


UDC 327:339.9

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2023.2.20>


**S. M. AAMIR ALI,**

*Symbiosis International (Deemed University), Pune (India),  
Symbiosis Law School Pune;*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8686-0217>,  
*e-mail: smaamiraliofficial@gmail.com;*

**DR. ANUTTAMA GHOSE,**

*Dr. Vishwanath Karad MIT World Peace University, Pune (India);  
School of Law;*

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7210-4074>,  
*e-mail: anuttamaghose@gmail.com*

## **BALANCING GLOBALISATION PROCESS THROUGH DEVELOPMENT AGENDA: SUSTAINABLE GLOBAL JUSTICE**

The prevailing assumption was that the phenomenon of globalisation would yield equitable benefits for all nations. Nevertheless, it has become evident that the benefits of globalisation norms are predominantly enjoyed by affluent nations. Although the concept of globalisation was initially intended to enhance the agency of developing nations, it has instead resulted in the erosion of their autonomy to independently determine their course of action. The democratic process has been impacted by the loss of decision-making power experienced by emerging countries as a consequence of globalisation. The rules governing globalisation were inequitably formulated to provide preferential treatment to developed nations. Contrary to prevailing popular opinion, the impact of globalisation on both developing and affluent nations has exhibited disparities. The questioning of norms governing globalisation has emerged as a consequence of the phenomenon of globalisation. This process further exacerbated the existing division between the global north and global south, leading to a heightened level of separation between these two regions. International financial institutions based in Washington disregarded the objections raised by developing nations and formulated a strategy aimed at mitigating the disparity in wealth. The ideology of privatisation and the free market is commonly referred to as the Washington consensus. The concept of state non-intervention proved to be disappointing as it primarily served the interests of the international organisations involved, thereby failing to benefit other stakeholders. Hence, it is imperative to formulate a development strategy that encompasses principles of equity, justice, and long-term sustainability. The existing understanding of sustainable development and the approach to attaining justice through sustainability necessitate a reevaluation in order to accomplish similar objectives. The authors of this research endeavor to investigate the extent to which the current development agenda is sufficiently comprehensive to address the shortcomings of past attempts to reconcile globalisation with development. This study aims to examine the response of the global community to the phenomenon of globalisation through the implementation of the Development Agenda. This paper examines the influence of globalisation on the policy-making processes of developing nations. Finally, the authors proceed to analyse the concepts of justice, growth, and sustainability.

**Key words:** *Development Agenda, globalisation, global justice sustainability, sustainable development.*

### *Original article*

**INTRODUCTION.** In the early 1990s, globalisation was greeted with extreme happiness and excitement. Capital flow in developing countries had increased massively, nearly six times more in the period ranging from 1990–1996. On the contrary, the globalisation process has produced uneven growth in developing and developed nations. Globalisation has favoured the rich to grow richer, which has posed serious questions on the rules that govern globalisation. The rules which

govern this process were unfair and specifically designed to benefit industrial countries.

Concerns about the development of poor countries were widespread in 2000, which led to a meeting of world leaders. The world leaders had decided to set a few time-bound targets for the period 2000–2015, known as Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The report card of MDGs had mixed results. Although development results were laudable, their impact was uneven. MDGs

have failed to recognise human rights and environmental aspects in it. To cure the deficiencies put forth by MDGs and balance the development process in a globalising world, sustainable development goals were devised by world leaders, which is the current developmental agenda. The question before us is how to implement the same to obtain sustainable global justice through balancing the globalisation process.

Contrary to popular belief, globalisation effects on both developing and rich countries have been unequal. As a result of globalisation, the norms that regulate it have been questioned. Globalisation rules were unfairly crafted to favour industrialised nations (Qizilbash, 1998). As a result, emerging countries lost their power to make their own decisions, which in turn affected the democratic process. Global North and Global South were further separated by this process, which resulted in a larger divide between them. Poor nations' objections were mostly ignored by Washington-based international financial institutions, which devised a plan aimed at reducing the wealth gap. The philosophy of privatisation and the free market is known as the Washington consensus. The notion of state non-intervention was a letdown since the sole beneficiaries of the above-mentioned agreement were the international organisations themselves (Ward, 2012).

In 2000, a conference of the world's most influential leaders was held to discuss the plight of the world's poorest peoples. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were agreed upon by the world's leaders that year. The outcomes of the MDGs were varied, despite the fact that the development achievements were commendable. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) failed to include human rights and environmental considerations in their goals. The leaders of the globe created a new set of development objectives to remedy the MDGs' shortcomings and balance the globalising development process. In order to achieve long-term global justice, we need to figure out how to execute these principles in order to balance globalisation.

An effort has been made to open a dialogue around the idea of development and its right to be developed in this study. The study also emphasises on how the global community reacted to globalisation by putting the Development Agenda into play. There is also a section on the way globalisation affects developing countries' policymaking. Last but not least, the study aims to examine the relationship between justice, growth and sustainability.

**PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH.** While globalisation was supposed to

empower developing countries, it has deprived them of the capacity to make their own decisions. As a result of globalisation, emerging countries lost their power to make their own decisions, which affected the democratic process. The rules of globalisation were unfairly designed in favour of industrialised countries. Contrary to popular belief, globalisation effects on developing and rich countries have been unequal. In this paper, an effort has been made to open a dialogue around the idea of development and its right to be developed in this study. The study also emphasises on how the global community reacted to it by putting the Development Agenda into play. There is also a section on the way globalisation affects developing countries' policymaking. Last but not least, the study aims to examine the relationship between justice, growth and sustainability.

**METHODOLOGY.** Given the nature of the problem, doctrinal and analytical methods should be applied. In accordance with this method, attempts shall be made to use facts and information already available and analyse them to make a critical evaluation of the problem. While analysing specific controversial issues, which often arise, conceptual methodology shall be adopted which is generally used to develop new norms or to re-interpret existing ones.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### *1. Development Scheme as Messiah of Balancing Globalisation Process*

#### *1.1. Expanding Divide Between North and South*

The decade after the conclusion of World War II was marked by an unprecedented drive for socioeconomic development by most countries. Development in the post-World War II era refers to changes in the region's socio-economic and political landscape. Underdeveloped, less developed, or developing countries may be found in several parts of the world. These nations are often referred to as being in the "third world".

Political liberalism, as embodied in the "free market" concept, has led to a greater split between the industrialised and developing worlds, which is characterised by a North-South divide. Increasingly, economic activity is being judged only on how much profit it can generate. It is not uncommon for people's labour, wisdom, and religious convictions to be treated as commodities in global markets. New forms of hegemony are emerging as a result of the lack of checks and balances in the power imbalances of capitalism, which has led to a polarisation of the globe. A balanced globalisation process between the global north and the global south necessitates a comprehensive development strategy.

### 1.2. *Meaning and Concept of Development*

Discussing development is required before talking about a complete development plan. People's living situations may be seen of as undergoing positive progress and transformation as part of the process of development. Developments in either the physical or non-physical realms are possible. It entails alterations or enhancements to the whole stock of a household's or country's assets (Kwane, 2011). Development, according to John Gantung's conceptual framework, is not confined to the development of nations, the production of goods, or the distribution of those things within the social system. He believes that they may be a means to a goal, but they should not be mistaken with the purpose itself, which is to develop mankind as a whole (Saxena, 1992). A considerable change in our appreciation and understanding of development has occurred. Economic growth has long been linked with development, but a new definition of development demonstrates a preference for human development. First Annual Human Development Report of 1990 likewise shows this change. Instead, than focusing just on money, as conventional economists have done, the aforementioned report includes "literacy, life expectancy, command over resources to enjoy decent standard of living" as factors to gauge progress.

The world community has been debating the measurement of progress for a long time. Now that economic development is being measured alongside other measures, such as liberty, human rights, social protection, and the presence of democratic institutions, growth is being calculated using a variety of metrics (Saxena, 1992).

### 2. *Recognition of the Right to Development as a Human Right*

Decolonisation throughout the 1960s ushered in a new era of political independence for developing nations, and they began to speak up for their right to development (Villaroman, 2011). Originally, the right to prosperity was not seen as a human right that could be asserted against the state by individuals but rather as a right of the people. As a result of colonial practises and exploitation, developing nations began claiming the right to development like an individual right that could be enforced against their state. Additionally, the above-mentioned need was related to two other requests.

First, creating a method that can help the "establishment of new international economic order" can enhance and, second, a commitment to the idea that natural resources belong entirely to the people who inhabit a certain place (Villaroman, 2011). In 1977, the UN Commission on Human

Rights officially recognised the "right to development" as a human right. To that aim, the panel suggested that the Economic and Social Council request the Secretary-General to begin a study project on the subject matter<sup>1</sup>. Working Group for Government Experts on Development's Issue to Development was set up in 1981 and discussion on the right was included in UN agenda<sup>2</sup>. The right to progress was also acknowledged by global leaders at important international gatherings. When they met in 1993, they reaffirmed their commitment to human rights at the World Conference on Human Rights<sup>3</sup>.

### 3. *Washington Consensus and its Consequences*

As the first development strategy for poor countries created by international financial institutions, might be referred as the Washington Consensus. To put it another way, it was a set of policies that were agreed upon by the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and other international monetary organisations. Thought to have been designed for the benefit of developing nations' economic institutions, economic prescriptions within this category have been widely disregarded (Stiglitz, 2004).

