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Introduction
This is aptly the era of liberal triumphalism following from the events of 1990s that engendered global capitalism at expense of global socialism. Thus, globalisation or globalism is simply global capitalism. But current phase of globalisation has been gendered, sexualised or feminised just as feminism has been globalised. Consequently, feminist scholars have played a vital role in opening up the study of globalisation to more diverse and critical perspectives that engaged the voices and perspectives of the disadvantaged (Murphy, 1996; Elias & Beasley, 2003). Therefore, global feminism signifies a vindication of core insights which were embedded in some of the issues pioneered by Third World women at the Mexico Conference in 1975 such as the vicious and cyclical dynamics of gender bias, asymmetry, and oppression as well as the increasingly totalising complexities of patriarchal hegemony (Obiora, 1997).

The main focus of this chapter is to identify and discuss the positive and negative impacts of globalisation, and by so doing find out if the latter outweighs the former. To do this, we divide this chapter into seven parts. The first part introduces the chapter, while the second and third parts conceptually define or clarify feminism, globalism and globalisation. The fourth part tries to establish a nexus between feminism and globalism but the fifth part identifies and explains different perspectives or theories of feminist international relations. The sixth part is concerned with identifying and discussing the positive and negative impacts of globalisation on women. Finally, the seventh part summarises and concludes the chapter.

Conceptual Explication of Feminism in International Relations (IR)
The main crux of concern for the feminist IR is to examine how the core and highly gendered concepts such as war, defence, security, etc. have been employed within the discipline of IR. There has been growing influence of feminist and women-centric approaches even within the international policy communities such as the World Bank and the United Nations but this has been due to emphasis on equality of opportunity for women by the liberal feminists (Wibben, 2004).

Thus, feminism has been defined as a belief in the social, political, and economic equality of the sexes. The main aim of feminism is to challenge the systemic inequalities that women face on a daily basis. Feminism focuses on equations of masculinity and femininity which has nothing to do with the biological male-female differences but rather on the construction of gender identities. Feminists challenge the misconception that inequalities between genders is natural. Feminism is not sexism, and thus, works towards equality, not female superiority (Wibben, 2004).

Feminism is based on female perspective of how international relations are formed and structured thereby encouraging gender equality. In other words, the essence of feminism in the IR is to study how politics are determined in the world today, taking cognisance of the role that men and women play in the decision-making process. It helps in understanding how female’s perspectives have influenced the foreign policy and international relations (Wibben, 2004).

However, Ngwainmbi (2011) noted that feminism can be defined in narrow sense or broad sense. Feminism is defined in narrow sense as “a complex set of political ideologies used by the women’s movement to advance the cause of women’s equality and put an end to sexist theory and the practice of social oppression”. In a broad sense, feminism is defined as “a variety of interrelated frameworks used to observe, analyse, and interpret the complex ways in which the social reality of gender inequality is constructed, enforced, and manifested from the largest institutional settings to the details of people’s daily lives” (Barsky 1992; Segal 1999; Ali, Coate & Goro 2000; Zalewski 2000; Bryson 2002; Ngwainmbi, 2011).
Following from the above, feminism is a multifaceted branch of competing theories employing separate epistemologies. It is also a somewhat marginalised field within the study of IR. Feminist IR theory remains on the margins of the discipline yet feminists fear co-option and are reluctant to allow their theories to be subsumed by other schools of thought. Feminist approaches in IR seek to reconstruct IR theory in a more gender-neutral way (Pettman, 2002; Sylvester 2002).

Feminists argued that paradigms like realism and liberalism present a partial view rooted in unacknowledged political assumptions that do not tell the whole story of international politics. Since the mainstream IR theories were not traditionally concerned with gender, the work of early IR feminists sought to unveil the crucial yet unaccounted role of women in conventional spaces of international politics like the global political economy, high politics and war. Thus, feminists in their different ways aim to expose gender biases embedded in conventional IR theories such as realism and liberalism (Pettman, 2002; Sylvester 2002).

