Globalization, International Order and Human Rights

DR HAKEEM OLATUNJI TIJANI

Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research
tunjitijani2000@yahoo.com

Abstract

With the advent of globalization, it is obvious that neither state from the North (developed countries) nor from the South (developing countries) can escape the rampaging tide of globalization. The tide of globalization through competition has stormed the global world and swept away uncooperative countries. This has, therefore, reconfigured and reshaped the state in both the activities and powers by transferring powers and activities hitherto held by the state to other actors. The consequence of this is that the phenomenon of globalization has created two different occupants in the same voyage - the strengthened states of the North and the weakened states of the South. The states of the North have strengthened their institutions to absorb the defects of globalization such as polarization of wealth and poverty, increasing terrorism, increasing citizenship gap and inequalities. While the states of the South are at the receiving end of the spectrum. The consequence of this is that these facets of globalization have implications for international order as countries of the North that benefit from globalization would want to maintain the status quo while those in the South who are at the disadvantaged position seek change. The corollary of this is that the maintenance of international order, which is tilted towards the North, has led to the infringement of the rights of the people and nations whose lives have been battered by the defects of globalization. Therefore, maintaining the status quo of international order would negate the right to development in the South.

Kew words: Globalization, International Order, Human Rights, Developed Countries, Developing Countries

Introduction

Globalization has become an inevitable phenomenon and, therefore, a denominator for regulating affairs of the mankind. It has also become the dynamic for development by strengthening some countries through marketization, liberalization and territorialization while weakening others through polarization of wealth and poverty, increasing citizenship gap, and increasing inequalities, among others. These facets of globalization have implications for international order as countries of the North that benefit from globalization want to maintain the status quo while those in the South who are at the disadvantaged position seek change. The corollary of this is that the maintenance of international order, which is tilted towards the North, has led to the infringement of the rights of the people and nations whose lives have been battered by the defects of globalization.

This paper has four sections; the first section introduces the focus of the discourse, namely, the nexus between globalization, international order and human rights. In the second section, we explain the emergent international order within the window of globalization and illuminate how each of globalization and human rights interact within the new order. This is done by seeking to understand each of these concepts and their practical impact in the global North-South divide. In particular, we explain the impact of globalization on the economic, cultural and political life of states and how these, especially the political impact, have led to human rights abuse in an era of globalization. Arising from this discourse, we then explore the specific impacts of globalization on human rights in the third section of the chapter. Here, we discuss factors that condition the manipulation of globalization for human rights abuse, including the configuration of the international arena, the idiosyncrasies of the developing world, nature of international politics and the misconception woven around development. We conclude the chapter in the fourth section, with a caveat that the present international order in this era of globalization poses significant challenges for people and nations.

Globalization, the Emergent International Order and Human Rights

Globalization

Globalization refers to the all-inclusive expression for the interconnectedness that exists between all human relations – political, economic, cultural and environmental. This interconnectedness is, *inter alia*, the result of advances in communication. In the words of Tijani (2015), citing Chesnais (2004), globalization is:

> The international economic and political regime, which follows from the adoption by practically all the governments and political elites in the world, of the policies of liberalization, regulation and privatization as well as of the ideology and domestic politics of laissez-faire and enrichisses-vous (enrich yourself) (Tijani, 2015:19).

Naim-Ahmed (2002), for instance, sees globalization as an ambivalent concept, which depends on the perspective of the scholars and sees the concept as having a helpful hand as well as a doomsday promise. On one hand, there is the helpful portion of globalization, recognized by scholars such as Friedman (1999) and Hufbaur (2001). Naim-Ahmed states that If globalization is conceived as turning the whole world into one global village in which all peoples are progressively more interrelated and all barriers are detached in a way that the world witnesses a new state of fast and free flow of people, capital, goods and ideas then the world would be witnessing exceptional satisfaction of human rights everywhere. This is because, according to him, globalization is bringing prosperity to all corners of the globe together with the spread of the highly cherished values of democracy, freedom and justice.

On the other hand, Naim-Ahmed expresses the view of the scholars such as Paul (2002) and Theodore (1983) who see globalization as connoting doom for mankind and putting the South at disadvantage. According to him, if globalization is envisioned as turning the world into a global market for goods and services which is conquered by the influential transnational corporations and governed by the rule of profit, then all human rights of the people in the world, particularly in the South would be seriously endangered.

The controversy rages on even at the theoretical level, the inter-paradigmatic debate on the theories of world politics has, instead of providing solution to understanding globalization, made conceptualization of the concept more complex. This is so because, as we see below, such theories of world politics as *realism*, *liberalism* and *world-system* have explained globalization so differently and vaguely that each of the theories has tended to align with the position of either of the proponents of globalization or its antagonists. In the words of Smith and Baylis (1997), *realists* do not see globalization as rendering obsolete the struggle for political power between states nor do they see it as undermining the use of force by the states, or the importance of balance of power. With this position on globalization, unequal power relations between states make human rights a subject of abuse by the powerful states against the less powerful ones as has been witnessed in the United States assaulting Panama in December, 1989 and subsequently imprisoning its leader in the United States for drug peddling, Saddam Hussein's Iraq invading Kuwait in August, 1990, and Israel overrunning Lebanon in July, 2006.