By focusing on the "Washington consensus", Dr. Joseph Stiglitz claims that it depicts a picture of market liberalisation and privatisation, as well as a diminution in government's overall role. Before they were widely accepted, the Washington consensus theories of development were regarded as intellectually bankrupt (Stiglitz, 2004). East Asia's development plan, which included a stronger role for the government, proved to be more effective than the majorities. In Latin America & Sub-Saharan Africa, the consensus in Washington has been undermined by failures (Stiglitz, 2004). Eventually, it became clear that it was a matter of politics instead of economics that was at play, and it may be found in the following paragraphs:

- When it came to openness, the International Monetary Fund and the United States Treasury were the least open of public organisations;
- On the other hand, the Scandinavian nation's most hit by the financial crisis were among the most open;
- The International Monetary Fund and its methods remained an impediment to market-based land allocation in the country.

<sup>1</sup> UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 4 (XXXII1) of 21 February 1977.

<sup>2</sup> UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 36 (XXXVII) of 11 March 1981.

<sup>3</sup> 15 Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, UN Doc. A/CONF.157/24 (Part 1), art 10, (1993), reprinted in 32 ILM 1661, art 10.

A lack of disclosure and weak governance have been blamed on developing nations' deficiencies by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for their economic troubles (Stiglitz, 2004). Some scholars have also noted that whatever growth that occurred as a result of Washington consensus policies was confined to the World Bank, IMF, and other international organisations that were founded after liberalisation (Woo, 2004). From the above, it is clear that the Washington Consensus was an abject failure as an agenda for developing nations.

The gathering at UN Headquarters in 2000 was prompted by widespread worries about global development. Leaders from across the globe gathered at the conference to establish goals for the future<sup>1</sup>. As a result, the Millennium Development Goals were established. This agreement was made between 2000 and 2015 by the leaders of the world's countries. It is critical to point out here that the conference did not discuss the link between the environment and economic growth (Stiglitz, 2004). A huge gap existed between developed and developing nations due to the affluent countries' primary focus on environmental conservation, while poor countries did not want to sacrifice their own growth in the name of protecting the environment. North and South are still at odds over the issue at hand. Because of this, there was a need for a paradigm that could accommodate the interests of both rich and developing countries (Stiglitz, 2004). The UN General Assembly approved the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) in September 2015, as the term of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) came to an end<sup>2</sup>.

#### 4. *Journey from Millennium Development Goals to Sustainable Development Goals*

##### 4.1. *Millennium Development Goals*

To meet the Millennium Development Objectives by 2015 (MDGs), there were eight goals, each with 18 time-bound targets and 48 indicators requiring measurable commitments<sup>3</sup>. As a result of MDG policies and programmes, significant progress had been achieved toward attaining the objectives of the global development agenda. There were mixed outcomes in *The Millennium*

*Development Goals Report 2015's*<sup>4</sup>, annual report card. It was hoped that the millennium statement would inspire the creation of the Millennium Development Goals. Human rights and democratization had been left out of the translation when they were issued. There was a lack of human rights emphasis in the MDGs, and as a result, various negative repercussions resulted. Even though many of the Millennium Development Goals have been met with commendable success, progress has been unequal in different parts of the world and nations. Millions of people were left behind because of their gender, age, handicap, and other factors, as shown in the study. It is obvious from the chart below that in Sub-Saharan Africa where 40 percent of the population resides in severe poverty, there has been a favourable influence on those who are undernourished and those who are living below the poverty line (Franco, 2018).

Global hunger and poverty have declined, yet in places like Sub-Saharan Africa, 40 percent of the population people living below the poverty line, as seen by the data presented above. For example, here are a few reasons why Millennium Development Goals did not work out as planned:

- There was a lack of openness in the development of the MDGs. Because the IMF, WB, and OECD did not allow wider involvement in the drafting process, vital rights like the right to life were missing<sup>5</sup>;
- Unnecessary emphasis was paid on statistical averages & composites in the MDG framework, which resulted in less attention to qualitative elements of development, such as disparities.

As a result, despite commendable progress toward the MDGs, considerable gaps and disparities persist, necessitating a dependence on the SDGs to help solve this complicated unsolved conundrum (Bell, Morse, 2011).

##### 4.2. *The New Development Agenda (Post-2015) – Sustainable Development Goals*

Globally, the community accepted the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) as a remedy for MDGs' shortcomings in 2015. It serves as a roadmap for the next 15 years of global growth for poor nations. Earlier that year, the United Nations General Assembly set up an Open Working

<sup>1</sup> G.A. Res. 55/2, U.N. Millennium Declaration, (Sept. 8, 2000) [hereinafter Millennium Declaration].

<sup>2</sup> 8. G.A. Res. 70/1, "U.N. Sustainable Development Goals" (Sept. 25, 2015).

<sup>3</sup> "U.N. System Task Team on the Post-2015 U.N. Development Agenda, Discussion Note, Review of the contributions of the MDG Agenda to foster development: Lessons for the post-2015 UN development agenda", at 3 (Mar. 2012)

<sup>4</sup> Dept. of Econ. and Soc. Affairs of the U.N. Secretariat, "The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015", at. 4–7 (2015) [hereinafter 2015 MDGs Report].