IR feminists understand that in order to produce genuine change it is necessary to challenge not only the content of a particular narrative, but also its structure. In other words, it is not enough to simply add women, or even to achieve greater visibility of the ways in which gender shapes international relations, but it is important to also transform how IR produces, disseminates, and recreates knowledges (Wibben, 2004).

Feminists apply the terms ‘gender’ and ‘patriarchy’ when analysing how situations have been shaped to exclude women from the international political arena (Ruiz, 2004). All feminist IR scholars are united by a concern with gender as an ideological and socially constructed difference between men and women as opposed to the biological differences between the sexes (Tickner, 1997; Steans, 1998; Pettman, 2002; Sylvester 2002).

Consequently, Tickner (1994; 2008) argued that IR is gendered to marginalise women’s voices and stressed that women have knowledge, perspectives and experiences that should be brought to bear on the study of IR (Ruiz, 2004).

**Conceptual Clarification of Globalism and Globalisation**

Globalisation is a process and not a condition or an event. Derived from the English word ‘globe’, globalisation simply means bringing the world into a global village, but its definition is not that simple. No wonder, Asobie (2002) opined that globalisation is a contentious concept.

Consequently, Ibeanu (2001) identified three major interpretations of globalisation, which include universalist, integrationist, and constructionist interpretations. Universalist interpretation perceives globalisation as a phenomenon, characteristics, events and problems that are universally present or are becoming so. Problems are seen as universal risk such as global environmental pollution, global warming, global population decline or explosion, global food crises, global demographic transition, etc. Some of these problems respect no geographical boundary.

Integrationist interpretation, slightly related to universalistic view, portrays globalisation as a supranational phenomenon, which is propelling disparate parts of the globe into one outlook and culture. The constructionists perceive globalisation as a process of creating new world order or system, complete with new institutions and culture. So that the solution to world problems created by asymmetrical power relations is the reconstruction of the global order (Ibeanu, 2001).

But Onuoha (2004) stated that broadly speaking, two schools of thought have emerged to explain globalisation, namely, liberal and Marxist perspectives. Liberal or bourgeois perspective of globalisation is essentially anchored on modernisation theory. It sees globalisation as mainly integration of people into a uniform world order, a uniform culture
through opening-up of borders and free movement of goods, services, capital, labour, and technology, reinforced through the instrumentalties of information and communication technology (ICT) (Igwe, 2002). The central idea here is that globalisation will rapidly homogenised the world to such a degree as to reduce conflict, strife and antagonism. In other words, scholars of liberal persuasion conceive globalisation in terms of breaking down of territorial boundaries, transcendence of national identities, universalisation of local values and localisation of universal values, precepts and practices (Asobie, 2001). Liberal perspective, consequently, embraces social, cultural, economic and political dimensions of globalisation.

Marxist perspective of globalisation, on the other hand, is essentially anchored on dependency theory. By focusing on the economic dimension of globalisation, Marxism emphasises the primacy of material condition of existence or economic determinism. Thus, Marxist scholars see globalisation as the universalisation of capitalist values or liberal ideology. It is in this regard, that Asobie (2001, p. 2) defines globalisation as “the universalisation of capitalism through deregulation of economy, privatisation of the public sector and liberalisation of trade and capital”.

Scholars of this persuasion believe that the agents of globalisation are World Trade Organisation (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and multinational corporations (MNCs) or transnational corporations (TNCs). This is the reason why deregulation, privatisation and liberalisation are embodied in the regulations of WTO, activities of MNCs/TNCs and conditionalities of IMF and WB (Aniche, 2009).

Marxist or radical perspective is, however, being criticised on the ground that it focuses excessively on the economic globalisation. But this should be understandable given its material foundation positing that these changes in economic substructure would ramify into the superstructure (i.e. political, social and cultural aspects of globalisation). Therefore, it identifies other aspects, though it does not consider them primary (Aniche, 2009).