The *liberalists'* account of globalization, according to Smith and Baylis (1997), is that states are not the central actors as they used to be. Liberals are more interested in the revolution in technology and communications as represented by globalization. In *liberalism*, *g*lobalization tends to downplay the powers and activities of the state, but uplift the importance of non-state actors as Multinational Corporations and international organization like the United Nations Organization.

The *world-system theorists* see globalization as the latest stage in the development of international capitalism. They are of the opinion that globalization is a western-led phenomenon, which simply furthers the development of international capitalism. To these theorists, rather than make the world more alike, globalization further deepens the existing divide between the core, semi-periphery and the periphery. This polarization makes human rights abuse very possible as

the core states easily lord themselves over the periphery states. Since globalization has become inevitable, it is not that if it can sustain its continuity, but its problem is on how and on whose terms, the North or the South, it would tilt. Amnesty International (2009) buttresses the inequality, deprivation and marginalization that globalization has brought. According to the body, many scholars point to the millions lifted out of poverty by economic growth, but many more have been left behind. In other words, the losses have outweighed the gains of the economic growth and the human rights costs too high.

International Order

International order, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, is woven around non-violent conflict resolution, state rights (sovereignty) and human rights. But, there is a tension among these norms, so also is the contention of its referent objects. As Maull (2002:10) laments:

> ...is it an order of and for states, or of and for individuals? This tension is further accentuated by the fact that states are both indispensable sources of protection and massive violation of human rights. How then, should 'international order' be conceived in the struggle against terrorism with global reach? Does 'international order' concern only states, or ultimately all human beings? And is international order a static or a dynamic concept? Does it discourage or promote change? (Maull, 2002:10).

International order is defined, according to Bull (1997a), as stable, predictable and controlled relations between states, in which turbulence, chaos and violence are mostly not present. This characterization makes the driving force of international order to be the state. Thus, traditionally, in the 1950s, the concentration of international order was on national governments. For the reason that power is the essence of politics especially in the international arena, it was believed that maintaining international order should take cognizance of the power relations among the states, hence the relevance of such concept as balance of power, which means, according to Bull (1997b), that no one state is preponderant in power in the international system as a whole. By implication, international order in that period was characterized by the protection of the powers. This scenario mirrored the relative pull that bipolarity had in stabilizing order in the international arena as the consequence of the military buildup including nuclear armament between the defunct Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the United States of America (USA) kept order in the international arena. This state of affairs was maintained until 1989 when the USSR disintegrated, which ended the bipolar world.

The end of bipolarity heralded the present unipolarity in world affairs, which gives the hegemony of the world to the United States. The ascendance of the United States as the unipolar hegemonist, in the late 1980s, was in cahoots with the emergent of globalization because the tenets of globalization, which tend to shift the control of the economy from the states to other sources, like market forces, also made it possible for the direction of international order to change

from the protection of the powers to the protection of the liberal ideology of the United States. In protesting against the protection of United States ideology, the present international order has also witnessed a radical challenge. Non-state actors such as the organized crime in Mexico and terrorist group as happened in the 11 September 2001 attack of United States by *al-Qaeda* and the emergence of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's murderous Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) - are now challenging the state.

Maull (2002), arguing the fact that the present international order is not a Western concept, opines that its present configuration and prevailing notions are Western in nature. He attributes international order and the debate about it to be the product of the European world through the dynamics of modernization, of which globalization represents but the most recent and most advanced stage. The Western shape and its prevailing notions about international order are reflected in the core norms of what international order stands for. But for the reason that what is Western does not necessarily translate into international, there is ambivalence in what international order mean.

Human Rights

Human rights, according to Amnesty International (2004) are basic rights and freedoms to which all humans are entitled. These rights include civil and political rights such as right to life and property and freedom of expression; economic, social and cultural rights, which include the right to be treated with respect and dignity, right to education and right to food, among others. The introduction of the human rights could be traced to the West, as earlier documents on human rights first emanated from the region. The British *Magna Carta*, which was signed by King John of England in 1215 (it stipulated the kind of contract that existed between the King and his subjects), the English Bill of Rights of 1689 (it addressed the rights of citizens as represented by the parliament against the Crown) and the United States Bill of Rights of 1789 by James Madison, but ratified in 1791 (it set limit on what the government can do and cannot do with regard to personal liberties), are all mirrors of current human rights. Ironically, the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, according to Osiatynski (2000), was not initiated by any Western power; neither by United States nor Britain, but by Cuba, Panama and Chile. This is because of the pending human rights abuse in those countries as prior to the Declaration there had been racism and segregation in the United States while England and France had colonies.

