



Katie (Winner)

Is globalisation good for the world?

As consumers in the 21st century we want lower prices, higher quality and sharper delivery. As businesses in the 21st century we want cheaper production, low labour costs and profit maximisation. Yet as humans in the 21st century we want social equality, cultural diversity and local businesses. As humans, we cannot reach these needs due to a growing problem in consumerism: Globalisation. This is the process by which businesses or other organisations develop international influence or start operating on an international scale. On the surface, businesses appear to be at the core of this problem. However, this is only due to consumers greedy demands wanting products quicker, cheaper and newer. As humans we must ask ourselves: is our hunger for products more important than equality in parts of the world? As businesses we need to ask ourselves: does an expansion of a market and profit maximisation come before the needs of our future planet and long-term success?

Not only do I strongly disagree that globalisation is good for the world but also that it drives social inequality in high-production countries such as China, India, South Korea etc as a way of highlighting how globalisation has only weakened the income gap between HICS profiting off sweat shops and LICs being paid less than minimum wage. For example, Shein, a global fast fashion brand offering clothes at prices such as £1.99 began to make consumers raise questions on how this brand could be profiting with such a low-price range. It wasn't until the BBC investigated this matter that it was found workers for Shein in China were being paid between "4,000 to 10,000 yuan a month," working 10-12 hours a day and taking part in child labour. When we consider a cheaper price of clothing in juxtaposition to the cost of hiring underpaid, tired children to make these clothes, globalisation is insignificant. Businesses are exploiting humanity and global markets for the cost of tax avoidance. It may seem countries specialising for different industries is beneficial for them however it only widens the gap between rich and poor as those at the top of global companies take all the money, leaving workers with less than minimum wage pay. Thus, HICS will continue to dominate world trade and therefore the cyclical nature of wealth will remain in the hands of arrogant leaders. However, it also impacts LICs where industry was being used for job opportunities. Due to labour and the cost of factories being cheaper abroad, many people have had job losses in developed countries too due to offshoring. This creates structural unemployment due to workers trying to combat a shifting economy and thus companies are not only destroying the world's economy but also their own countries too. Therefore, whether globalisation is good for the world depends on how it is managed and regulated; such as protecting workers and ensuring that the benefits of globalisation are more evenly distributed across countries which businesses are failing to do. Thus, socially globalisation negatively impacts most demographics.



Katie (Winner)

Another reason I strongly disagree is due to the rapid erosion of local businesses and cultures being destroyed by globalisation not only in LICs where they have less economic security but also in HICs where they struggle to compete with unsustainable and unethical global brands. For example, fast fashion brands such as H and M and Zara have made local boutiques in the UK go out of business due to consumer needs changing to have rapid production cycles and low prices which they increasingly struggle to compete with. Many businesses with strong USPs driving their brand loyalty and sales have struggled in the face of big corporate businesses who are copying the models of successful businesses by tailoring it to different market's needs. Not only are local businesses affected but also local cultures. Large companies are overshadowing unique local traditions and heritage which once made countries thrive with tourism. As countries are now integrated into the global economy, countries are more likely to adopt western style capitalist economic systems and consumer cultures. e.g. less farming, local businesses, less economic security and a disconnection from a country's own heritage. This can be due to factors such as migration as local people living in rural areas, e.g. on low-income jobs like farming, realise that there are more opportunities in the urban areas of the city, rife

with globalisation. However, this migration destroyed local customs, making cities increasingly dependable in what they feared the most: Globalisation. For example, "urbanisation in Nigeria to seek better jobs led to depopulated rural prayer houses." Commercialisation of culture has also had a disturbing impact on the people of Nigeria. What was once an element of Nigeria's cultural way of life has become a product and discarded their past. Nigeria's markets are now full of new images, music, clothes, discarding the familiar and old artefacts. These artefacts will now be lost due to not being valued in global markets and the spread of western culture will infect the once unique aspects of countries. Globalisation even has affected language patterns as most countries are forced to learn English and gradually overtime, making it more spoken than their own countries language. However, it wasn't just their language, it was their heritage and uniqueness stolen by globalisation. Despite this, globalisation has positively impacted countries heritages through tourism as it has created economic incentives for preservation and raising global awareness for unique tradition. E.g. In Indonesia, the tourism sector has helped to preserve historic sites, and global media has increased the recognition of cuisines and music. Using Indonesia's heritage as a tourism attraction has led to the restoration of their heritage, thus making us question whether globalisation can help local businesses and the economy thrive again if globalisation encourages foreign investment in tourism infrastructure. Therefore, only to an extent has globalisation damaged parts of countries heritages and businesses as in some areas it has had the direct opposite impact, helping to reconstruct culture.