Following from the above, Aniche (2009, p. 410) defines globalisation as “universalisation of socio-cultural, economic, political and ideological values through deregulation, privatisation, liberalisation and information and communication technology (ICT) in order to facilitate global prosperity, global unity, global peace, global security, global culture and global values”.

Aniche (2009, p. 410) further defines globalism as “a principle aim at universalising socio-cultural, economic, political and ideological values through deregulation, privatisation, liberalisation and ICT in order to achieve some stated objectives which include global prosperity, global unity, global peace, global security, global culture and global values”. The values that are being universalised are Western values such as Western culture, economic system (i.e. capitalism, liberalism, etc.), political system (i.e. liberal/plural democracy, etc.). Therefore, globalisation or globalism is simply global capitalism. This represents the era of liberal triumphalism.

Feminism, Globalism and Globalisation

Globalisation of feminism is simply an extension of feminism to a global level. Globalisation of feminism refers to the variety of interrelated frameworks used to observe, analyse, and interpret the complex ways in which the social reality of gender inequality is constructed, enforced, and manifested from the largest institutional settings to the details of people's daily lives within the global capitalist society (Ali, Coate & Goro 2000; Lotz 2003). In this sense, globalisation can be conceived as a driving force behind global feminism whose main goal is to accelerate the liberation of women globally (Ngwainmbi, 2011).
Thus, Obiora (1997) noted that global feminism deals with the permeation and reinforcement of pre-existing feminist proclivities, currents, and movements in some quarters or of the inception and intensification of a global momentum. Global feminism signifies a vindication of core insights which were embedded in some of the issues pioneered by Third World women at the Mexico Conference in 1975 such as the vicious and cyclical dynamics of gender bias, asymmetry, and oppression as well as the increasingly totalising complexities of patriarchal hegemony. This multi-perspective approach conclude that women’s roles are closely linked to the political, economic, social, and cultural conditions that constrain them from advancement. It insists that the factors determining the economic exploitation and marginalisation of women stem from chronic inequalities. Therefore, a feminist analysis of globalisation has to be framed by the ideas that: (i) the market is a gendered social construction; (ii) production and reproduction are intrinsically linked, constituted and reconstituted through relations of power; (iii) women and men often enter and participate in markets on differential terms; and (iv) nation-states have differential levels of development in addition to being unevenly developed within their national boundaries (Bisnath, 2001).

Globalisation is both gendered and sexualised. It is gendered in that it impacts differentially on men and on women, and it is sexualised in that it also operates through the exploitation of women’s bodies (Bronwyn, 2002).

**Feminist International Relations**

Feminism is indeed a multi-perspective approach to the study of IR. It was Thorburn (2000) who stated that there is a diversity of views within feminism itself. Similarly, Buskie (2017) noted that the feminist approach to IR is not a single unitary theory, but a distinct discourse made up of many competing theories. Some of these theories or perspectives of feminist international relations include difference feminism, liberal feminism, Marxist feminism, radical feminism, post-modern feminism, critical feminism, feminist constructivism, post-colonial feminism, standpoint feminism, and feminist empiricism.