Human right has been a baggy concept easily adaptable to manipulation. This is because after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, human rights became a Cold War victim, an ideological instrument, which was used by the two blocs of East and West to wage war against each other. It became the subject of bitter conflicts seeing that the East challenged the West for using human rights as an ideological instrument by mirroring it as the social ownership of assets. This position is maintained by Mark (2001) that false division between political rights and economic rights arose partially from the political maneuverings of the Cold War. In his words, during the ideological conflict, the influence of the free-market democracies was domineering as it

tended to attack the communist nations and charged them with human rights violations. Ironically, democratic states would ignore the social and economic rights abuses that occurred in their own states. So, human rights are used as a tool for pursuing self interest by individual countries with the developing ones at the receiving end.

Today, in an era of globalization, an era that is more conflict-prone, terrorist inclined and politically and economically insecure, understanding of human rights should go beyond self-serving and limited approaches. It should be made elastic in order to accommodate consideration for the environment – cultural background, religions, historical background, etc. - of other regions.

In contrast to these specificities, Amnesty International (2009) defines human rights as basic rights and freedoms that all people are entitled to regardless of nationality, sex, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, language, or other status. This definition tends to align with the Western view of human rights, which negates the sensitivity of the specificities of other regions. It is this lack of sensitivity of the specificities of other regions that informs the limitations of human rights.

Human Rights and its Limitations
Cultural Limitation
Human right, just like development, is a normative concept that is culturally biased. So, to make human rights universally ingrained to the general embodiment of liberty and freedom of all individuals and countries of the world, it should take into consideration the difference in the culture of the people especially between the North and South. In other words, the cultural relativity, which makes the issue of practicalising the concept more difficult to tackle, has affected its understanding. Discussing human rights in the West and the East, Darusman (2003) opines that understanding human rights should take into account the cultural differences that exist in different regions of the world. Even though political elites may use the argument to perpetuate repression, cultural differences affect the understanding of human rights.

According to Darusman, violations of human rights are manifestations of underlying and more substantive dynamics that are specific to traditions and conditions of specific areas. Recognizing the cultural relativity among the countries of the world as evident in the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights in Islam adopted in 1990 by members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the Mideast and North Africa Encyclopedia (2009) observes the significance of regional specificities and various historical and cultural backgrounds as distinct from the other international human rights declarations. The Encyclopedia adds that the rights in the declaration are markedly different from those set out in the international human rights treaties. He provides examples that resolutions from OIC summits most often express cultural relativity when responding to the demands of the international human rights norm of universality.

The difference in the cultures across the globe has made an important component of human rights law, *universal jurisdiction,* to be unachievable. Universal jurisdiction is the concept, which is not widely accepted among the states. The notion of the concept is that any nation is authorized to

prosecute and punish violations of human rights wherever and whenever they may have occurred. This is because the right to partake in the culture of the community is enshrined in the *Article 27* of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights**:** everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits. This limitation has, to a large extent, affected the horizon of human rights as a universal concept that is applicable to the dignity of all persons, families, groups, communities, states and international community. In other words, at what point does the protection of cultural, religious or state values become a human rights abuse? When and how does the protection of dignity of self become a human rights abuse of the values of the family, groups, communities, state and that of the international community?

The Subject Matter Limitation
Arising from the problem of cultural relativity is the problem of the substance often encountered in understanding human rights. From Britanica Concise Encyclopedia, which defines human rights as rights that belong to an individual as a consequence of being human, to United States Military Dictionary to Political Dictionary of Human Rights to Russian History Encyclopedia, the referent object is the individuals, it is about *self*. A variant of this is the Buddhism Dictionary, which tends to view human rights differently. According to the Buddhism Dictionary, the key doctrine of Buddhism is the absence of *self* (The Mideast and North Africa Encyclopedia, 2009). This is akin to Talmon's (n.d.) top-down perspective of society. The philosophy of totalitarian democracy, according to Talmon, is an absolute and perfect political truth to which all reasonable humans are driven. He explains that a totalitarian democracy is a form of democracy where the elected representatives of the people grant them the right to vote but little or no participation in the decision making process of the government.

Such activities as the economic and social endeavors, which tend to strengthen the collective, are considered valuable. Activities that strengthen *self,* such as education and religion, are seen as counterproductive. This dual conception is illustrated in the notions of human rights. For example, while the first generation of human rights has a propensity towards the *self* since such political rights as the rights to freedom of speech, of assembly and of religion are preserved in the individual, the second and third generations of human rights are associated with such economic and social activities as education or better standard living, which are about the collective. The problem of substance becomes more problematic when international conventions and declarations are made to support both *self* and the collective.

The problem becomes more conspicuous as all the three notions; first, second and third generations deduce their support from the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted on 10 December 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Brown (1997) observes that the third generation notion of human rights tends to limit the universality of human rights. This is because, according to Brown, one of the rights of the people must be to be different from other

people, arguing that such difference could be achieved under the universal standard According to the United Nations (2009), Article 2 of the Universal Declaration, erodes the sensitivity of human rights to the peculiarities of regions of the world. The article states:

> Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty (Article 2 of the Universal Declaration, United Nations, 2009).

The limitations of human rights have implications for achieving international order. These limitations have made it impossible to have an international order that takes into consideration the specificities of all regions of the world and thereby making the order a universally accepted one.

