
THE JURISPRUDENTIAL CHALLENGES OF GLOBAL JUSTICE: RECONCEPTUALIZING THE RULE OF LAW IN HUMAN RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT TRANSNATIONALISM IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

S Srinivasa Sathyannarayanan, LL.M., Christ University, Bangalore

ABSTRACT

The title of this research paper is *The Jurisprudential Challenges of Global Justice: Reassessing the Rule of Law in Transnational Human Rights Enforcement Amid Globalization*, which will analyze the role of globalization in enhancing inequalities in the international human rights enforcement, and offer a critique of the traditional jurisprudence and suggest reforms to correct the situation. The introduction puts the erosion of the Westphalian sovereignty by transnational actors into perspective, pointing to the gap in the enforcement and relying on the thinking of Kelsen, Finnis, and Rawls to propose a jurisprudence of planetary responsibility. It anticipates four major questions: the contribution of globalization to increasing the enforcement gaps by using hybrid tribunal mechanisms; the asymmetry of power within institutions, such as the UNSC as well as Rawlsian mitigating rule of law; the international courts reallocating state responsibility and diffuse harms which reveals positivism gaps.

Chapter 1 splits open the way globalization makes non-state actors stronger and sovereignty weaker to inspire impunity in developing countries and suggests hybrid courts such as the one in Sierra Leone to fill the empty spaces with localized internationalism. In chapter 2, the UNSC vetoes are examined to perpetuate selective injustices, and the chapter promotes reforms based on Rawls, including veto restrictions and representation of the Global South to the unbiased cooperation. Chapter 3 examines borderless harms of tech companies, providing examples of GDPR enforcement against Meta and Instagram, arguing about the extraterritorial jurisdiction and recommending hybrid regulation and cosmopolitan morality. Chapter 4 judges ICJ climate opinions that uphold due diligence obligations under customary law, but also that criticizes the deficiencies of causation of positivism and proposes solutions that are more equity-oriented.

These are synthesized in the conclusion in order to help transform an integrated jurisprudence by focusing on inclusive innovations to put world law back on track in a manner that is just to vulnerable groups in an interdependent world.

INTRODUCTION

Globalization has massively redefined the global law and human rights landscape in a world characterized by unparalleled interconnection, in many ways increasing inequality in access to justice and its application.¹ With the erosion of boundaries due to trade, technology and migration, the Westphalian concept of sovereignty of states is facing new realities where transnational actors such as multinational corporations, digital platforms and international institutions actually have power that is no longer bounded by national borders.² This development puts into question the fundamental jurisprudential principles, such as the primacy of the state consent in legal positivism or natural law as the advocate of universal justice.³ The rule of law, which should be the obstacle against arbitrary power, now has to deal with an "enforcement gap" the gap between the stated norms of human rights and their practical practice, especially in developing countries that can be influenced by economic needs and climate risks.⁴ In this paper, the jurisprudential dilemmas of global justice are reevaluated and the ways in which globalization contributes to the systematic inequalities and possible solutions to address the gaps in the enforcement of transnational human rights are proposed. The crux of this question lies in the level to which globalization is escalating the enforcement gap in human rights whereby hybrid tribunals, a combination of international and local factors, have arisen as some solutions to developing countries.⁵

1. Luca Siliquini-Cinelli (ed.), *Legal Positivism in a Global and Transnational Age* 1-5 (Springer, 2019) (discussing how transnational actors challenge traditional sovereignty and regulatory dynamics). Available at: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-24705-8>

2. P.M.R. Stirk, 'The Westphalian Model, Sovereignty and Law in Fin-de-siecle German International Theory', 19(2) *Int'l Rel.* 153, 153-72 (2005) (examining the Westphalian model and its relationship to sovereignty in international legal theory). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117805052811>

3. Luca Siliquini-Cinelli, 'About the Impossibility of Absolute State Sovereignty: The Modern Era and the Early Legal Positivist Claim' in Luca Siliquini-Cinelli (ed.), *Legal Positivism in a Global and Transnational Age* 31 (Springer, 2019). Available at: <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783030247041>

4. A. Batesmith, 'Cambodia and the progressivist "imaginary": The limitations of international(ised) criminal tribunals as mechanisms for implementing human rights' in L. Ashley & N. Butler (eds.)