**Difference Feminism**

Difference feminism in international relations arose as a reaction against the mainstream international relations, what is called “malestream” international relations, particularly, realist and neo-realist international relations by criticising its core assumption such as anarchy and sovereignty. Difference feminist therefore argues that core concepts of realism reflect the ways in which males tend to interact and see the world. Thus, the realist perspective simply assumes male participants when discussing foreign policy decision-making, state sovereignty or the use of military force (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Difference feminism therefore emphasises the unique contributions of women as women and sees women as potentially more effective than men on average in conflict resolution as well as group decision making. Difference feminists in international relations believe that there are real differences between genders that are not just social construction and cultural indoctrination. Difference feminists find in realism a hidden assumption of masculinity, for example, the sharp distinction that the realists draw between international politics being anarchic and domestic politics being ordered parallels the distinction in gender roles between the public and private spheres denoting masculine and feminine, respectively (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Difference feminists thus believe that realism constructs international relations as a man’s world. By contrast an international system based on feminine principles might give greater importance to the interdependence of states than their independence or sovereignty, stressing
the responsibility of people to care for one another with less regard for states and borders. In the struggle between the principles of human rights and of sovereignty (i.e. non-interference in internal affairs of states) human rights would receive priority. Difference feminism notes that the neo-realist's preoccupation with the inter-state or systemic level of analysis presumes that the logic of war itself is autonomous and can be separated from other social relationships such as economics, domestic politics, sexism and racism, however, difference feminist international relations exposes the connections of these phenomena with war. It suggests new ways for understanding war at the domestic and individual levels of analysis underlying causes that realists largely ignore (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011). Difference feminists perspective also note that neo-liberalism, another mainstream international relations, by accepting the realist assumption of separate unitary states as the important actors and downplaying sub-state and transnational actors including women represents a setback on orthodox liberalism. It also notes that neo-liberalism's conception of cooperation as rule-based interactions among autonomous actors as well reflects masculinity assumptions. Difference feminists see war as a male occupation because men are inherently the more warlike gender, and the women more peacefully. Although realism may accurately portray the importance of war and military force in international relations, it merely reflects the male domination of the international sphere. Difference feminists thus have plenty of evidence to support the ideas of war as a masculine pursuit. Difference feminism sets out to develop a feminist practice of international relations that could provide an alternative to the masculine practice of realism (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

**Liberal Feminism**

The liberal feminism is equally concerned with equal rights for both men and women. Liberal feminists believe that women need to be empowered and should have an equal role in society, politics and workplace. Liberal feminists focus on securing equal rights and access to education and the economy for women. Therefore, the goal of feminist liberalism is to ensure complete gender equality between men and women (Tickner, 1992; Pettman, 1996; Steans, 1998; Biswal, 2009; Donovan, 2012; McCann & Kim, 2012; Buskie, 2017; Vaiphei, nd). In other words, liberal feminism intends to empower women and give them an equal role in society, especially in politics and at work. Its goal is to ensure complete gender equality between men and women without changing completely the way the society works or girls' and boys' socialisation (Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Liberal feminism in international relations arose as a critique of difference feminists' critiques of realism. Thus, liberal feminists believe that when women are allowed to participate in international relations, they play the game basically the way men do, with similar results. They think that women can practise realism in terms of sovereignty, military force, etc., just as well as men can. Liberal feminist international relations scholars therefore tend to reject the difference feminism's critique of realism as masculine (Kelly, 2001; Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Liberal feminism in international relations focuses on the integration of women into the overwhelmingly male preserves of foreign policy making, diplomacy and the military. In most states, these occupations are typically at least 90 percent male, for instance, in 1995, the world's diplomatic delegations to the UN General Assembly were 80 percent male totally and the heads of these delegations were 97 percent male. For liberal feminists, the main effect of this gender imbalance on the nature of international relations is talent waste. Liberal feminist scholars believe that women have the same capabilities as men so the inclusion of women in traditionally male occupations would bring additional capable individuals into these areas.
Gender equality would thus increase national capabilities by giving the state a better overall pool of diplomats, soldiers and politicians (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008). To buttress their argument that on average, women handle power just as men do, liberal feminists point to the many examples of women who have served in such positions. No distinctly feminine feature of their behaviour in office distinguishes these leaders from their male counterparts. Female state leaders do not appear to be any more peaceful or any less committed to state sovereignty and territorial integrity, than are male leaders. Some have even suggested that women in power tend to be more warlike to compensate for being females in traditionally male roles. In all women state leaders, like men, seem capable of leading in war or in peace as circumstances demand. Liberal feminists also believe that women soldiers like women politicians have a range of skills and abilities comparable to men's own; and the main effect of including women would be to improve the overall quality of military forces (Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Therefore, liberal feminists reject the argument that women bring uniquely feminine assets or liabilities to foreign and military affairs. They do not critique realism as essentially masculine in nature but critique state practices that exclude women from participation in international politics and war. Liberal feminism critique difference feminism. For example, difference feminists argue that realism reflects a masculine perception of social relations whereas liberal feminists think that women can be just as realists as men. Therefore, liberal feminists believe that female participation in foreign policy, diplomacy and the military will enhance state capabilities but difference feminists think that women's unique abilities can be put to better use in transforming or feminising the entire system of international relations rather than in trying to play men's games. Feminist liberalism in a nutshell see essential differences in men's and women's abilities or perspectives as trivial or non-existent and insists that men and women are equal. They reject these claims on gender difference as stereo-typed gender roles and deplore the exclusion of women from positions of power in international relations but do not believe that inclusion of women would change the nature of international system. Liberal feminists seek to include women more often as subjects of study such as women state leaders, women soldiers and other women operating outside traditional gender roles in international relations (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Feminist critiques of liberal feminism critique the economic inequalities inherent in free trade, which disproportionately affects women. It has been argued that male-centred macroeconomic indicators such as the Gross National Product undervalue the work of women (True, 2001; Ruiz, 2004).

