lives (Bourdieu 1977). We are born into a certain country, culture, language, religion and legal system. We do not choose our socioeconomic status, gender or race at birth. These statuses and institutions have a profound impact on us and influence our lives in many ways.

It is important to note that these same social structures endure because they are reproduced in the behavior of the majority of individuals in that society. Whereas the classical social theorists tended to focus on the social structures within a given society, Global Studies scholars take this idea and use it to describe enduring structures in the wider global system.

The ability to recognize various social structures is important for a number of reasons. First, because these social structures remain relatively unchanged over long periods of time they can serve as important landmarks or touchstones for scholars attempting to analyze a complex and confusing world of change. Second, when structured relationships such as race and class are contested it can lead to major conflict. The historical record indicates that conquest, revolution and war can be either the causes or results of structural change, and are frequently both. Third, change in one social structure is often accompanied by other important changes in the system. When multiple structures change simultaneously we call it a period of *structural transformation*. These tend to stand out as important moments in history.

The shift from feudalism to capitalism marked by the Industrial Revolution is one such structural transformation. It changed the way people lived so profoundly that its only precedent was the discovery of agriculture some 10,000 years before. Changes in the economic system were accompanied by sweeping changes in beliefs, laws and social norms. These crucial shifts still explain much of what we see in the world today. However, as wide-reaching as the changes brought on by the Industrial Revolution may have been, it is still possible to discern important continuities in the system before, during and after that transformation. For example, the works of postcolonial theorists such as Edward Said point out that cultural difference and skin color remained important elements of cultural domination before and after the transformation from feudalism to modern capitalism. The patriarchal system of gender inequality also endured over the centuries. Similarly, the tendency of capitalist systems to transfer wealth from poorer (darker) countries to wealthier (whiter) countries extended from early colonialism, through the Industrial Revolution,

beyond modern imperialism, and seems even to have survived the process of decolonization and the recognition of former colonies as independent nations.

Why should anyone care about past structural transformations? We should care because we are currently in a similar transformation. There is every indication that the period we are in, the period of economic globalization, is part of another large transformation that is already impacting social structures all around us. (Held et al 1999). We are beginning to see changes in citizenship, national identity, human rights and international law, and it is reasonable to expect major changes in a wide range of other social structures that are not as yet apparent. Is the fact that we are just beginning to understand the depth and breadth of the present structural transformation reason enough to care about the past? I certainly hope so.

Power and Inequality

Some scholars might argue that periods of deep structural transformation are the hallmarks of human progress. This may be true enough. Scientific and medical advances, freedom of the press and democratic revolutions have all attended the transformation from feudalism to capitalism in one way or another. However, scholars who take more critical global perspectives point out that the features of society that most often survive these kinds of enormous structural transformations are stratified relationships and the ideologies that support inequality. Social and economic classes along with racial and gender inequities somehow managed to endure through the upheaval of modernization. These asymmetrical power relations reappeared dressed in new clothing, sporting new name tags, deploying new technologies of domination, and new forms of exploitation justified by new ideologies, but they were still in essence the ancient and unequal relationships between rich and poor, black and white, male and female. It is almost as if exploitation's greatest trick is to avoid detection by transforming itself over-and-over again throughout history.

The works of historians such as David Brion Davis and Eric Hobsbawm help us to re-connect the dots across long cycles of history and bring large-scale transformations into focus. With their guidance we follow the threads of imperial domination from Alexander the Great, through the Crusades, to Columbus and colonialism, Queen Victoria and modern imperialism, and onward through both World Wars. Students will find themes of imperial domination appearing again and again throughout history, from Third World decolonization onward to what Jan Nederveen Pieterse identifies as a new "global plantation" economy. Learning to see

continuities makes it possible to address the ongoing structural transformations that have been shaping and re-shaping society while preserving these key forms of domination and exploitation. By this point readers should be asking themselves, “Could these enduring forms of exploitation still be at work in our new and improved era of twenty-first century globalization?”