5. Alice Dieci, 'Beyond "Fragmentation": The Potential of Hybrid Courts to Restore Local Trust in International Justice through Prosecution of Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights Violations' in Kirsten Ainley & Mark Kersten (eds.), *Hybrid Justice: Innovation and Impact in the Prosecution of Atrocity Crimes* 375, 378-80 (Oxford Univ. Press, 2025) (analyzing SCSL jurisprudence and the potential of hybrid courts to address enforcement gaps). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192893758.003.0018>

As an example, courts, such as the Special Court for Sierra Leone, show how such mechanisms can deal with impunity in fragile states, although there are gaps because of resource asymmetries and political opposition.⁶ Power disparities in international organisations, such as UN Security Council vetoes, serve to perpetuate injustices as they advance the interests of great powers rather than fair outcomes as in the examples of slow action toward crises such as Darfur or Ukraine. Based on the Rawlsian concepts of equal cooperation, a change in the form of reforms might be a veto restriction or the increased representation of the Global South, which would lead to a more inclusive cosmopolitan order.⁷

The rule of law is also exacerbated by the technological globalization that allows tech companies to commit extraterritorial violation of human rights through data surveillance and algorithmic biasing. The GDPR application to non-EU actors, e.g. fines on US based companies due to privacy breaches, exemplifies the developing extraterritorial jurisdiction, but the state centrality in legal positivism creates loopholes in combating borderless harms. Lastly, global courts such as the ICJ balance the diffuse effects of globalization and state responsibility through advisory opinions on climate obligations that state that they have the responsibility to address the issue of climate change according to customary law and treaties such as the Paris Agreement. Yet, the ongoing enforcement gaps can be highlighted by the presence of positivist constraints like assigning blame on climate. This paper explores by probing these dimensions why we need a jurisprudence of planetary responsibility: in all its ability to combine Rawlsian justice with cosmopolitan ethics with hybrid innovations to reorient world law to justice. It presents reforms that are not bound by positivist limitations through the analysis of doctrines and case studies and therefore, guarantee the rule of law to be used as the instrument of equity in the globalized world.

6. Chandra Lekha Sriram, 'Wrong-Sizing International Justice? The Hybrid Tribunal in Sierra Leone', 29 *Fordham Int'l L.J.* 472, 472-75 (2005) (analyzing how the Special Court for Sierra Leone "suffers from the limits of being a partially domestic court, in terms of resources and mandate" while also being "viewed by many as foreign," creating gaps in justice delivery). Available at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/ilj/vol29/iss3/3/>

7. Deniz Akkas, 'From Representation to Redistribution: Africa's G20 Entry and the Philosophy of Global Governance', LinkedIn (14 Sept. 2025) (applying Rawlsian concepts of fairness to global governance and arguing that "representation must evolve into redistribution, recognition into restructuring" to achieve structural transformation). Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/from-representation-redistribution-africas-g20-entry-philosophy-qyxbc>

RESEARCH QUESTION 1 - The first research question is How does globalization contribute to the larger enforcement gap in human rights and what could be done jurisprudentially (e.g. hybrid tribunals) to close the gap in developing countries?

The research question, which is; To what extent does globalization increase the so-called enforcement gap of human rights, and what jurisprudential reforms (e.g. hybrid tribunals) can bridge the gap in developing countries? explores a crucial intersection point of international law, philosophy and world politics.⁸ In its essence, it questions how interconnected economic, technological, and cultural flows, which are the characteristics of globalization, increase inequality between the alleged human rights standards and their actual application, suggesting the legal-philosophical means of solutions, which are specific to vulnerable states.⁹

The assistance gap is the institutional inconsistency within the translation of universal standards of human rights, embodied in documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) to practical responsibility. Such a gap is expressed in the form of impunity of the transgressions, feeble judicial systems, and insufficient solutions, which in many cases are aggravated by lack of resources or political motivation. This is enhanced by globalization in a number of ways. To begin with, it gives power to transnational corporations (TNCs) and non-state actors and makes extraterritorial violations such as labor exploitation in supply chains or environmental damage less vulnerable to national jurisdictions. Indicatively, MNCs in the developing countries can act to advance their interests in favor of profits instead of rights, with the help of free trade agreements (e.g. in WTO) that put the emphasis on commerce rather than social protection.¹⁰