**Marxist Feminism**

The Marxist feminism rejects the reformism of liberal feminism but also criticises schools of thought which advocate oppression of women by men. For Feminist Marxists, oppression of women as a social group is the product of the political, social and economic structures associated with global capitalism, and not as a result of bias or ignorance or the intentional action of individuals. In other words, the oppression of women or discrimination against women is a result of the globalised class system (Baylis & Smith, 2008; Vaiiphei, nd).

The feminist Marxism stresses the role played by women in providing global capitalism with a valuable reservoir of labour which may be exploited at times of labour shortages or used to keep male labour cheap. In all of these ways women help to sustain and reproduce an exploitative economic and social order. The socio-economic and gender inequality are inextricably linked and therefore it would be impossible for women to gain equality in a globalised class society. Marxist feminists seek to transform the oppressive socioeconomic structures of global capitalist society. This is why they advocate that women's liberation must
girlfriends on the home front. Postmodern feminist international relations scholars believe that the stories of military forces should not omit the roles of prostitution at military bases, nor should stories of diplomacy omit the roles of diplomats’ wives (Enloe, 1989; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Feminist postmodernists reject not only realism but also some of the alternative approaches that emphasise the protection of women and other non-combatants. Just war doctrine is considered too abstract that it is a set of concepts and rules that does no justice to the richness of each historical context and varied roles of individual men and women within it. Postmodern feminists have tried to deconstruct the language of realism especially when it reflects influences of gender and sex. They note that realism and liberalism ignore all the sexual aspects of weaponry, limiting themselves to such issues as a weapon’s explosive power, its range and other technical information about its use as state leverage. Also, feminist postmodernists fault Marxism on the grounds that by focusing on paradigm of production and class as basic units Marxism ignores other forms of exclusion such as gender and in the same process subsumes women and their reproductive labour and replicates the gender blindness of liberalism and realism (Tickner, 1992; Peterson, 1998; Aniche, 2009).

In summary, postmodern feminism tends to reject assumption about gender made by both difference and liberal feminists. Where difference feminists consider gender difference important and fixed and feminist liberals consider those differences trivial, postmodern feminists find them important but arbitrary and flexible (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2008; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Critical Feminism
The critical feminists draw upon the work of scholars from the Marxian tradition of critical theory and radical and Marxian feminist thought. Feminist critical theory has roots in Gramscian Marxism as it explores both the ideational and material manifestations of gendered identities and gendered power in global politics. They believe that there is need to meet the challenges of changing social arrangements to fight against exclusion and establish a society based on just order (Brown, 1994; Vaiphei, nd). Critical feminism is geared towards anti-globalisation (Eschle and Maiguashca, 2007).