Impacts of Globalization

Economic Impacts

Globalization has had impacts on the economy of the world by blurring the boundaries between politics and economics and the national and international. This is done by the creation of high levels of interdependence between national political economies. In other words, each national economy becomes more sensitive and vulnerable to changes in other national economies (Tooze, 1997). A typical example of this is the happenings in the economy of the United States that have disrupted international business resulting in economic meltdown and political calamity in many nations. This has had dire consequences on the economy of the countries of the South.

Again, globalization has also made people of the South more vulnerable to one of its impacts is the polarization of wealth and poverty, with calamitous consequences for the poor of the South. According to Thomas (1997), in the North, the ratio of rich to the poor is decreasing, conversely, in the South the poor people are getting poorer by the day. Such tenets of globalization as liberalization and marketization have provided unequal result with the North benefiting the more while the Southern economies have been in the doldrums. With this, globalization has reconfigured, reshaped and redirected the international order towards favouring the North. Expectedly, the North has tried to maintain the status quo. The corollary of this is that development, which should be the essence of globalization, has itself lent credence to under-development of the South. While globalization may be splendiferous in the eyes of the North, it has made the South including Africa splenetic. This is because of its fluidity, which makes it to have both complimentary and contradictory interpretations.

As globalization complements the interconnectedness of people and states therefore brings the world together, it ironically breeds such word as *disconnection.* Globalization breeds

disconnection between people as the gap between the poor and the rich becomes widened. In an era of globalization, within the state, the disconnection between leaders and the led is on the increase while between states, there is disconnection between nationals of the rich and those of poor countries. This explains its contradiction because much as it tries to bring together some of its instrumentalities as technology which aids information, financial transactions and education, it tends to breed conflict among people by polarizing them along economic cleavages.

While globalization transfers and brings about new technology and innovations that aids industrialization, paradoxically, industrialization has become a catalyst for under-developing the South through the pollution of the atmosphere. Emission of greenhouse gases by the North has brought adverse effects for the South. The depressing implication has meant the infringement on the rights of the people of the South. Such impact of atmospheric pollution as climate change, which culminates in desertification, flooding, erosion etc., has brought loss of livelihood of the poor people of the South whose major occupations depend on land. This predicament has made the people of the South to be more conscious of the destabilizing role of globalization in their daily life and further see its role in enforcing the culture of the North in the international arena.

Cultural Impact

The emerging reality of the era of globalization is that globalization has intensified the consciousness of civilization as propounded by Huntington (1993). It has aided the interactions of peoples and states thereby making the world a smaller place. The increasing interactions, according to Huntington, intensify civilization-consciousness and awareness of differences between civilizations and commonalities within civilizations, which in turn have had grave implications for the relations of the people and states. Huntington puts it succinctly that interactions among people of different civilizations enhance the civilization-consciousness of people. He adds that these interactions, in turn, invigorate differences and animosities stretching or thought to stretch back deep into history.

The interactions among people of different civilizations are reinforced by such grave cultural impositions as the use of English language for global communication - the use of internet, e-mail communication and other global media are typically done by the use of English language. Such cultural imposition has led to the castigation of globalization by other regions of the world because they see globalization as having a cultural, economic and political hegemony of the United States. Strengthening this view, Intriligator (2003) states that globalization comprises of cultural developments such that media and arts become homogenized with the widespread use of the English language for global communication. He adds that as a result of these cultural developments, some people especially the French and some other continental Europeans see globalization as an attempt at U.S. cultural as well as economic and political hegemony.

Political Impact

Globalization has had political implications for the states as it has eroded the sovereignty of the state through *denationalization*, to borrow from Jessop (2003), by transferring power hitherto

held by the states to other units of the state and non-states actors as civil society organization, faith based organization and Multinational Corporations. Again, Intriligator sees globalization as eroding the sovereignty of national governments and political leaders. However, he opines that globalization should not lead to a loss of sovereignty. This is because, according to him, international cooperation can play a role in ensuring the sovereignty of national governments. But, in a globalised world, even though states may be relevant, much of its sovereignty has been taken up by other state actors. For example, where federalism is much in practice, sub-state authorities have bypassed central government in taking policy initiatives. Scholte (1997) affirms that Canadian and Chinese provinces and most of the US federal states now have their own diplomatic missions abroad. These federal states and provinces operate independently from their respective national embassies.

Loss of state sovereignty is more pronounced between states than within states. A hitherto sovereign but less powerful state can now be attacked at will by another state because of such intrinsic dictum of globalization as being a global village: in a global village, whatever affects country A will have impact on country B. With this dictum, states are now being attacked even without the consent of the United Nations as we had in the invasion of a sovereign Iraq in 2003 by the United States, a situation that led to series of human rights cruelty, both in the invaded country as well as the detention camps. A top United Nations human rights investigator, Phillip Alston (The Guardian, 2 July 2008, p. 11), criticized the United States justice system as flawed and chided the former administration of George Bush for lack of transparency at the Guantanamo detention camp where inmates were tortured and abused.