8. Kirsten Ainley & Mark Kersten (eds.), *Hybrid Justice: Innovation and Impact in the Prosecution of Atrocity Crimes* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2025) (examining hybrid tribunals as responses to enforcement gaps and their potential to deliver justice in developing countries). Available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/1885/733757879>

9. Peer Zumbansen, 'Transnational Legal Pluralism', 1 *Transnat'l Legal Theory* 141, 141-89 (2010) (analyzing how globalization creates new legal complexities that challenge traditional state-centered approaches to human rights enforcement). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/20414005.2010.11424504>

10. Pushkar Anand, 'Multilateral Rules on Trade and Human Rights' in Julien Chaisse & Christoph Herrmann (eds.), *The International Law of Economic Integration* 517, 517-36 (Oxford Univ. Press, 2025). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/law/9780192871626.003.0033>

Second, it undermines state sovereignty through economic enslavement, IMF loans or foreign investments, which compel governments to weaken regulations in order to get capital, as in extractive industries in Africa or Asia.¹¹

Third, global institutions have power asymmetric, such as vetoes of the UN Security Council, which benefit the powerful countries, and contribute to selective enforcement, with developing countries subjected to greater scrutiny or disregard. In third world countries, this disparity is critical: the lack of institutional power, corruption, and neo-colonial relations enhance vulnerability, which results in unaddressed atrocities.¹²

The question is based jurisprudentially on legal positivism (enforcement by the state) and cosmopolitanism (justice across borders without regard to the state) which criticizes the manner in which globalization is undermining the traditional principles of rule of law. Reforms such as international expertise in local legitimacy such as hybrid tribunals provide bridges. They include Special Courts like the Special Court for Sierra Leone or Extraordinary Chambers in Cambodia, which combine the national legislation with UN-appointed judges, and have the capacity to develop internal capacity whilst diminishing sovereign issues.¹³ They also seal impunity loopholes by taking action against transnational crimes (e.g. war crimes, environmental destruction) where the pure international institutions such as the ICC have no jurisdiction or national failures. Other reforms may involve increased extraterritorial jurisdiction (e.g. through EU-inspired models) or Rawlsian-inspired fair cooperation in treaties, in which case burden-sharing is equitable.¹⁴

11. Eric Toussaint, 'Confronting Financial Institutions' Legacies in the Global South: 30 arguments against the World Bank and the IMF', CADTM (3 June 2025). Available at: <https://www.cadtm.org/Confronting-Financial-Institutions-Legacies-in-the-Global-South-30-arguments>

12. M. Munir Safiedin, 'Why UN Charter should be reformed', *New Vision* (18 Sept. 2025). Available at: https://www.newvision.co.ug/category/blogs/why-un-charter-should-be-reformed-NV_218907

13. Erica Bussey, 'Striking the Right Balance: Impact of the Nationality of Judges/Staff on the Legitimacy of Recent Hybrid Tribunals' in Ainley & Kersten, *supra* note 24, at 177, 177-97. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192893758.003.0009>

14. Alyssa R. Bernstein, 'Climate Change and Justice: A Non-Welfarist Treaty Negotiation Framework' (2015). Available at: <https://philpapers.org/rec/BERCCA-7>

This query is an opportune one, yet it brings out the two faces of globalization as both a facilitator of development and an enhancer of inequality. Through reevaluating jurisprudence via hybrid strategies, it recommends adaptive, inclusive systemic models to promote world justice, especially giving the developing countries the upper hand in combating systemic exploitation.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2 - What are the mechanisms of power asymmetries in the global institutions (e.g., UN Security Council vetoes) that perpetuate injustices, and what reforms based on Rawlsian principles of just global cooperation can be implemented to alleviate it?

