

Tasha White

Research Essay

Abstract

In this paper I will attempt to define the following concepts: globalization, human rights, and environmental involvement in the latter. Following this, I will introduce conflicts among their relations. Next, I will propose attainable solutions for each laid out strife. I will conclude with an inclusion of recommended progression for research.

Introduction

This paper will be touching on three concepts. These will include globalization and human rights, as well as the environment. The importance of the relations among these terms reflects the future of each term individually, along with intertwined future. Our species survival depends entirely upon the successful eventuality of each of these concepts, notably regarding environmental sustainability. The environment is affected by globalization, exceedingly in reference to human rights; the relations among these terms can be reversed through civil action, however, it must be prompt and drastic. The goal of this paper is to provide the knowledge needed to spark debate regarding these neglected topics and offer an option for potential solutions at this time. The three terms will be defined in the first section. The second section will describe the conflicts within them and display the reasoning of why discord is occurring in the first place. Lastly, a few pragmatic options will be shared in order to reverse the adversities within the relationships between the concepts. A conclusion will be the last to follow, sharing an overview of this paper's content and suggesting a beneficial transition for future research in order to appeal to the described solutions.

Definitions

Globalization can be described as the process of a growing interdependence among nations (Vargas, 2003). The ending product of globalization is globality, or a new global reality. The idea behind this process is to integrate the world's social connections and economic potential (Dinescu, 2017). This includes the removal and opening up of countries' borders in order to promote trade among them (Javaid, 2017). Globalization attempts to connect the world on a global scale to the degree of eliminated nationalism. It suggests an intertwined relationship among all communities in the world. Globalization is not an entirely new process. The shift from rural to urban living in itself shows this, however, it has only recently been sped up to the point of bringing widespread attention to itself. The emphasized conditions of globalization are the market, economic development, and increased world communications (Javaid, 2017). The idea behind the concept of globalization is that it will produce economic growth through the increased opportunities in a global market. This increase in economics will result in more money flow, and thus a higher standard of living. With an increase in living standards comes an escalation in fulfilled livelihood among populations. This growing contentment will then encourage workers to continue putting in effort for their economy through jobs and trade, creating a continuous circular effect. The ending result is hoped to be a united global world which is brought together through prosperity, especially economically (Dinescu, 2017). This is a pleasant theory but unfortunately, this is not the way that globalization has ended up progressing. I will discuss more of its actual effects in the next section.

Human rights are specific written entitlements and limitations designed to apply to every individual in the world. They protect only the fundamental needs of humans. Human rights have evolved through time, progressing from the past when rights were given by nature. Natural laws, as they were previously termed, were rights obtained by individuals in their natural state. These laws were not given but they were received by humans entirely just for being (Ristevski, 2016). They were the present conditions in the natural world which benefited humans. For example, the right to property was granted as people could choose whichever land they pleased as there was no overarching power system to stand in the way of their attainment. The right to culture was granted as individuals had no one to stop them from practising their own. A need for a documentation of these natural laws only became apparent upon globalization. Interference among one nation by another with different views often resulted in coercion to change that. This can be seen in an abundance of cases, coincidentally even through human rights. There is still controversy over the content of the rights as each culture and community is vastly different. The overarching idea of these rights is not to eliminate culture or differences but to provide individuals with absolute basic necessities (Hiskes, 2017). This illuminates the importance of what actual needs have progressed to be included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The environment enables all rights, comprehensibly the right to life, to be possible by sustaining life on earth. The environment entails all natural aspects of our ecosystem. The most prominent human right is the right to life. Of course, the justification is obvious; without life there would be no humans, let alone human rights. Without an ecosystem, humans would cease to exist. Therefore, it is an important aspect of what our basic human rights should entail for survival: clean air, clean water, etc. Again, these are several of the basic needs that human rights

declare they must protect, let alone the most important. Unfortunately, it is not so simple to include environmental rights into the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To adequately do this, there must be a hypothetical line drawn. This line should verge on the side of sustainability versus deterioration. The difficulty with this is determining where and justifiably why this line is where it is. Additionally, there are conflicts regarding the diffusion of environmental advantages which relates back to globalization. Many populations have no opportunity to protect and sustain their environment due to growing population product demands. This effect of globalization's priorities displays the importance of precedence among the process. These struggles, like the latterly listed ones, will all be examined in the next section.