Following the Marxist-oriented critical perspective, critical feminism wants to change the society through socialisation. They show that not only are international relations’ concepts gender-biased or based on male assumptions and representations but also the way gender is conceived in international relations (True, 2002). Critical feminists like postmodern feminists question the existing ontological and epistemological assumptions of international relations theory. They draw attention to the consequences for those assumptions in considering gender as one of the crucial conditions of possibility both for contemporary interstate relations and for the realist worldview. The works of critics have drawn attention to the fact that gendered division of labour and constructions of femininity and masculinity underlie many practices in contexts that are central to the realist perception of international politics. Also, critical feminists have challenged the positivist claim to neutrality by pointing out the gendered assumptions that help to construct the building blocks of positivist analysis and methodology (Tickner, 1991; Hutchings, 2001; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Feminist Constructivism
Feminist constructivism as a constitutive international relations theory builds upon the theory of constructivism, which is an epistemological approach that generates knowledge and meaning through human interactions and ideas. The central tenet of constructivism is that international life is social and is a product of social interactions with each other through norms, rules and dialogue, etc. While there are similarities, the feminist constructivists view
relationships of power differently than the traditional constructivists. The constructivist feminism focuses upon the study of how ideas about gender influence global politics. The concept of power and gender are considered as an integral elements in processes of construction. The constructive traditionalists believe power to be external while the feminist constructivists argue that gender differences between men and women unlike the anatomical differences, are constructed due to socialisation and acculturation (Prugl, 1999; Vaiphei, nd).

Post-colonial Feminism
The post-colonial feminism tries to explain how genders and the gender roles are constructed in the now decolonised countries. Many of the post-colonial feminists argue that there is need to deconstruct women and their role from the prism and perspectives of western socio-cultural norms. She criticised western feminists’ portrayal of Third World women as poor, uneducated, victimised, etc. (Mohanty, Russo & Torres, 1991; Mohanty, 2003; Vaiphei, nd). The post-colonial feminists such as Mohanty (1984) had suggested that women’s subordination must be addressed within their own cultural context, rather than through some universal understanding of women’s needs. The main argument of the post-colonial feminists is that women’s subordination must be understood differentially within the socio-cultural context (Mohanty & Alexander, 1996; Mohanty, Riley & Pratt, 2008; Vaiphei, nd).

Standpoint Feminism
The focus of feminist research has been directed at deconstructing major discipline-defining texts and uncovering gender biases in the paradigmatic debates that have dominated the field since its inception in 1919. Sometimes referred to as standpoint feminism, this type of feminist scholarship argues for the construction of knowledge based on the material conditions of women’s experiences, which give us a more complete picture of the world since those who are oppressed and discriminated against often have a better understanding of the sources of their oppression than their oppressors (Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Standpoint feminism focuses on how the gendered construction of knowledge helps to understand or explain traditional topics of international relations, and underscores the idea that gender may be structuring how we think in the international context. Standpoint feminists argue that international relations is gendered to marginalise women’s voices and stress that women have knowledge, perspectives and experiences that should be brought to bear on the study of international relations. In contrast to traditional or mainstream international relations which views security as protecting the state from other states, standpoint feminists argue that the topic of security should address acts of rape and violence, not only from foreign perpetrators but from their fellow citizens as well. Thus, the topic of security shows how gender consideration excluded from the very beginning of the discussion, results in policymaking that would be subsequently exclusive of, and likely detrimental to women, because of the traditional international relations focus on state-to-state interaction in matters of security. Prior to discussing any international relations topic, standpoint feminist international relations theory would first challenge those participating in the discussion and those defining the key terms and issues, by critically asking them if the normative perspectives and working vocabulary are broad enough to effectively accommodate issues affecting women (Griffiths, et al 1999; Code, 2002; Tickner, 2001; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

Whilst feminist empiricism exposes the role of women in international relations, standpoint feminism alerts us to the ways in which the conventional study of international relations is itself gendered. Despite the rise of feminism in the field, there remains a major imbalance between male and female academics in international relations, and many feminists attack the ways in which men’s experiences are projected as if they represent some universal
standpoint. According to standpoint feminists, the major Western intellectual traditions of
realist and liberal thoughts have drawn from culturally defined notions of masculinity,
emphasising the value of autonomy, independence, and power. Those traditions have
formulated assumptions about interstate behaviour, security, progress, and economic growth
in ways that allegedly perpetuate the marginalisation and invisibility of women (Griffiths &
O’callaghan, 2002; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).
Standpoint feminists argue that women’s knowledge comes from a marginalised perspective
that has the potential to provide fuller insights into world politics than those from the core
(Brown, 1994; Buskie, 2017).