<sup>5</sup> U.N. System Task Team on the Post-2015 U.N. Development Agenda, Discussion Note, Review of the contributions of the MDG Agenda to foster development: Lessons for the post-2015 UN development agenda, at 3 (Mar. 2012).

Group to investigate how to come up with a set of universally accepted Sustainable Development Goals. There is a new global development agenda that was accepted during the 2015 World Summit, which includes 17 objectives and 169 targets, issued by the working group in September 2015<sup>1</sup>.

It was believed to have been created by the global leaders to address the MDG's in the following ways:

- SDGs focused more on the poor and vulnerable than the MDGs, which was not the case with MDGs;
- In addition to focusing on women's health and rights, the sustainable development objectives also included a focus on the mortality rate of women;
- Environmental factors, such as climate change, received particular emphasis;
- There was a clear connection between peace and security.
- The SDGs, unlike the MDGs, were developed via public input and openness. Its development was marked by an unprecedented level of openness to public input. MDGs were drafted by United Nations officials, on the other hand<sup>2</sup>. The SDGs, however, have been criticised for the following reasons.
- The non-binding character of the declaration of aspirations it included was not properly used.
- The draught does not specify how much of the burden each party should bear, and particular tasks have not been assigned, therefore this may not be adequately performed until it is clearly defined.
- Progress cannot be measured properly since the present institutions are influenced by politics instead being autonomous and democratic (Pogge, 2015).

SDGs go well beyond the MDGs in every area since they apply to everyone everywhere. It has attempted to fill up the void left by the absence of a human rights framework. The implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) at both the national and international levels must be democratic.

<sup>1</sup> Introduction to the proposal of the Open Working Group for Sustainable Development Goals.

<sup>2</sup> U.N. Security-General, Synthesis Report of the Secretary-General on the post-2015 sustainable development agenda, entitled the road to dignity by 2030: ending poverty, transforming all lives and protecting the planet, U.N. Doc. A/69/700 and Corr. I (Dec. 4, 2014) [hereinafter Synthesis Report].

### *5. Globalisation and Race to the Bottom: Policy Framework in the Developing Nations*

Interplay between globalisation and development policies has several ramifications for less developed nations, such as the choice of policies to preserve the balance between market demands and boost domestic welfare activities (Cook, Silisi, Adolph, 2015). In order to compete in the increasingly competitive global finance markets, less developed nations must join. Governments slash salaries and benefits for the poor in order to appease capitalists on both the local and international fronts. In essence, "race to the bottom" (RTB) refers to this situation (Rudra, 2008).

According to this, when commerce and cash move freely throughout the world, investors are able to chase the best rate of return. These countries would have to deal with decreased profit margins as a result of policies that either boost production costs or impede healthy macroeconomic fundamentals. For example, it is difficult for governments to implement or sustain pro-public policies like low-cost wages, worker safety nets, and environmental protections in such a circumstance. Consequently, there is an imbalance in the weight given to global trade over the welfare programmes (Rudra, 2008).

It follows from the arguments above that poor nations do not gain more from globalisation by opening themselves up to the globalising globe. It is possible that GDP growth may be unsustainable, or that growth will be maintained, but the quality of life for the people will be negatively impacted (Stiglitz, 2006). Globalisation has been linked to a worsening of the lowest classes of society, both real and comparative, according to a number of academics (Stiglitz, 2006). Taking all of the above into consideration, the current research aims to identify and analyse how the growing globalisation of the world market would affect the welfare reforms of LDCs.

#### *5.1. Policy Framework in the Developing Countries Keeping in Mind Race to the Bottom Pressures*

According to some critics, the predicament of the poor is not a result of globalisation. The above-mentioned factors are determined by the relationship between globalisation and state institutions and practices of a country (Stiglitz, 2006). What is next for emerging economies is how to react to race-to-the-bottom pressures while ensuring social welfare measures are not undermined by globalisation. Is it possible to continue social welfare programmes in view of the constraints exerted on emerging nations by global competition for resources? (Stiglitz, 2006).

According to this theory, home institutional variables such as fragmented labour movements,

government-labor interaction restrictions, and domestic social policy configurations eventually shape solutions to globalisation problems. Analysis of the reasons why race towards the bottom results vary in developed and developing nations is necessary to comprehend the above. This necessitates the identification of the underlying causes. Labour has a better chance of overcoming collective action challenges in the industrialised world, making it simpler to reconcile globalisation with long-term social spending. As a result, in the developing world, labour market organizations are more dispersed, which increases the likelihood of a race to the bottom (Durch et al., 2009).