However, arguably globalisation has helped the world using economic growth and productivity, vital for developing countries to have good job opportunities and reduce



Katie (Winner)

the rates of poverty. Expanding markets across businesses promotes wider competition between countries. Thus, this helps to drive businesses efficiency and lower prices due to factors such as economies of scale and the freer movement of labour. But these benefits arguably aren't distributed evenly between countries and thus this is why globalisation is a catalyst for further inequality. For example, the UK has a strong financial sector and high value manufacturing which means it can focus on exporting these products internationally, giving it a competitive advantage and helping to create jobs in developing countries and export income. Therefore, this enables countries to specialise and allows them to leverage off economic strengths to trade products. Thus, in reverse, in a developing country such as South America who specialise in the production of Sugar canes, they can sell and export these products to a HIC and in return receive manufactured goods. Another advantage is tech advancement due to the push of Globalisation. Large global companies are now exposed to increased competition and thus the desire to innovate and create a new differentiated product in the market has surged with motivation. This allows a global company not only to gain a competitive edge but also dominate the market effectively. For example, research from Harvard Business Review has shown that "companies exposed to global competition are 30% more likely to innovate than those operating solely domestically." Not only does this economically help businesses but it also socially helps developing countries. Using this innovation and technology, companies can spread the knowledge and technology to LIC'S which helps to boost local innovation capacity and productivity. This is essential for their long-term future development and improving the local people's quality of life. Therefore, arguably globalisation does help to positively impact people's lives socially, especially in areas of inequality.

Not only however is globalisation one of the most significant impacts on the environment and our planet but also on our future due to the ever-growing problem of the pollution and waste from producing these unethical and toxic products. The negative effects of globalisation are extensive due to the increased global demand of products leading to an increase in transportation of goods by using trucks, ships and planes and the extraction of resources such as oil which generates pollutants, contributing to greenhouse gases and thus adding to climate change. Also, businesses desire for materials such as minerals, water and timber has grown due to demand flourishing which in turn over exploits the shared natural resources of the earth which we now have a scarcity of. However,

this problem has been combated by governments agreeing to use renewable energy resources such as wind turbines, tidal energy and bio energy etc to lower the carbon footprint. It has also led to pollution due to factories increasing the use of plastic waste and plastic packaging which is being littered in developing countries. This in turn has led to widespread environmental contamination and pollution in land and water. For



Katie (Winner)

example, in Asian rivers and oceans, western waste is littered and due to developed countries, e.g. Turkey, exporting their plastic waste to these poorer nations, this contributes to the already heavily contaminated waters and damaged ecosystems. However, arguably globalisation could be turned into a positive tool if the government, businesses and workers all agreed to lower environmental effects. This can be seen by global companies creating pressure on countries to implement stricter environmental standards due to consumer demand and influencing public opinion. This in turn creates governments to implement these regulations to keep global brands satisfied and meet public expectations. It also has helped to promote a green economy due to the challenges of globalisation helping to develop governmental meetings on green economic strategies and the focus on sustainable energy. However, we must consider whether these are only positives due to trying to reduce the effects of globalisation in the first place and thus it hasn't had a positive direct impact on the environment. Therefore, arguably if we never had globalisation our planet wouldn't be in such a crisis in the 21st century as it is now.

In conclusion, yes globalisation has helped to create economic growth, increase innovation and technology and to help developing countries flourish. However overall, the vast environmental impacts, social inequality and decrease in local businesses and cultures is significantly more costly to our planet than the benefits for consumers and businesses. I believe that even though globalisation hasn't been good for the world as of now, in the future it could become a tool to implement international cooperation on climate change, the investment in LICs by international companies and create a smaller, more connected world where we positively exchange ideas and celebrate cultures. This has already started to be implemented through governmental and global business meetings to try and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Instead of globalisation for a company being able to compete with others, we should help to work with competitors to create a socially and environmentally safer future.