Feminist Empiricism
Feminist empiricists believe that science is gender biased (i.e. not gender friendly), but can
offer valuable insights if research is conducted in the right way. They advocate moving away
from considering the masculine condition as the defining human condition and toward
incorporating a feminist awareness (Wiben, 2004). The first wave of feminist scholarship in
the 1980s is what is now called feminist empiricism, in which international relations scholars
have sought to reclaim women’s hidden voices and to expose the multiplicity of roles that
women play in sustaining global economic forces and state interactions. For example,
women’s participation and involvement facilitate tourism, colonialism, and economically
powerful states’ domination of weak states. The maintenance of the international political
economy depends upon stable political and military relations among states. In turn, the
creation of stable diplomatic and military communities has often been the responsibility of
women (as wives, girl-friends, and prostitutes). Feminist empiricism exposes the role of
women and demonstrates their importance in a wide variety of arenas (Griffiths and
O’callaghan, 2002; Egboh & Aniche, 2011).

The Impacts of Globalisation on Women
The general impact of globalisation is that unemployment has also risen around the globe
with some indications that men’s unemployment rates are rising to the levels of those of
women (Acker, 1990; Standing, 1999). However, globalisation has both positive and negative
impacts on women. The commonest positive effects of globalisation in the literature is that it
has increased employment opportunities for women (Subhalakshmi, 2012). For example,
globalisation has created work opportunities for women, especially professionals, in the
newly emerging forms of employment in the IT and service sectors (Sarkar, 2007). It is to a
large extent true that through globalisation, women have gained certain opportunities in terms
of widening field of job options and also in terms of recognising women’s rights as a part of
the human rights (Sarkar, 2007).
Therefore, one of the positive impacts of globalisation has been the increased participation of
women in the paid labour market. In addition, in many countries educated middle-class
women have had in the 1980s and 1990s increased opportunities for professional and
managerial employment, contributing to increased affluence for their families (Acker, 1990;
Standing, 1999).
By creating more job opportunities for women in the paid employment, globalisation has
resulted in women gaining more autonomy over their own wages and a feeling of
independence from traditional gender roles in society, especially in marriage and childrearing
(Bacchus, 2005). In other words, it has opened up new employment opportunities for
educated and professional women thereby creating an environment that allows many women
to achieve higher income, greater personal autonomy, and gender parity (Vijaya, nd). In
addition to this, the ideas of autonomy, individualisation, liberation and equality that are
inherent in globalisation has modified women’s self-perception and their identity as legal subjects (Vargas, 2003).

However, women face major challenges as a result of changes in the world economy arising from rapid globalisation and fast-paced technological progress (Mitter & Efendioglu, 1999; Mitter, 2000a). Therefore, not a few feminist scholars believes that the negative impacts of globalisation on women outweigh its positive effects (Mitter, 2000b). Thus, the overall effects of globalisation have proven to be negative (Bacchus, 2005).

Feminist IR has emphasised the structural inequalities that emerge in the age of globalisation (Braidotti, 2007; Sarkar, 2007). It has been argued that globalisation is not necessarily integrating men and women into a homogenous entities in the sphere of economy, culture, technology and governance (Sanderson & Crompton, 1990; Walby, 1990; Sarkar, 2007). This is evidenced in the fact that the impact of globalisation on gender is geared towards gender discrimination and inequalities in terms of access to and control over capital and resources. The semi-skilled or the unskilled women have lost the control over their land resulting in the loss of traditional livelihood and sustainability (Sarkar, 2007).