In addition, it is important to remember that the effects of globalisation vary greatly across affluent and poor nations. When the international market expands, policymakers in rich and developing nations respond differently because of the variations in their internal institutions. The capacity of labour market institutions to successfully (or not) bargain between labour, industry, and government is what causes these inequalities, particularly in respect to labour. Whereas, on the one hand, organised labour and labour institutions are much more widespread in industrialised countries, labour and labour organisations in developing countries are fragmented, making effective negotiations between the two parties difficult. In LDCs, there is no unanimity on national objectives, therefore governments have more discretion to act according to foreign pressure. As a result, we can argue that the structure and organisation of the labour and labour markets play a significant role in protecting against RTB. Furthermore, the RTB proposes that, regardless of the national institutions, all nations would succumb to the free market principles, laissez-faire policies in order to retain a position in the world market and to enhance competitiveness in the global marketplace (Mishra, 1999).

There are two additional causes for decreased welfare expenditure in LDCs as a result of globalisation, in addition to those already listed. It is important to realise that market discipline is not an effective tool for achieving social goals. For one thing, "Footloose capital" has made it difficult for governments to obtain funds for social expenditures (Mishra, 1999). Furthermore, governments are obliged to lower capital taxes as the worldwide market expands in strategies to succeed with other countries for foreign investment. As a result of this, the world has seen Lindblom's "markets as prisons" theory come to life (Maxfield, 1998). For governments, protecting people from the hazards and uncertainties of market development has become more challenging as a result of international competition.

Developing and under-developed nations are more vulnerable to the "race to the bottom" acceleration of globalisation, making it harder for them to implement welfare and protectionist measures. Ultimately, this causes unfairness and divides not only between the developed and developing worlds, but also inside the country itself. As a result, injustice results from inequality.

The following section will discuss Indian regulatory framework in the context of globalisation, with a focus on how it responds to competition for resources and declining wages.

### *5.2. Case of Globalisation and Policy Framework in India*

We may learn a lot about the impact of globalisation and the race to the bottom in a developing nation by studying the legislative framework in India before and after globalisation. It might be claimed that the distribution system in India is protected. For a long time, the Indian government concentrated on de-commoditization activities and did so in particular in two ways. These included labour market protection and public sector job creation (Maxfield, 1998).

The employment of a large proportion of employees in the public sector and labour-friendly policies that take into consideration employment relationships and working conditions may be seen as the heart of Indian welfarism. First Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru aspired to develop a reasonably autonomous economy in order to strengthen India's national security. Import substitution industrialization strategies were used in an effort to keep India isolated from the global economy, thereby preserving strategic independence (Nayar, 2001). As a result, India was able to join the global economy earlier than any other emerging nation following independence (Nayar, 2001). In contrast, India's strategy to growth was labelled as "export pessimism". Eventually, India's position in global markets slipped due to its inability to sustain the "Hindu rate of growth" (Nayar, 2001). Subsequently, India shifted its position and embraced the globalisation of the globe. Industry and commerce reforms under Rajiv Gandhi started in the mid-1980s, but only gained traction until the early 1990s balance of payments crisis.

As a result of globalisation and the RTB, India's policies have changed. In India, RTB pressures are quite genuine. Government spending in India has decreased by over 6 % since the introduction of this new policy in 1991 (Nayar, 2001). As a result, India's spending on social security, health care, and education has decreased significantly since 1991. There is a movement in the allocation of resources from the above-mentioned

industries to address foreign competition, which might be seen as evidence. Health, education, and social security are the three most obvious policy targets. While India's welfare methods have not changed significantly, the cuts to education, social security, and health care spending that began in 1991 have never been fully recovered (Nayar, 2001).

### *5.3. Race to the Bottom-Paradox Between Development, Justice and Sustainability*

In the 1980s and early 1990s, a new wave of social movements swept across the globe, from the First World to the Third, including India. The term "environment movements" has been used to describe this new social movement. In actuality, the environmental movements that took place in India were not conservationist movements. An amalgam of numerous current concerns and beliefs came together in these movements (Nayar, 2001).

All of these movements have added new dimensions to the "environmental" struggles, from the resistance to the Narmada, Silent Valley, and Tehri dams, to the efforts for peace and community harmony, to the new constructive initiatives to seek alternatives in water, education and energy, and so on. Additionally, since the 1980s numerous organisations and activities in India have also addressed various concerns, in which the democratic aspects and the human rights and justice issues are intertwined with each other. "Movements for environmental socialism" would be a good label for these types of movements (Nayar, 2001).

According to the current discussion, it is important to emphasise that all these social movements of the modern generation began to define the nexus among globalisation, development, and sustainability, and India is not the only location where this occurred, as previously indicated.

### *6. Justice, Sustainability and Development*

Based on this conversation, it may be concluded that justice and ecological are the most important concerns in the world's future. To fill the gap between affluent and poor nations and to restore the allocation of Earth's resources, justice is required. "Ecology" refers to the human-earth interaction. It is important to remember that in order to maintain the Earth, society must be organised in a way that allows everyone to benefit.

Understanding the link between fairness and sustainability is thus essential. Sustainable but unjust societies can't be described as worthy of sustaining. It is also self-defeating if a community is just but just not sustainable.