Conflicts

The world's current course of globalization is unsustainable (Lowe, 2004). This is an absolute fact. The idea behind the concept possesses good value; an interdependent world with free trade comes across as globally progressive. Dismally, the process did not materialize in this manner. The contradicting actuality is that there is an extreme polarization among benefits across the world. The wealthy are benefiting greatly, while the poor are being left even worse off than previously (Chapman, 2009). In the last four years, the two hundred wealthiest people in the world have doubled their net worth (Gates, 2000). During this same time frame there have been three billion people living on less than two dollars a day. Within this, over one billion people are left with less than one dollar a day (Gates, 2000). Globalization boasts about the promotion of a united global "us" who work together to create a balanced, fair, and fruitful world, however, it is creating greater dissonance than it is solving. Its promotion of economic convergence has yet to

be seen in action with widespread positive effects (Dinescu, 2017). With a declining capital in developing countries comes a corresponding deterioration of health care amidst them as well. This in itself infringes upon human rights, however, environmental sustainability is also among the declining factors of health care (Chapman, 2009). Air, water, and soil do not recognize the wealthy from the poor or the differences between borders but they are still succumbing to the negative effects of globalization. This global process has unwittingly created the encouragement across developing nations to destroy what nature they have left to ensure survival. In order to produce the products necessary for global trade and keep up with the increasing expectations and demands of the growing world population, and thus maintaining their jobs, people must continuously destroy an ever increasing amount of their land (Lowe, 2004). They have no option other than to destroy or be destroyed. Faced with this conflict, there is only one obvious decision which enhances environmental degradation. The carrying capacity is currently inordinately beyond its limits (Edward, 2004). This capacity is the amount of product we can take from the Earth and still live sustainably. Being so far past the carrying capacity, if we continue on this path there will soon be no product to take from the environment. At this point we must cut back generously to be back at a sustainable capacity. It is no longer an option to just not use more but we must use much less. In fact, a large reason for such disproportional presence of benefits and rights for developing countries is due to the fact that developed countries use up so much of the carrying capacity that there is not a substantial amount left for those who don't get first pick. Developed countries have created foods that encourage overeating and obesity which use up even more of our environmental resources (Poskitt, 2009). Oil production has already peaked, meaning that with every passing day we are closer to the end of our supply. Land is increasingly

being lost to the growing urbanization and growing agriculture spaces. Forests are being destroyed, losing global coverage at an astounding rate. Almost all the world's fisheries are in decline, if still established, from salinity degradation (Lowe, 2004). Upon realizing the harmful results, the powerful transnational corporations who are allowing and persevering globalization, urge onward, consequently destroying increasingly more of the environment (Lowe, 2004). The enforcers of globalization respond to their own defiling of the environment by deeming life essentials, such as safe water, sanitation systems, and sufficient nutritious foods, as public goods and entitlements (Chapman, 2009). Pretending that life can survive without these necessities can only be short term ignorance. The long term effects are too drastic to upkeep such a narrow, inaccurate view. The disappearance of environmental products will eventually expose this ignorance.