In the contemporary moment global perspectives can also provide new ways of looking at old problems. For example, it is possible to combine W.E.B. Du Bois’ concept of the *color line* with Patricia Hill Collins’ *intersectional theory* to better understand the contemporary issue of global inequality (Du Bois 2005, Collins 2001). Du Bois argued that the line between black and white, the color line, divides our minds, our neighborhoods and the nations of the world (Lake and Reynolds 2008). Collins built upon Du Bois theory by combining race, class and gender analyses to show that the disadvantages of being black, female and poor are in many ways cumulative. She argued that these overlapping forms of domination work together to *over-determine* the relative positions of individuals in society. Collins concept of intersectionality provided us with a powerful tool for understanding why the poor tend to remain poor. Intersectionality is one of many similar analytical concepts that take on entirely new meanings when applied to a global context. If we follow Du Bois color line out into the developing world we can add whole new levels of disadvantage to Collin’s intersectional theory. What does it mean to be black, female, homeless, country-less, utterly destitute and on your own struggling to keep your children alive in a refugee camp in Chad? In these circumstances, even the basic rights normally associated with citizenship may have little meaning. Missing are the protections of law, citizenship, political representation, and even in some cases the protections afforded by traditional value systems.

Collins originally applied her theory of intersectionality to the position of individuals in a society. Her theory can also be applied to the global arena to better understand the overlapping forms of domination and exploitation working together to *over-determine* the inequality within and between nations. Adapting Collins’ ideas in this way allows us to track intersectional lines of race, class, culture and religion that I argue still run deep in our development and globalization paradigms.

Layering Identities

In recent decades the issue of a person’s identity has become highly politicized. Before the modern period a person could have been identified by occupation as

baker, weaver, blacksmith or porter. During the modern period identity became closely associated with nationality and one's country of birth. Today the ways people identify themselves and others have become complex and contested.

One of the areas where identity is most keenly contested is around a person's nationality. Over the course of the modern period the entire world was divided into nation states, and it was presumed that everyone had one unitary and exclusive national identity. Following World War II multiple competing forms of cultural, religious and political identity began to reassert themselves and challenge the idea of monolithic national identities.

Ethnicity began to qualify national identity and in the United States, for instance, we started to use the terms Native American, Italian-American, Asian-American or Mexican-American. Moreover, sub-national identities such as Basque or Chechen began to challenge the unitary identities of Spain and Russia respectively. At the same time, terms such as Afro-Caribbean and Latino were used to identify transnational and regional cultural groups that were not contained by any one nation.

The rise of dual citizenship is one indicator of this new state of affairs. The modern notion of citizenship came into widespread use in the eighteenth century with the democratic revolutions and the formation of the modern state. For two hundred years concerns about national loyalty, military service and taxation, among other issues, meant that citizenship was treated as an exclusive identity. Dual citizenship was generally illegal and even the idea was considered somewhat traitorous. In some nations dual citizenship is still prohibited by law. However, in the late 1960's the idea of exclusive citizenship began to change when the United States and other countries passed laws allowing their citizens to hold dual citizenship.² Since that time the list of countries allowing dual and multiple citizenships has grown and the idea of having more than one national identity is no longer as inconceivable as it once was (Ong 1999:32). More recently, as the world shifted gears into new forms of hyper-globalization in the 1990's, new transnational organizations and supranational entities such as the United Nations, European Union and African Union began to issue passports. These supranational identities serve to further threaten and destabilize monolithic national identities (which were already being actively undermined from below).

The destabilization of national identities can be understood in the context of larger historical processes. Throughout history new forms and scales of identity have been layered over older forms of identity. Two thousand years ago Athenians

² See *AFROYIM v. RUSK*, 387 U.S. 253 (1967) and *VANCE v. TERRAZAS*, 444 U.S. 252 (1980).

were threatened by a Greek identity, whereas today Greeks may be threatened by a larger European Union identity. But history shows that new scales of identity do not necessarily displace old forms of identity. I can belong to my neighborhood, my town, state, country and region. Why do we feel we must give up our national identities to become citizens of the world (Dower and Williams 2002)? Could we not think of it as one more layer of our collective identities?

Changing ideas of nationalism and citizenship is just one indication of the fundamental changes impacting the modern nation-state in the period of globalization. It is also just one arena in which representations of self and other are negotiated and contested. Changes in various kinds of identities over long periods of time demonstrate that identities are not fixed or natural. Identities are *socially constructed* and *contested* (Spencer 2006:5). When immigrants are identified as “illegal immigrants” their political status is significantly changed. Similar categories of identification such as “terrorist” and “enemy combatant” come with dire political and legal implications. The processes of globalization, and specifically immigration, continue to complicate the politics of identity, and identities will likely remain a highly controversial issue (Alcoff and Mendieta 2007:7). Global perspectives allow us to situate these kinds of identity issues in the context of the larger transformations at work in the global system.