It has become clear that the impoverishment that women have experienced in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Pacific, and the former socialist countries is not a transitory phenomenon, nor a consequence of poorly implemented policy recommendations, as is often claimed by the World Bank but a direct consequence of further integration of these regions into the global economy (Federici, 2000). Thus, women’s material well-being has generally deteriorated and gender inequality has increased as a consequence of globalisation thereby intensifying the marginalisation of women and the “feminisation of poverty”. Hence, globalisation has gender discriminating effects because of gender-differentiated initial conditions which discriminate against women (Sen, 1999; Thorin, 2001). Even the class differences among women have been exacerbated by globalisation (Acker, 1990; Standing, 1999).

It has been generally argued that although globalisation has improved women’s labour market access, it has done little to reduce the sexual division of paid labour. Women have access to a very limited number of occupations and are concentrated in the low quality range of the service sector and in labour-intensive manufacturing (Radcliffe, 1999; Thorin, 2001). It has been therefore noted that globalisation increases the existing economic disadvantage experienced by many women relative to men in most countries of the world (Neumayer & de Soysa, 2007). This structural poverty is exacerbated in many countries by globalisation which is often gendered in terms of the differential entitlements, capabilities and rights conferred to women and men (Bisnath, 2001; Sen, 2010). Thus, globalisation intensifies some of existing inequalities and insecurities for women. It has reduced the ability of women in developing countries to find paid work that offers security and dignity (Desai, 2002; Bacchus, 2005).

Inequality and poverty contribute to the apparent increase in the international trafficking in women for prostitution and trafficking in both women and men for other kinds of labour (Acker, 1988; 1990). This has led to globalisation of the sex industry sometimes through coerced labour. For the violence against women is not only domestic violence but also the institutional violence inscribed in economic programmes that sustain globalisation (Federici, 1999; 2000; 2001).

The wave of deregulation under globalisation has introduced labour market “flexibility,” which, in the fragmented, low-wage labour markets of developing countries, has initiated new forms of expropriation of female labour (Sen, 2010). Therefore, it remains an illusive concept of economic ‘freedom’ as described by the advocates of globalisation who assert that women are expected to benefit from many new job opportunities in new economic era whereas the reality depicts that emerging new work opportunities laid out to them generate further exploitations and vulnerability (Sarkar, 2007).
As a result, globalisation has made many international corporations (MNCs & TNCs) richer by the billions at the expense of women who are suffering enormously due to this expansion of corporate empires (Subhalakshmi, 2012). Consequently, the traditional and central role of women in the food chain from seed keeping to food making is being broken with the onset of globalise food industry (Sarkar, 2007). Women workers get the brunt of such exploitative, aggressive and capitalist policies of the global labour market. Hence, global capitalism makes use of existing patriarchal ideology whereby women are perceived to be more sub-servient to (male) managers’ authority, less prone to organise unions, more willing to accept poor working conditions and easier to dismiss using lifecycle criteria such as marriage and child birth (Sarkar, 2007).

Furthermore, globalisation has changed the intra-household responsibilities for males and females where females are given more responsibility over the survival of the family. Female responsibilities have thus increase in era of globalisation. Even young daughters are financially supporting their parents and fellow siblings while mothers are seeking informal work to provide for their children (Bacchus, 2005).

**Conclusion**

It has been stated that there is a diversity of views within feminism itself that is to say that the feminist approach to IR is not a single unitary theory, but a distinct discourse made up of many competing theories. Indeed, feminism is a multi-perspective approach to the study of IR. As such, some of these perspectives or theories of feminist international relations have been identified and explained.

We also noted that feminist scholars have played a veritable role in opening up the study of globalisation to more diverse and critical perspectives that engaged the voices and perspectives of the disadvantaged (Murphy, 1996; Elias & Beasley, 2003). But despite the rise of feminism in IR in this era of globalisation, there remains a major imbalance between male and female academics in international relations. Subsequently, the chapter was able to establish the nexus between feminism and globalisation. Just as globalisation has been gendered, sexualised or feminised, feminism has been globalised. The argument is that it is sexualised in that it also operates through the exploitation of women’s bodies. Thus, the chapter concludes that generally the negative impacts of globalisation far outweigh its positive impacts on women.
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