#### *6.1. Relationship Between Justice and Sustainability*

Dobson spoke about the relationship between distributive justice and environmental sustainability, according to whom, the relationship

between the two and "can only ever be a contingent one" (Dobson, 1998). Dobson contends in his "First Thesis", three major ways in which sustainability and justice discourses might be linked are the distribution of the environment as a resource, and justice as a function of sustainability and "justice to the environment" (Dobson, 1998). While Dobson's discussion of sustainability and justice has three options, it is possible to add a fourth option: that sustainability is a prerequisite for justice.

In light of this fourth alternative, below are some conceivable outcomes. In this research, we are attempting to determine if the link among sustainability and justice is constructive or destructive, whether the two are irreconcilable, and whether justice is an intrinsic aspect of sustainable development (Langhelle, 2000).

When it comes to describing the functional link between justice and sustainability, it is fair to say that this relationship is almost always portrayed as virtuous. Even in the case where environmental sustainability might be compromised by social and economic inequality, this could be seen as a positive sign for the future of our planet. For example, it would be difficult to choose either justice and sustainability in such a situation because if we choose durability above justice, we will be putting justice on the back burner while at the same time widening the gap between rich and poor (Dobson, 1998). Sustainability and justice have only a theoretical link, not a practical one, according to the previously indicated point of view.

#### *6.2. Sustainable Development and Liberal Theories of Justice*

Sustainability may be considered as a prerequisite for most things in the future. In the foregoing debate, we sought to grasp the link between sustainability and justice. For example, it is said that the framework of social justice link with sustainability is a major factor in environmental and development strategies. Goals of development and objectives and strategies that emerge from the notion of sustainable development are both affected by this (Dobson, 1998).

According to critics, the notion of sustainable development is a hot-button issue. Concepts of this kind are normative and difficult to grasp. As Dobson notes in his "Sixth Thesis", more or less liberal notions of justice can be reconciled with sustainable development (Dobson, 1998). Although it is argued that sustainable development violates liberal notions of justice in many ways, Dobson disagrees.

Sustainable development considers "other societies" and "future generations" (Thero, 1995). Accordingly, it supports what Rawls contends in Justice as fairness (Rawls, 1993). Using this idea

as a starting point, liberal views of justice are accused of overlooking the importance of economic interconnectedness and ecological restrictions at the global level. Assumptions like these are more egalitarian than liberal theories since they establish distributional principles.

What is to be sustained? The answers include irreversible nature, crucial natural capital, and natural value, as discussed further in the issue of sustainable development and justice (Dobson, 1998). This is a good representation of non-anthropocentric thinking. Dobson, on the other hand, says that “critical natural capital” includes sustainable development (Dobson, 1998).

In order to achieve social justice across generations, it is required to have both a material basis and access to natural resources, according to the viewpoint of equal chances and need fulfilment. Rawls’ thesis is that we should endeavour to ensure that human needs may be addressed in the future by securing the circumstances for this to occur (Rawls, 1993).

The concept of “critical natural capital” and sustainable development may be included into Rawls’ theory of justice (Dobson, 1998). From the perspective of Rawlsian justice, sustainable development can be seen as a “just savings principle”. In addition to preserving civilizations and cultures, sustainable development states and espouses that each generation does not endanger life-supporting natural systems on the Planet and preserves ecological conditions of life. For the same reason as sustaining the “just savings principle”, i.e., respecting, creating, and maintaining just institutions and everything necessary to make just institutions and the fair value of independence feasible, the above-mentioned actions may be stated to be taken (Dobson, 1998).

It is worth mentioning Dobson’s take on the matter. He makes the case for the following conclusion, “*to say that environmental sustainability is a precondition for distributive justice is to say nothing about the content of justice, and so we are drawn back to the empirical point*” (Dobson, 1998). He also takes issue with Dobson’s view of equality of opportunity, arguing that it is “*weak and rather unhelpful formulation*” (Dobson, 1998).

It is possible to find a wide range of justice systems based on a number of distributive principles and philosophies. However, the topic of physical sustainability as a requirement for distributive justice remains unanswered.

### 6.3. *The conception of sustainable development*

The World Commission differs from liberal ideas of justice in its endeavour to give a solution to the dilemma of reconciling physical sustaina-

bility and justice. A number of factors, including ideal and non-ideal theories, perceptions of the “empirical” reality, and the subject matter, are to blame for this shift in perspective. One of the most appealing aspects of sustainable development as an ideal is that it focuses on what is really doable in the near future. As a rule of thumb, it is not ideal in the idea that it is designed for an unfavourable environment. This effort to combine environmental and development problems into a unified framework deviates from of the liberal justice topic.

The empirical world, with a focus on environmental issues, is conspicuously lacking from liberal methods in many respects. One of the most important assumptions in the notion of sustainable development is the fact that ecological interconnectedness is rapidly increasing.

In this view, Rawls’ implicit premise about environmental self-sustainability is incorrect. Ecological interdependence, a notion based in sustainable development, makes it difficult for any state to preserve its environmental integrity on its own, which is what is meant by “self-sufficiency”. When it comes to economic conditions in developing nations, the European Commission has taken a step back from liberal views.