Human rights supposedly protect the basic necessities of human life. It seems illogical then that the very things to ensure survival for any given human are absent from the document. Social, cultural, economic, and political living conditions are deemed needs and are present in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as they should be. A right of paid vacation is proposed as a dire need yet sustainability of the environment is overlooked (Hiskes, 2016). Environmental protection and sustainability should also be present on that list. Without a healthy, sustainable environment there will be no humans and definitely no need for rights. If we are to assume environmental protection and sustainability are human rights then there are conditions embedded within globalization that effectively violate the rights instead of protecting them (Chapman, 2009). At this time, globalization as we know it cannot exist coinciding with human rights. The economy of the world is raised and praised higher than any human right through

globalization. The transnational corporations in control of public policies, including regard for the market, are the same groups that make basic need availability constrained among most individuals. There is a growing public debt among developing countries, leading to an even greater reduction in public revenue which is worsening living conditions systematically (Chapman, 2009). This vast downfall among developing countries is currently still allowing these transnational corporations to continually grow and increase their own revenue. It is apparent that they will encourage globalization, at any cost, until it is no longer directly beneficial to them. The only time that the benefits will no longer occur is when there is no longer a life sustaining planet for it to occur on (Lowe, 2004). The threats of capitalism must also be addressed. Capitalism negatively impacts the way in which goods are produced (Gates, 2000). A capitalist context is currently present and abundant within globalization. The threat capitalism poses is the controlling of the market, without organized production, to ensure the production and consumption needs are met, at any cost. This promotes cheap, fast labour, therefore disregarding human rights and, correspondingly, environmental sustainability. This ties back in with the prioritization of the market instead of human capital.

The capacity to make and keep promises is a uniquely human trait, as noted by Hobbes (Hiskes, 2016). All social, material, economic, and political processes entirely depend upon our aspirations to maintain such promises. The exercise of creating and upholding promises, then, would be present in a natural state and thus be considered a natural right of humans. This presence should ensure the conversion of this right from natural law to human rights. Regarding this ideal, the documentation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights promises to all humans, present and future, that their rights will prevail (Hiskes, 2016). By living in our current

world and accepting these rights, we make an implicit communal promise to pass on the rights we enjoy today to future generations. This means that we must protect and fulfill environmental rights for not only ourselves but for future generations as well. We must acknowledge that the risks present today will eventually turn into harms. We must recognize the environmental rights of future generations and make changes in our lives in order to maintain them. By ignoring the harms we are currently generating upon our environment, we are effectively infringing upon future generations' human rights. We are disallowing them from being able to enjoy many of the listed human rights and potentially from getting the chance to live, what we consider, a full life. This is just one more way in which our current process of globalization is infringing upon human rights. If continued, there may not be an environment to save in the future. The coming generations deserve more from us and legally, through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we owe it to them. By accepting the existence of a future global world, it should be easier to see future populations as people we want to help. We must look forward and proactively avoid disasters just as we look to the past to protect against repeating tragedies. It is much easier for us to help people we know as opposed to people we have only heard of (Hiskes, 2016).

Solutions

The question of environmental sustenance does not have to remain ambiguous. The access and spread of information regarding our situation and possible solutions are giving way to new formalized rights aimed at protecting and sustaining life (Marien, 2012). Although we are currently on a negative path in terms of globalization, human rights, and the environment, it does not have to progress further than it already has. There must be an illumination of the seclusion

between “them” versus “us.” We must acknowledge and respect the future global “us” in order to turn it into reality (Hiskes, 2016). We are all being threatened by environmental damage and lack of human rights. This peril should, in itself, be enough of a motivator to commence serious change of the way we are treating our planet and each other. Though some of us may not experience it to the same extent, if nothing is done we most definitely will. Human capital must become the first and foremost priority for every individual and collective (Gates, 2000). In this respect, the flow of information should be allowed, but more importantly encouraged. It will promote and strengthen the development of increasingly sustainable lifestyles that could also save individuals and economies money (Gates, 2000). With more attainable knowledge, it will be easier for those who otherwise wouldn’t have access to education to become a skilled individual. This in turn benefits globalization by creating more individuals with skills to contribute to the global economy. The spread of knowledge positively affects smaller communities and nations directly, then more global communities as a result (Martin, 2004). Local ownership should be one of the highest priorities among globalization. Indigenization among a global world can help protect against the threats of capitalism (Gates, 2000). It can also create more genuinely engaged communities, those of which are much more apt to progress a global “us.” The inclusion of the entire world population into this global “us” will promote better attitudes, and a more dedicated population toward sustenance. Giving power to communities rather than large unknown transnational corporations gives citizens a sense of responsibility and community. Localization has the potential to benefit globalization, human rights, and the environment in so many ways. The power of larger corporations must be shared so the wealth and benefits can also be communal.