The research question, which explores the persistence of injustices in the world through the actions of power asymmetries in global institutions (e.g., UN Security Council vetoes), addresses a major conflict in the development of international jurisprudence the discrepancy between the ideals of global justice and the reality of unequal power distribution.¹⁵ It is open to philosophical analysis at the border of legal philosophy, political theory, and institutional design, including the role of structural imbalances within institutions such as the United Nations in the rise of failure to enforce human rights and norms justly, and suggestions of a philosophically-based remedy to the problem based on the framework of John Rawls.¹⁶

The essence of the question posed is on asymmetries in power by the dominant states, specifically, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (UNSC) (the USA, Russia, China, UK, France) which have the veto where they can prevent passing of resolutions to critical matters.¹⁷ This creates injustices of selective application: e.g. veto has blocked action against crises such as the Syrian civil war (vetoes by Russia in defense of Assad) or conflict in Gaza (veto by US in defense of Israel), leading to human suffering, encouragement of atrocities, and undermining of

15. Ambassador I.R. King, 'A Power Imbalance Frozen in Time: The Case for Security Council Reform', Inter Press Service. <https://www.ipsnews.net/2025/10/a-power-imbalance-frozen-in-time-the-case-for-security-council-reform/>

16. Ambassador I.R. King, 'A Power Imbalance Frozen in Time: The Case for Security Council Reform', Inter Press Service. <https://www.ipsnews.net/2025/10/a-power-imbalance-frozen-in-time-the-case-for-security-council-reform/>

17. Oxfam International, 'No Representation, No Peace: The African demand for a reformed Security Council', Oxfam Policy & Practice (Feb. 2026). <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/no-representation-no-peace-the-african-demand-for-a-reformed-security-council-621781/>

the credibility of international law. These mechanisms have promoted geopolitical interests instead of universal justice, which worsens geographical separations. With no veto power, developing countries are disproportionately vulnerable. e.g. in climate negotiation or sanctions regimes, whereby powerful countries make policies that reinforce economic inequalities or face colonial legacies. In a jurisprudential perspective, this questions the state-consent paradigm of legal positivism (e.g., Kelsen), which discloses the capacity of formal equality to conceal substantive injustice, and goes along with the critical legal studies approach to law as an instrument of hegemony.¹⁸

This second section switches to remedies with reference to Rawlsian principles of "The Law of Peoples" (1999), which carry his domestic veil of ignorance to international collaboration. Rawls sees international relations as just by using such principles as mutual respect, non-aggression and support of overloaded societies and focusing on the cooperation of peoples (not states) on mutual terms. The reforms might involve democratizing the UNSC, e.g., by abolishing or restricting vetoes (e.g. by only allowing non-permanent members to observe the veto), providing Global South representation in permanent seats (e.g. India, Brazil), or establishing parallel bodies to hold the veto to account, such as a Global People's Assembly.¹⁹ These would cultivate the sense of duty of assistance by Rawls that would make institutions embody fair equality of opportunity that alleviate asymmetries by put more weight on burdened nations when making decisions.²⁰

This question is urgent due to the increased inequalities in the wake of globalization that calls on a cosmopolitan jurisprudence (e.g., Habermas) to the sovereignty collective human beings. It offers the interplay between theory and practice with calls to empirical case studies (e.g. the

18. Alexander Somek, *Kelsen Lives*, IILJ Working Paper 2006/4 (2006). Available at: <https://www.iilj.org/publications/kelsen-lives/>

19. Ambassador Amar Benjamaa, statement in 'Beyond the Veto: Mounting Pressure for a More Representative UN Security Council', ENTv (29 Oct. 2025). Available at: <https://entv.dz/en/news/beyond-veto-mounting-pressure-more-representative-un-security-council>

20. Jon Mandle & David A. Reidy, 'Duty of assistance' in Jon Mandle & David A. Reidy (eds.), *The Cambridge Rawls Lexicon* 224-25 (Cambridge Univ. Press 2015). Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/cambridge-rawls-lexicon/duty-of-assistance/61925BFB015378EE19B8B5F5A7E046E3>

influence of veto on ICC referrals) and normative discussions and finally the recommendation of reforms to bring global law into harmony with justice, narrowing the void between enforcers and enforced in a global world.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3 - How do we reformulate the rule of law so that it can deal with extraterritorial human rights abuse perpetrated by global technology companies, using examples such as the implementation of the GDPR by the EU on non-EU organizations?