Inequality is an issue that has to be addressed in international procedural justice, as stated in Our Common Future. Future politics will be shaped by how resources were allocated in the past, according to this theory. But if there were no constraints to development, past disparities in resource usage would have little value. Finally, this premise that distinguishes sustainable development from liberal theories (Meadows et al., 1972). As a result, it can be claimed that the connection among justice and sustainability must be strengthened in order to achieve a fair development agenda that includes growth, justice, and equality, as well as sustainable development (Bednar, 2023).

**CONCLUSIONS.** Obviously, GDP can be used to assess the economic impact of a country, but it should not be used as the only measure of progress. To ensure a fair and sustainable world, the idea of development must take the qualitative aspects of human progress, such as the environment and human rights, into consideration. For the definition of development, which is now political in nature rather than independent and democratic, an appropriate mechanism rather than a few interested international organisations is required.

The existing institutional structure for promoting development in a globalised society lacks openness. In order for these institutions to accomplish their primary mission, they must be



democratised in both their structure and decision-making processes. When it comes to the World Trade Organization, it is important to oppose “green room” meetings and promote the participation of all nations. A more balanced allocation of voting rights across members of the IMF, both developed and developing, is needed to maintain fairness. The arbitrariness of debt waivers should also be evaluated in order to ensure openness.

When it comes to international relations, globalisation has a significant impact on the policy choices made by countries throughout the world. In contrast, the developing world was forced to bear the brunt of a race to the bottom.

Because of this, there is an imbalance of power among the countries, which has to be addressed right now. The world’s most powerful nations should pause for a moment and avoid interfering in developing countries’ decision-making processes. Developing nations should also improve their social security systems to guarantee that the benefits of globalisation are shared equally by all parts of society.

Sustainable development is indeed the future for a globalising society, and justice is an essential aspect of it. Toward a sustainable global justice, the international community has to integrate not only social justice, but environmental justice as well.

## REFERENCES

1. Bednar, J. (2023). Governance for Human Social Flourishing. *Daedalus*, 152(1), 31-45. [https://doi.org/10.1162/daed\\_a\\_01958](https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_01958).
2. Bell, S., & Morse, S. (2011). Sustainable Development Indicators: The Tyranny of Methodology Revisited. *Consilience*, 6, 222-239.
3. Cook, S., Silici, L., & Adolph, B. (2015). *Sustainable intensification revisited*. International Institute for Environment and Development.
4. Denoon, D. (1998). Cycles in Indian Economic Liberalization, 1966-1996. *Comparative Politics*, 31(1), 43-60. <https://doi.org/10.2307/422105>.
5. Dobson, A. (1998). *Justice and the Environment. Conceptions of Environmental Sustainability and Theories of Distributive Justice*. Oxford University Press.
6. Durch, W. J., Andrews, K. N., England, M. L., & Weed, M. C. (2009). Proposals to Increase UN Mission Criminal Accountability while Building Local Justice Capacity. In *Improving Criminal Accountability in United Nations Peace Operations* (pp. 39-65).
7. Franco, I. G. (2018). Sustainable Intergenerational Justice and its Ends. In C. Roldan, D. Brauer & J. Rohbeck (Eds.), *Philosophy of Globalisation* (pp. 167-178). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110492415-013>.
8. Kwane, D. K. B. (2011). Ethical Sustainability and Development. In H. S. Schiffman (Ed.), *Green Issues and Debates*. Sage.
9. Langhelle, O. (2000). Sustainable Development and Social Justice: Expanding the Rawlsian Framework of Global Justice. *White Horse Press, Environmental Values*, 9(3), 295-323.
10. Maxfeld, S. (1998). Understanding the Political Implications of Financial Internationalization in Emerging-market Countries. *World Development*, 26(7), 1201-1219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(98\)00053-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(98)00053-9).
11. Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J. et al. (1972). *The Limits to Growth*. Universe Books.
12. Mishra, M. (1999). *Globalisation and the Welfare State*. Edward Elgar.
13. Nayar, B. R. (2001). *Globalisation and Nationalism: The Changing Balance in India’s Economic Policy*. Sage Publications.
14. Pogge, T. (2015). The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) as Drafted: Nice Idea, Poor Execution. *Washington International Law Journal*, 24, 571-587.
15. Qizilbash, M. (1998). Concepts of Sustainable Development. In *Sustainable Development: Concepts, Measures and Conflicts* (pp. 2-5). Sustainable Development Policy Institute.
16. Rawls, J. (1993). *The Law of Peoples*. In S. Shute & S. Hurley (eds), *Human Rights*. Basic Books; Harper Collins.
17. Rudra, N. (2008). *Globalisation and the Race to the Bottom in Developing Countries, Who Really Gets Hurt*. Cambridge University Press.
18. Saxena, J. N. (1992). Uprooted People and Development. *The Right to Development in International Law*, 2, 179-189.
19. Stiglitz, J. E. (2004). The Post-Washington Consensus Consensus. *The Initiative for Policy Dialogue*. [https://policydialogue.org/files/publications/papers/Ch\\_4.pdf](https://policydialogue.org/files/publications/papers/Ch_4.pdf).
20. Stiglitz, J. E. (2006). *Making Globalisation Work*. Penguin Allen Lane Publications.
21. Thero, D. P. (1995). Rawls and Environmental Ethics: A Critical Examination of the Literature. *Environmental Ethics*, 3, 93-106.