Globalization is not a negative process. With some amendments it can continue to benefit the global world as well as promote human rights and environmental sustenance. The global united world must begin today. With it, comes the need for a global government. The global world is an entirely new concept and to accommodate this there must be new and improved laws regarding it. Law has always been malleable and it is constantly changing in response to the changing society around it. The introduction of a global world and government calls for such a response (Marien, 2012). The highest priority for this institution must be the sustenance of the environment in order to maintain human rights and continue globalization as a drastically more beneficial process. Global enterprises must also widen and become more inclusive. The importance should be placed on the fact that there is a flow of capital, and not with concern of who owns the capital (Gates, 2000). Small businesses must stand a chance against multimillion dollar corporations for human rights and the environment's sake. The promotion of small businesses will not only create more jobs for the working class but also allow for a progressive future (Gates, 2000). The ways that transnational corporations can help is through their previous success. The United Nations Development Programme is a seemingly proactive network. They share knowledge and experience among nations who can benefit from it. They share the resources they acquire to help those who have a harder time getting it. From appearances, this program is extremely beneficial to the global world. Unfortunately, success and widespread popularity do not come without secrets. The UNDP has enough money to meet needs in every single developing country. It could easily pay off the debts and still be financially stable. Instead, they have sent their large financial sum offshore to other corporations (Gates, 2000). Companies, such as this one, need to review their actions and recognize the bigger, global picture. It is

beneficial to no one but themselves to hide such large sums of money from those in need. This is again where the global “us” must come before all else, especially greed. The recognition of interdependent nations must be achieved for any hope of a positive outcome. There should not be a desire to hide wealth or prosperity from any individual in our globality. There should, instead, be a desire to do all that one can to protect and promote prosperity among the global world.

Sustainability of the environment and human rights will not happen without advocacy. This will occur either by individuals and communities demanding it or as a last resort by government when there is no longer the option to ignore it (Bucur, 2017). People leave the comfort of their homes to seek out new product options, not to advocate against them. Through the spread of knowledge, as previously mentioned, there is dire hope that populations will become motivated to advocate changes now, while there is still an option for doing so with dignity (Bucur, 2017). Global scale social movements have the potential to force changes within globalization that will encourage environmental sustainability as well as respected and widespread human rights (Buttel, 2003). These are the globalized effects that will produce positive outcomes. An abundance of production used to be viewed as beneficial, however, it has escalated so much and has become so concentrated in areas in the world that it is now harming us (Bucur, 2017). Just like many other aspects of life, economics must be updated with the social world. We no longer need to continue producing for the very fact that we can. It is time, now, to produce change versus goods. Human rights cannot be honored and the environment has no hope of sustainability while the market is emphatically promoted as the paramount priority. Recognition of the availability of sustainability must be present to encourage and reaffirm those advocating on the behalf of the environment and human rights (Witoszek, 2006). It is not too late

but one day it will be. Creating a powerful narrative can also help to encourage individuals to demand changes (Witoszek, 2006). Creativity has the ability to spark widespread interest and advocacy. We must use this to our benefit. By engaging populations in the relations between human rights and environmental sustainability there will likely be more positive acceptance and participation in civil action. This is exactly what is needed to pressure governments to prioritize human capital, as they should have been doing all along. Our global world must begin to unite on important issues such as this. The future of all of our worlds literally depends on it.