Impact of Globalization on Human Rights

Fundamentally, the primary responsibility of the state is to protect and promote the cause of the individuals in the state. This is not so in the present international order as the state is seen as the symbol of the collective, with attendant consequences in the human rights of individuals being trampled upon, that must be protected irrespective of the specificities of the states in the international arena. As a result, in order to maintain an international order that is free of human rights abuse, individuals should be the referent object. Protecting the interest of the state should translate into the protection of the individuals. Apparently, there is a tension in the three norms that international order is built for the reason that in an era of globalization there have been several troubled spots of the world such as Iraq, Chechnya, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan and Nigeria's Niger Delta (before the amnesty programme introduced by President Umaru Yar' Adua) where the use of force had been preferred to dialogue or peaceful resolution of conflicts. This has shaken the norm of the international order of non-violent resolution of conflicts and, in fact, infringed upon the rights of the individuals in the states. What is gain in international order by making state the symbol of the collective and disregarding the rights of the individuals is lost to the rampaging effects of globalization, which rubbishes the hitherto jealously guided sovereignty of the state. States are now being attacked at will with serious consequences on the individuals as have been witnessed in many of the recently attacked states.

It is this aberration that makes Bull (1977a) to equate international order with international stability, which further makes human rights abuse more prevalent. According to Shah (2004), governments are losing their moral direction, sacrificing the global importance of human rights in a blind pursuit of security. This failure of leadership is a dangerous concession to armed groups." With international order sacrificing the rights of the human individuals, it is therefore important to look at some of the factors that are responsible for human rights to be abused in this era of globalization. The factors we consider here are: the configuration of the international arena; the idiosyncrasies of the South; nature of international politics; and misconception woven around development.

The Configuration of the International Arena

The configuration of the international arena that has redefined, reshaped and redirected the relations of states from multi-polarity, before the advent of Cold War between the East and the West, to the bipolar world of two superpowers, the defunct Soviet Union and the United States of America, to the present uni-polarity with the ascendance of the hegemonic ruler of the world, the United States of America, reinforced the tendency of the hegemonic power to exercise its power erratically. For example, the unilateral decision of the United States in its invasion of Iraq in 2003 over unfounded Weapons of Mass Destruction as against the wishes of almost all the countries of the world is a clear case of human rights abuse perpetrated by the hegemonic United States against a less powerful country. A United States chief weapons inspector in Iraq, Charles Duelfer's report stated that there was no evidence Saddam Hussein had chemical, biological or nuclear arms after the Gulf War of 1991. The report found Iraq's nuclear capability before the invasion as decaying rather than being preserved. The 1,000 page report disclosed that chances of finding Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) were less than five per cent (The Guardian, 8 October 2004, p. 9).

Children, women and the old who should be protected are wantonly killed, tortured or abused. The report, *Report about the situation of children in Iraq,* by International Order of Human Rights (2009), with the disgusting pictures of abused children, depicts the human rights abuse by the superpower whose role should be to maintain world peace by keeping human rights. Worse still, it is disheartening that the United States shows lackadaisical attitude towards the International Criminal Court (ICC), a special court established to try people accused of crime against humanity. The US threatens to use military force if US nationals were held at the Hague and continues to pressure many countries to sign agreements not to surrender U.S. citizens to the ICC. Nevertheless, the same criminal court, since its creation in 2002, has tried five cases – all of them in Africa (The Guardian, 27 November 2009, p. 10). However, it is unable to prosecute the powerful states that have violated human rights. Surprisingly, US soldiers have continued to violate one form of human rights, such as rape in Okinawa, Japan or another (The Guardian, 13 February 2008, p. 11).

Again, there have been series of human rights abuse by the United States as against the international conventions, laws and declarations on human rights. Mariner (2007), responding to former President George W. Bush's order on the detention and interrogation programme of the

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), disclosed that the order, which established the secret detention sites, was contrary to Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, that detainees be treated humanely. Mariner observed that a number of CIA prisoners were held for three or more years in secret detention facilities known as *black sites* before they were transferred to military custody at Guantanamo Bay, while others remained disappeared. More surprisingly, the United States under Obama administration continued to support developing countries that use children as child soldiers (Stohl and Georgieff, 2013). Premising this on the need to protect domestic interest, the United States has reneged on the Child Soldiers Protection Act (CSPA) that was passed in 2008 by the US Congress. The Act prohibits arms transfer and training to governments that use child soldiers. The Obama administration has continuously provided support for developing countries that promote child soldiers as identified in the State Department's annual Trafficking in Persons (TIP) report. TIP in its 2010 and 2011 reports identified Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Sudan, Yemen, and Chad as countries that the Obama administration provided blanket waiver for (Stohl and Georgieff, 2013).