Section Outline

The global themes briefly outlined above contribute to the organization of the sections that follow. Each section re-reads a portion of history in order to highlight the major transformations and global forces that continue to shape how our world looks today. The authors in Sections 1-3 begin the process of re-reading the histories of empire, religion, early world trade and colonialism. These historic processes set into motion political, economic and cultural relationships that in many cases continue to persist. As a newer and more efficient form of domination, colonialism would spread across the globe drawing and redrawing maps of the world. Eventually colonialism would encompass nearly 80% of the world’s population. Sadly, some of the boundaries drawn by empires more than a thousand years ago are still being contested today in the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the War on Terror, and democratic uprisings around the world.

The readings in Sections 4–6 examine the crucial ideological transformations that would eventually give rise to the modern world. The ideas of humanism,

secularism and progress took hold in the Renaissance, Reformation, and the Scientific Revolution, and set the stage for the both the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution. These processes changed the ways people thought, how they worked, where they lived, and even in some cases prolonged people's life spans. The resulting ideals of liberalism, natural rights, nationalism and imperialism prefigured the democratic, socialist and fascist ideologies that would come to dominate the politics of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Sections 7–8 examine modernity as a historical complex. Fast-paced industrial societies emerged as economic powerhouses. The new ideologies of democracy, socialism and fascism promised bright new futures and captured the hearts of millions while faith in the civilizing power of modern capitalism drove the expansion of the imperial empires. From a global perspective the period of modern industrial imperialism, from Queen Victoria to the close of World War II, can be seen as an extension of the colonial project. Aggressive and efficient, imperialism continued the work colonialism had started centuries before. By the end of World War II in 1945 large sections of the world were drawn into the capitalist world market. But the end of the war also revealed the Nazi death camps. These horrific revelations were quickly followed by the United States obliterating the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with nuclear bombs. Modernity's bright future was clouded and the modernist faith in human reason and the progress of science were deeply shaken.

The readings in Sections 9–10 consider the post-modern period, from the Nuremberg Trials in the late 1940's to the rush of decolonization in the 1950-60s. The recently formed United Nations promised a new age of international cooperation and economic development. New ideas of racial equality, universal human rights, gender equality, and environmentalism began to spread around the world. In the process of decolonization more than a hundred new nations gained their independence. The term "Third World" was coined and economic development became a major concern. However, almost as quickly as they gained their independence the new nations became pawns in a new kind of war, the Cold War between nuclear super-powers. This strange new conflict was designed to contain the communist threat and was fought mainly through proxy wars in places like Korea, Vietnam and Afghanistan. The interventionist logic of the Cold War eclipsed the development paradigm and gave rise to new definitions of war including the "War on Drugs" and the "War on Terror." In the end the Cold War served as a template for a new world order, one that continues to haunt international relations well into the new millennium.

Sections 11–13 begin to explore the rise of international organizations and transnational social movements that focused on social issues at a global level. From the 18th century onward international issues such as abolition, suffrage, civil rights, apartheid, environmental degradation, sweatshops, human rights, fair-trade and social justice called for new forms of association. The movements spawned thousands of non-profit and transnational organizations. Since the 1960's the number of NGOs has exploded from a few thousand into the tens of millions. Some NGOs still represent grass roots movements. Others represent the interests of the philanthropists and corporations that fund them. Still others have become powerful arms of the governments they serve. In the current era of globalization and structural adjustment these non-profit and non-governmental organizations became increasingly important players in international and transnational relations. What role should the different international NGOs play in regulating international commerce, illicit trade and environmental protection? Will the changing role of the NGO impact the stability of developed and developing nations?

Without losing sight of the deep historical perspectives laid out in the previous sections, the readings in Sections 14–16 deal more directly with the brief history of globalization in the contemporary period. With the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the Cold War period seemingly came to an abrupt end. These readings begin to interpret the chaos of the post-Cold War era and the eruption of local conflicts long suppressed under the Cold War paradigm. At the same time the post-Cold War era offered new opportunities. In the 1990's some progress was made in developing international regulations, Third World debt relief, the WTO and other areas. Dozens of new international treaties were ratified by the international community. However, during the same period neoliberal globalization began to run rampant (Harvey 2005). The initial blush of international cooperation was strained by excessive corporate exploitation and then finally crushed under the weight of the “War on Terror.” Over the last decade all progress in the international arena on issues of equality and development were pushed to the back burner. How far have the unilateral policies of the United States pushed back the multilateral impulse that led to the formation of the United Nations? With the end of the war in Iraq in sight are we finally able to return to the bargaining table to address issues of global inequality?