This research question examines the adaptive pressures of the rule of law in the face of globalization borderless challenges, especially those caused by tech giants as their operations cross jurisdictions, and they are not often answerable to human rights harms. It concentrates on the so-called extraterritorial offences, where the conduct in a location may affect rights in other locations—e.g. the violation of privacy of data, surveillance or algorithmic discrimination made by a platform such as Google or Meta. The rule of law, which has traditionally been state-bound and positivistic (based on sovereign implementation), would have to develop to include transnational governance and include concepts of universality, accountability and equity based on the natural law and cosmopolitan jurisprudence (e.g. discourse ethics developed by Habermas or global democracy developed by Held).²¹

Technological giants contribute to these problems by using cross-national data models to enable evils such as mass surveillance (e.g., Cambridge Analytica scandal) or discriminatory AI against marginalized groups of people across the globe. The query appeals to EU GDPR cases to show how evolution has occurred: GDPR has extraterritorial application in the targeting or targeting of EU data subjects to enforce rights (such as privacy) (Article 3(2), EU GDPR).²² The notable enforcement actions are the Data Protection Commission in Ireland imposing EUR1.2 billion on

21. Karl Allan Henriques, *Habermas, Democracy, Rights, And European Supranational Integration: Observations for North American Critical Theorists*, Ph.D. Dissertation, York University (Canada) (1998). Available at: <http://pqdd.sinica.edu.tw/twdaoapp/servlet/advanced?query=NQ33533>

22. *District of Columbia v. Facebook*, No. 23-CV-0550 (D.C. Ct. App. July 31, 2025). Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/facebook-must-face-dc-attorney-generals-lawsuit-tied-cambridge-analytica-scandal-2025-07-31/>

Meta in 2023 in unlawful transfer of EU-US data and EUR405 million on Instagram in 2023 in mishandling children data- the fines collected through EUs representatives or seizing assets, even though the US is resisting such sanctions. These examples indicate both achievements but also shortcomings: enforcement is dependent on cooperation (e.g., EU-US Data Privacy Framework), but non-enforcement continues to exist because of jurisdictional issues because US courts can overrule fines in conflict with free speech (e.g., possible First Amendment defenses).²³

Evolution may seek hybrid jurisdiction: enhancing extraterritorial jurisdiction through treaties (e.g. updating UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights to require corporate due diligence), establishing global tech courts (based on WTO dispute settlement), or AI regulation mechanisms such as the risk-based nature of EU AI Act extended internationally. The reforms may be guided by Rawlsian fairness to make sure that the veil of ignorance is applied in the design of rules that safeguard the vulnerable users fairly.²⁴ Sovereignty conflicts and implementation in non-compliant states are challenges, though some achievements such as the implication of GDPR (altering laws in Brazil, California) are encouraging the possibility of a cosmopolitan rule of law, where human dignity takes precedence over corporate territories.²⁵

RESEARCH QUESTION 4 - How do international courts (e.g., climate obligation advisory opinions by ICJ) balance the responsibility of states with the diffuse harms of globalization, and what lacks in legal positivism?

This question analyzes the place of the international judicial institutions in maneuvering the amorphous dangers of globalization such as climate change where the injuries are extensive, inter-

23. Freshfields, 'Rising risks and shifting rules for international data transfers', Data Law Trends 2026. Available at: <https://www.freshfields.com/en/our-thinking/campaigns/2026-data-law-trends/rising-risks-and-shifting-rules-for-international-data-transfers>

24. Isabelle Roccia, 'A view from Brussels: Time is of the — high-risk — essence', IAPP (19 Feb. 2026). Available at: <https://iapp.org/news/a/a-view-from-brussels-time-is-of-the-high-risk-essence>