The Idiosyncrasies of the South

The characteristic of the South of being *soft* makes them prone to human rights abuse. A soft state is characterized by bad leadership and not visionary about the development of the state; hence laws are nor enforced by the leaders and not obeyed by the citizens. Policies are often not well articulated and not well implemented. Laws that are not enforced by the leaders lead to the abuse of the rights of the led. Although most states in the South, especially the African states, practice one form of democracy or another, they can still be regarded as soft states. The *softness* of a state is reinforced by the effect of globalization on both the leaders and the led as it elongates poverty among poor countries with high vulnerability among the poor. The consequence of this is that there are many poverty-induced conflicts in most poor countries of the world especially in African countries. Protests over lack of basic necessities of life are often recorded, which is resisted by the oppressor leaders with maximum use of force.

Amnesty International (2009) reports that, in Khorera, near Boke, Guinea, a youth leader, Karambaa Drame, was shot dead on 31 October 2008. The allegation was that he spearheaded a demonstration over rising food and commodity prices. It is reported that security forces often use excessive force to repress protests by the people over the rights to basic necessities of life as food and shelter. In Cameroon, in late February 2009, security forces killed 100 people in response to violent protest in various towns against low wages. There was a similar experience in Mozambique where three persons were killed and 30 others injured when live ammunitions were used against the people who were protesting against an increase in transport costs (Amnesty International, 2009). Again, in Nigeria, In December 2015, 347 members of the Shia Islamic Movement of Nigeria (IMN) were killed by the Nigerian army after a road blockade by the group in Zaria. According to Human Right Watch (2017), the leader, Ibrahim El Zakzaky with his wife and adherents remained in custody for several months without charges. Correspondingly, where

protests are not witnessed, it is due to incapacitation of the victims such as the case of victims of Boko Haram terrorist attacks in Nigeria. Internally Displaced Persons who need to be protected are devoid of basic rights.

Human Rights Watch reports that the declining intensity of Boko Haram attacks has made a poor response the humanitarian crisis a bit gloomier. This is because, for example, most of the 2.5 million internally displaced people (IDPs) lack basic rights such as rights to shelter, healthcare, food, education and protection from harm in addition to the right to freedom of movement. More disappointingly, displaced women and girls have become victims in the hand of those who should protect them as they suffer rape and sexual exploitation perpetrated by fellow IDPs, members of vigilante groups, policemen, and soldiers. In the same vein, according to a research organization in Nigeria, NOI Polls (2016), almost 9 in 10 Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) (85 percent) did not have access to quality food and regular meals, about 8 in 10 IDPs (78 percent) did not have access to potable water, while almost 7 in 10 IDPs (69 percent) lacked access to quality healthcare. According to NOI Polls, the incidents occurred in both official and unofficial camps, across Borno, Yobe and Adamawa states of Nigeria.

Nature of International Politics

Nwolise's (2001) characterization of politics as the control of the minds and resources of men and nations aptly captures happenings in the international arena apropos of relations between states. The notion about politics, which is about the protection of one's interest, is the main thrust of international politics. It is done with the use of *good reason* to manipulate the *real reason*. Good reason is often provided by a powerful state to justify its ulterior action, the *real reason*. This is devised essentially to protect the clandestine national interest of the powerful state against the interest of the less powerful state. The powerful state uses the *good reason* as in the case of China using a good reason as rapid economic development of Tibet to manipulate the autonomy of Tibet for its national interest whereas China's human rights record at home needs to be improved upon, at least, according to United States president, Barak Obama (The Guardian, 17 November 2009, p.11). In international politics, the powerful states lord themselves over the smaller states. This is aided by globalization as it provides an alibi for human rights abuse because it has made what were hitherto national specificities such as cultures, values, religion now international phenomena. This is done by breaking the coat that covers the state.

As anticipated, the territorial border that is seen in the sovereignty of the states is made borderless and, conversely, sovereignty of the state is lost to subjugation of the smaller states by the powerful ones in the international arena. In some cases, supranational organization as the United Nations Organization is used as the instrument of subjugation. It is confirmed by former Secretary of State of the United States, Madeline Albright that during the Cold War, the United Nations was a tool of American foreign policy (Mian, 2005).

China, another superpower has continued to commit human rights abuse against a smaller Tibet. An instance was the crackdown of 2008 that resulted in the killing of numerous

demonstrators. Even an attempt by the Chinese government in using propaganda such as the need for it to modernize Tibet (an effort to justify its human rights abuse) has further elongated poverty among the people of Tibet with resultant creation of wealth for the Chinese who migrated to Tibet (Global Issues, 2008). However, without any political reforms to accompany this process, the social tensions have increased as local Tibetans see little of the prosperity and growth, while ethnic Chinese, who have also been encouraged to migrate to Tibet, have seen their wealth generally increase.