Finally, the readings in Section 17 consider the issue of global governance. The crises attending the current era of globalization are no longer far off, safely affecting others out there somewhere; they now touch those living in rich industrial nations. Even in centers of power increasing inequality is reaching new heights and causing political instability as evidenced by the Occupy Wall Street movement. Meanwhile,

absolute poverty affects the lives of billions of people around the world. The world faces increasing competition for limited natural resources such as oil and water. Even the dual specters of global warming and ocean acidification seem unable to penetrate minds bent on short-term profit. The 2008 banking crisis in the United States clearly highlighted once again that the nations and peoples of the world are economically and politically interdependent. In profound ways the economic rise of countries such as China, Brazil, Russia and India are de-centering the United States, moving it away from center stage. Yet, even as our go-it-alone policies fail, the United States seems unwilling to accept any role other than that of “superpower.”

What is at stake when the United States deliberately undermines the Geneva Conventions prohibition against torture and refuses to ratify international conventions such as those upholding women’s and children’s rights? Can we let go of the modern notions of human rights, equality and justice? What does it mean to say that our “War on Terror” may have no end? Will the profit driven neoliberal ideologies of deregulation and privatization win the day? Will we allow the world’s ecosystems to collapse around us? Can we let the already wide gap between rich and poor both within and between nations continue to increase unchecked? Can we ponder the end of progress and development? Will the wealthy nations allow poorer nations to simply fail?

Taken together the scope of these crises and increasingly ineffective response of national governments make global governance seem necessary and even urgent. Yet the prospect of implementing some form of global governance seems complex to the point of being overwhelming. No matter how urgent the need to resolve regional conflicts, level the international playing field, fix failing states, and protect shared resources, the opposition of the global market to the very idea of global governance remains as fierce as ever. Can a system of global governance emerge despite these self-serving interests and parochial attitudes? Buckle up. History indicates that structural transformations come whether you are for or against them.

Works Cited

- Alcoff, Linda and Eduardo Mendieta, eds. 2007. *Identities: Race, Class, Gender, and Nationality*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brettell, Caroline, ed. 2008. *Constructing Borders/Crossing Boundaries: Race, Ethnicity, and Immigration*. Lexington Books.

- Desai, Mihir. 2009. "The Decentering of the Global Firm" in *The World Economy* 32(9): 1271-1290.
- Dower, Nigel and John Williams, eds. 2002. *Global citizenship: A Critical Introduction*. Routledge.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. 2005. "Of Our Spiritual Strivings" in *The Souls of Black Folk*. Bantam Classics.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Held, David, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton. 1999. *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford University Press.
- Hobson, John. 2004. *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson, John. 2009. "Provincializing Westphalia: The Eastern Origins of Sovereignty." *International Politics*, 46(6), November, pp. 671–690 (20)
- Kaye, Jeffrey. 2010. *Moving Millions: How Coyote Capitalism Fuels Global Immigration*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Klein, Julie Thompson. 1996. *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity*. University of Virginia Press.
- Lake, Marilyn and Henry Reynolds. 2008. *Drawing the Global Color Line: White Men's Countries and the International challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Molony, Barbara. 2010. "Crossing Boundaries Transnational Feminisms in Twentieth-Century Japan," pp. 90–109 in *Women's movements in Asia: Feminisms and Transnational Activism* edited by M. Roces and L. Edwards. Taylor & Francis.
- Nayak, Meghana and Eric Selbin. 2010. *Decentering International Relations*. Zed Books.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Duke University Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2011. *Cities in a World Economy*. Pine Forge Press.
- Spencer, Stephen. 2006. *Race and Ethnicity: Culture, Identity and Representation*. Routledge.
- Weingart, Peter. 2010. "A Short History of Knowledge Formations" in *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity* edited by R. Frodeman, J. T. Klein and C. Mitcham. Oxford University Press.