22. Villaroman, N. G. (2011). Rescuing a Troubled Concept: An Alternative View of the Right to Development. *Philadelphia Law Journal*, 85, 140-196.

23. Ward, H. (2012). Key Concepts: Sustainable Development and Governance. In *Iso 26000 And Global Governance for Sustainable Development* (pp. 38-51).

24. Woo, W. T. (2004). *Serious Inadequacies of the Washington Consensus: Misunderstanding the Poor by the Brightest in Teunissen and Akkerman*, 9-43.

Received the editorial office: 8 April 2023

Accepted for publication: 15 May 2023

**С. М. ААМІР АЛІ,**

*Симбіоз Інтернешнл (визнаний університетом), Пуна (Індія),*

*Школа права «Симбіоз» у Пуні;*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8686-0217>,*

*e-mail: [smaamiraliofficial@gmail.com](mailto:smaamiraliofficial@gmail.com);*

**ДОКТОР АНУТТАМА ХОСЕ,**

*MIT Всесвітній університет миру Доктора Вішванатх Карад, Пуна (Індія),*

*юридичний факультет;*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7210-4074>,*

*e-mail: [anuttamaghose@gmail.com](mailto:anuttamaghose@gmail.com)*

**ЗБАЛАНСУВАННЯ ПРОЦЕСУ ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЇ ЧЕРЕЗ ПОРЯДОК ДЕННИЙ РОЗВИТКУ: СТАЛА ГЛОБАЛЬНА СПРАВЕДЛИВІСТЬ**

Вважалося, що феномен глобалізації надасть рівні переваги для всіх народів. Проте стало очевидно, що перевагами глобалізаційних норм користуються переважно заможні країни. Хоча концепція глобалізації спочатку мала на меті посилити спроможність країн, що розвиваються, натомість вона призвела до послаблення їхньої автономії у визначенні власного курсу дій. Втрата країнами, що розвиваються, права приймати рішення внаслідок глобалізації вплинула на демократичний процес. Правила, що регулюють глобалізацію, були несправедливо сформульовані таким чином, щоб надати переваги розвиненим країнам. Усупереч поширеній думці, вплив глобалізації як на країни, що розвиваються, так і на заможні країни виявився нерівномірним. Наслідком самого явища глобалізації стало піддавання сумніву норм, що регулюють глобалізаційні процеси. Цей процес ще більше поглибив існуючий поділ між глобальною Північчю та глобальним Півднем, що призвело до зростання рівня відокремленості між цими двома регіонами. Міжнародні фінансові установи, розташовані у Вашингтоні, проігнорували заперечення країн, що розвиваються, і сформулювали стратегію, спрямовану на пом'якшення нерівності в багатстві. Ідеологію приватизації та вільного ринку зазвичай називають Вашингтонським консенсусом. Концепція державного невтручання виявилася неспроможною, оскільки вона слугувала насамперед інтересам міжнародних організацій, що брали в ній участь, і таким чином не приносила користі іншим зацікавленим сторонам. Отже, необхідно сформулювати стратегію розвитку, яка б охоплювала принципи рівності, справедливості та довгострокової сталості. Існуюче розуміння сталого розвитку та підхід до досягнення справедливості через сталий розвиток потребують переоцінки для досягнення подібних цілей. У статті зроблена спроба з'ясувати, наскільки сучасний порядок денний розвитку є достатньо всеохоплюючим, щоб усунути недоліки минулих спроб поєднати глобалізацію з розвитком. Метою дослідження є вивчення реакції світової спільноти на феномен глобалізації через реалізацію Порядку денного розвитку. Досліджено вплив глобалізації на процеси формування політики країн, що розвиваються. Крім того, проаналізовано концепції справедливості, зростання та сталого розвитку.

**Ключові слова:** *Порядок денний розвитку, глобалізація, стала глобальна справедливість, сталий розвиток.*

**Цитування (ДСТУ 8302:2015):** Aamir Ali S. M., Ghose A. Balancing globalisation process through Development Agenda: sustainable global justice. *Law and Safety*. 2023. No. 2 (89). Pp. 217–226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2023.2.20>.

**Citation (APA):** Aamir Ali, S. M., & Ghose, A. (2023). Balancing globalisation process through Development Agenda: sustainable global justice. *Law and Safety*, 2(89), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2023.2.20>.