Misconceptions Woven around Development

Prior to globalization, inequality and polarization of the world along developmental cleavages had existed, what globalization has just done is to confirm it and further elongate the polarization. Development theories have explained inequalities in the world along asymmetrical line. Modernization Theory has explained this inequality at the realm of the social formation by dividing the world into two unequal worlds: the 'modern' and the 'traditional' (Durkheim, 1984; Taylor, 2002). Even Dependency Theory that attempts to contest the modernization theory sees the polarization as coming from the economic formation, simply that capitalist North is the ideal model, yet it assumes that development can occur if the North's capitalist model is followed. This simply divides the polarization of the world along the capitalist world and the non-capitalist world; or better still, through the assumption of Rodney (1973) that sees process as the underpinning argument of the dependency theory. Rodney sees the process of integrating the South into the capitalist's world as explaining the underdeveloping nature of the South. All of this has meant that inasmuch as globalization has confirmed and elongated the polarization of the world as reflected in the polarization of wealth and poverty, where the rich countries of the North are continuing to be richer and the poor countries of the South are continuing to be poorer, human rights will continue to be violated and the victims will continue to be the people of the South.

With globalization polarizing the world into haves and have-nots, strengthening some states (the North) and empowering their people while weakening other states (the South) and disempowering their people, and treating such variables as education, food, shelter and health care, which make development achievable, as needs and denying them as rights, it is doubtful if the South will ever develop as much as the North. For development to be realized in the South, particularly in Africa, these variables should be regarded as rights, which individuals are entitled to with opportunities created for them to claim those rights. Robinson (2003) acknowledges the challenge that human rights faces in bringing about development, when he posits that human rights framework adds to development policy the notion that education, food, adequate housing and health care are rights, not merely needs. According to him, it implies that the poor must have legal and political space to claim their rights and participate fully in decision-makings as such have overriding influence on their lives. He opines that the poor should not simply benefit from more resources, but government policies should also ensure access to justice, protect against discrimination and fulfill economic and social rights. In other words, government policies which include designing of poverty reduction

strategies and social safety nets must respect the rights of the poor to an adequate standard of living, which include food, housing, health protection, education and social security.

Consequently, if these fundamental basic necessities of life are taken as rights and failure to provide them is considered as breaking the law of the land, then issues such as accountability, responsiveness and transparency, which are key principles of good governance and a prerequisite for development will become meaningful. This is so because development itself is a contingent outcome. A contingent outcome, according to Vitta (2000), is an event that occurs after every other event has occurred. So, human right is *sine-qua-non* for development. Flowing from the recognition of basic needs as rights is the right due to the women. In other words, issues of gender equality where women would have equal access to good health, education and employment are paramount to development. Indiscrimination against the women would further empower them and ultimately translate into development for them. Discrimination against them has been a hindrance to development because it makes them susceptible to poverty.

Conclusion

Since globalization is an inevitable phenomenon whose continuity is not in doubt, then the South's propensity to fight human rights abuse will be propelled by the terms of and the direction of globalization. In other words, if globalization continues to benefit the North, then the resultant effect of inequality, polarization of wealth and poverty, economic marketisation and political territorialisation of the states will put the human rights of the poor people in the South at a disadvantage. This will further make international order a subject of security where the status quo is to protect the powerful states of the North in all relations – political, economic, cultural and even environmental. Maintaining the status quo of international order will make development a mirage in the South and, in fact, negate the right to development as adopted by the United Nations' *Declaration on the Right to Development* in 1986 (Sengupta, 2006). This declaration that makes human rights the window of development by recognizing the right to development and making specifically the realization of the right of all individuals in developing countries, like the realization of any other human right, a policy-priority of all nations.

References

Amnesty International (2004) *Amnesty International Report, 2004.* United Kingdom: Amnesty International Publication.

Amnesty International (2009) *Amnesty International Report 2009: State of the World's Human Rights.* United Kingdom: Amnesty International Publication.

Amnesty International, *Human Rights*, www.amnestyusa.org/human-rights, accessed on 18 November 2009

Brown, C. (1997) Human Rights in J. Baylis, and S. Smith, (eds) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bull, H. (1977a) The Present Relevance of the Balance of Power in Levine, H M. (ed) *World Politics Debated: A Reader in Contemporary Issues.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Bull, H. (1977b) *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics.* New York: Macmillan/Columbia UP.

Chesnais, F. (2004) Globalization against Development, *International Socialism Journal,* 102, Spring, retrieved from http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj102/chesnais.ht, accessed 01 February 2010.

Darusman, M. (2003) Advances in Furthering Human Rights in South East Asia, *Development Policy Dialogue,* Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung, 29-30 September, Cologne, Germany.

Durkheim, E. (1984) *The Division of Labour in Society.* New York: Free Press.

Friedman, T.L. (1999) *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization.* Cairo: International Publishers.

Hufbaur, G.C. *Globalization Facts and consequences*, Institute for International Economics, http://www.iie.com/papers/hufbaur1000.htm), 2001.

Human Right Watch (2017) *World Report 2017: Nigeria,* Human Right Watch, New York, www.hrw.org/world-report/2017/country-chapters/nigeria, accessed 17 July 2018.

Huntington, S. (1993) The Clash of Civilization, *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 72, No3.

International Order of Human Rights, Report about the situation of children in Iraq, www.iohr.org/news/2006070301/report.html, accessed on 11 November 2009.

Intriligator, M. D. (2003) Globalization of the World Economy: Potential Benefits and Costs and A Net Assessment, *Policy Brief Number 33*, Milken Institute, California.