Conclusion

If this paper has reached its goal then you, as the reader, will have a better understanding of globalization, human rights, and environmental involvement. There is an immediate and undeniable relationship among the three terms. I listed definitions and broke down the portrayed assumptions of how they are meant to be brought to action. A process with good intentions does not always display these positive desires. To be sure of how the procedure is proceeding, there needs to be continuous research and amendments. We must understand the conflicts today, in order to fix them tomorrow. The proposed solutions are not enough to turn our current negative situation into a positive one but each positive action is a small step in the right direction. I would suggest future research to the move in the direction of development for more sustainable conversions regarding modern luxuries. Similarly, it should continue to promote and provide knowledge regarding the relations between human rights and the environment and the necessary changes to globalization to sustain them. The restriction of currently abundant opulence in many cases will be the most difficult aspect of the transformation to a sustainable future. Living with

easy access to anything imaginable and then taking away such present options can be deemed difficult to adjust to. It is important during such endeavors to remember the bigger picture and regard the global “us.” We are all necessary to create the change needed for a sustainable future with human rights present in the new globality.

References

Bucur, Mihaela. “A Study on Issues and Solutions for Sustainable Development.” *Scientific Bulletin of the Petru Major University of Targu Mures*. Vol. 14, no. 2, July 2017, pp. 36- 43.

Buttel, Frederick H. “Some Observations on the Anti-Globalization Movement.” *Australian Journal of Social Issues (Australian Council of Social Service)*. Vol. 38, no. 1, Feb 2003, pp. 95-116.

Chapman, Audrey R. “Globalization, Human Rights, and the Social Determinants of Health.” *Bioethics*. Vol.23, no. 2, Feb 2009, pp. 97-111.

Dinescu, Adrian-Gabriel. "The Future of Globalization." *Romanian Review of Social Sciences*, vol.7, no.12, Jan 2017, pp. 29-44.

Gates, Jeff. "Humanizing Capitalism." *Peace Review*. Vol.12, no.2, June 2000, pp. 183-8.

Hiskes, Richard. "The Honor of Human Rights: Environmental Rights and the Duty of Intergenerational Promise." *Human Rights Review*. Vol.17, no. 4, Dec 2016, pp. 463-78.

Hiskes, Richard P. "With Apologies to the Future: Environmental Human Rights and the Politics of Communal Responsibility." *International Journal of Human Rights*. Vol. 21, no. 9, Dec 2017, pp. 1401-16.

Marien, Michael. "Law in Transition Biblioessay: Globalization, Human Rights, Environment, Technology." *World Future Review (World Future Society)*, vol. 4, no. 2, Summer 2012, pp.103-13.

Mittelman, James H. "Globalisation and Environment Resistance Politics." *Third World Quarterly*. vol. 19, no. 5, 15 Dec 1998, pp. 847-72.

Javaid, Umbreen, and HabibollahJavan Siahmardy. "Globalization, Interdependence and Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO)." *South Asian Studies (1026-678X)*. vol. 32, no. 1, Jan-Jun 2017, pp. 27-38.

Lowe, Ian. "Globalisation, Environment and Social Justice." *Social Alternatives*. Vol.23, no. 4, 2004, Fourth Quarter, pp. 37-41.

Martin, Edward J. "Sustainable Development, Postmodern Capitalism, and Environmental Policy and Management in Costa Rica." *Contemporary Justice Review*. Vol. 7, no. 2, June 2004, pp. 153-69.

Poskitt, E. M. E. "Countries in Transition: Underweight to Obesity Non-Stop?" *Annals of Tropical Paediatrics*. Vol. 29, no. 1, Mar 2009, pp. 1-11.

Ristevski, Temelko and Nazmi Malichi. "The Right to a Healthy Living Environment in Function of the Right to Life." *Vizione*. Vol.26, Aug 2016, pp. 95-107.

Vargas Llosa, Mario. "Culture and New International Order." *European Judaism*. Vol. 36, no. 1. Spring 2003, pp. 17-29.

Witoszek, Nina. "Globalization and Sustainability: A Humanist Agenda." *Ecotheology: Journal of Religion, Nature & the Environment*. Vol. 11, no. 3, Sept 2006, pp. 268-81.