Jessop, B. (2003) The Future of the State in an Era of Globalization, *International Politics and Society,* 3/2003.

Mariner, J. (2009) US Presidential Order Affirms CIA Secret Detentions: Allows Detention in Violation of Geneva Conventions, *Human Right Watch*, www.hrw.org/en/news/2007/07/19, accessed on 23 November 2009.

Mark, J. (2001) At the Millennium, a Broader Definition of Human Rights: Justice, Democracy and Dignity, *Global Exchange,* www.globalexchange.org/about/newhumanrights.html, accessed on 19 November 2009.

Maull, H. (2002) Containing Entropy, Rebuilding the State: Challenges to International Order in the Age of Globalization*, International Politics and Society*, 2/2002.

Mian, Z. (2005) A New American Century? *Foreign Policy in Focus*, www.fpif.org, accessed on 6 May 2005.

Mideast and North Africa Encyclopedia, *Middle East States and International Human Rights,* www.answers.com/topic/human-rights, accessed on 17 November 2009.

Naim-Ahmed, S. (2002) Human Rights and Globalization, Paper presented at the XV *Congress of the International Sociological Association,* Brisbane, 8-11 July.

NOI Polls (2016) *Situational Assessment of Internally Displaced Persons in North-East Nigeria: Survey Report,* Abuja, www.noi-polls.com, accessed 17 July 2018.

Nwolise, O.B.C (2001) War Making, Peace Making and Conflict Resolution in Africa, Paper Presented for 5 Day *Peace-Mediation Essential Skills Training Programme,* AREF Headquarters, Lagos, March 19-23.

Osiatynski, W. (2000) Human Rights Need Definition, *Gladstein Distinguished Lecture on Human Rights,* 23 October 2000, www.advance.uconn.edu/2000/001023/00102302.htm, accessed on 18 November 2009.

Paul, L. S .J (2002) *Education for Globalization*, America Press. http://www.americapress.org/articles/locatelli.htm

Robinson, M. (2003) Globalization and human rights, *21st Century Trust seminar on Globalization: Rhetoric, Reality and International Politics*, Congress, Washington DC.

Rodney, W. (1973) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa.* Dar-Es-Salaam: Tanzanian Publishing House.

Scholte, J. A. (1997) Introduction: A Globalizing World in J. Baylis and S. Smith, (Eds) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sengupta, A. (2006) The Human Rights to Development in B. A. Andreassen and S. P. Marks (eds) *Development as a Human Rights: Legal, Political, and Economic Dimensions,* Harvard School of Public Health, Boston.

Shah, A. (2004) Human Rights in Various Regions *Global Issues,* www.globalissues.org/article/138/human-rights-for-all, accessed on 24 November 2009.

Shah, A. (2008) China and Human Rights, *Global Issues*, www.globalissues.org/144/china-and-humanrights, accessed on 24 November 2009.

Smith, S. & Baylis, J. (1997) Introduction in J. Baylis, and S. Smith, (eds) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Stohl, R. & Georgieff**,** A. (2013) *UN Committee Criticizes Obama Administration's Use Of Child Soldiers' Waivers*, February 14, 2013, http://www.stimson.org/spotlight/un-committee-criticizes-obama-administrations-use-of-child-soldiers-waivers/ accessed 08 August 2013.

Talmon, J. L. *Totalitarian democracy,* www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Totalitarian_democracy, accessed on 8 August 2008.

Taylor, I. (2002) New World Orders Without End? An Intellectual History of Post-War North-South Relation, *Annual Journal of African History*, Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa, Nos. 9 & 10.

The Guardian (Lagos), UN investigator slams US justice system, death penalty, Wednesday, July 2, 2008, p. 11.

The Guardian, ICC prosecutor requests probe of Kenya's post-election violence*,* 27 November 2009, p. 10, www.ngrguardiannews.com.

The Guardian, Japan leaders denounce Okinawa rape, February 13, 2008, pp11, www.ngrguardiannews.com.

The Guardian, Obama nudges China on human rights, 17 November 2009, pp11, www.ngrguardiannews.com.

The Guardian, *World Report: Bush defends Iraq war decision despite report*, Friday, October 8, 2004, p. 9. www.ngrguardiannews.com.

The United Nations (2009) *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, www.un.org/en/documents/udhr, accessed on 11 November.

Theodore, L. (1983) The globalization of markets, *Harvard Business Review*, 61 (3) (May-June): 92-102.

Thomas, C. (1997) Poverty, Development, and Hunger in Baylis, J. and S. Smith, (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Tijani, H.O. (2015) Globalization, Institution and Public Private Partnership: The Nigerian Experience, *Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization,* Vol. 43.

Tooze, R. (1997) International Political Economy in an Age of Globalization in J. Baylis, and S. Smith, (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vitta, P. (2000) What one African said to me the other day**,** *UNESCO Bulletin*, Vol. 35, No. 2, July-December.

Wikipedia encyclopedia, *United States Bill of Rights,* www.en.wikipedia.org, accessed on 16 November 2009.