25. Aaron Schultz, 'Can Algorithms Really Treat Us Fairly?', The Prindle Institute for Ethics (16 Jan. 2026). Available at: <https://www.prindleinstitute.org/2026/01/can-algorithms-really-treat-us-fairly/>

generational, and not linked to individual actors. It is a critique of the manner in which courts are balancing state responsibility, based on positivist traditions (e.g. treaties by consent), with diffuse harms, which cannot be subject to the normal causation paradigm, such as increased sea levels or loss of biodiversity affecting other countries. In jurisprudence, it is identified as a challenge to formalism of positivism (uniformity of norms in hierarchical form) and norms that develop in the direction of an *erga omnes* obligation (duty towards all).²⁶

This is addressed by international courts by advice judgments and opinions which spread responsibility. The July 23, 2025, advisory opinion of the ICJ on the subject, *Obligations of States in Respect of Climate Change* commissioned by the UN General Assembly on behalf of Vanuatu will be decisive. It confirms the obligations of the states in the context of UNFCCC, Paris Agreement and customary law that the anthropogenic GHG emissions should not negatively affect the climate system, including due diligence, cooperation and compensation of violations. Reconciliation is through doctrines such as no-harm rule (Trail Smelter arbitration legacy) where the responsibility of the harm is attributed to states even though the harm may be global and cumulative.²⁷ The opinion requires ambitious mitigation (reflecting 1.5degC target) and adaptation, in which major emitters have a bigger role, and diffusion through aggregation of state actions. Climate and human rights Opinions that correlate climate with human rights occur in similar reconciliations in ITLOS (2024 opinion on marine pollution) and IACtHR.²⁸

However, the gaps in legal positivism remain: by basing itself on state consent, enforcement is constrained (e.g. no enforceable ICJ jurisdiction without consent), it has difficulties with attribution in diffuse harms where causation is partial (e.g. its attribution of diffuse harms relate to specific emissions leading to island submersion). Formalism of positivism disregards equity and

26. International Court of Justice, *Obligations of States in Respect of Climate Change*, Advisory Opinion (23 July 2025). Available at: <https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/187/187-20250723-adv-01-00-en.pdf>

27. Sara Seck, 'Amicus Curiae Brief' at 5, Western University. Available at: <https://chrobservatories.uwazi.io/en/entity/fftuic9vk7?page=5>

28. Karen Mansour, '*Colombia's New Path Forward in Climate Governance: From Advisory Opinion AO-32/25 to National Action*', American Bar Association. Available at: <https://www.americanbar.org/advocacy/global-programs/news/2026/colombias-new-path-forward-climate-governance/>

makes imbalances between the North and the South; historical emissions by developed countries are not held completely accountable. Weak remedies (advisory opinion is not binding) and sovereignty barriers are among the gaps, giving them an option of opting out of treaties.

CONCLUSION

In reviewing the jurisprudential dilemmas of global justice in the paradigm of globalization, the paper sheds light on how synergistic processes enhance inequality in transnational human rights application that requires the paradigm shift in the rule of law. Out of the enforcement gap that has been exaggerated by economic dependencies and non-state actors to the power imbalance of institutions such as the UNSC that endears certain injustices, the assessment demonstrates structural defects stemming out of the state-centrism of legal positivism. The extraterritorial aggression of technological globalization represented by GDPR bold jurisdiction highlights the necessity of adaptive, cosmopolitan models which place universal responsibility before sovereignty. Equally, the attempts of the international courts to balance the state responsibility with diffuse harms of climate, through the advisory opinions of the ICJ, unleash the limitations of causation and consent in positivism, maintaining unbalanced inequalities against the Global South.

These dimensions are united by the call to green responsibility on the planet: fair cooperation in Rawlsian jurisprudence, discourse ethics in Habermas, and hybrid innovations. Reforms- includes the curbing of veto at the world organizations, obligatory company due diligence agreements, increased hybrid courts can help in bridging the gaps by promoting fair participation and enforcement. In case of developing countries, it implies empowered local structures intertwined with international control, so that such rights as environmental justice or the privacy of data will not be luxuries but universal.

However, there are a few constraints: political opposition and resource imbalance can be obstacles to implementation, a fact that should be investigated by other empirical researches on the results of post-reforms. After all, the promise of globalization lies in the development of the rule of law to go beyond positivist mandates, to a form of truly inclusive order where justice has no borders, and it is humanity as a whole that will suffer under a world of interdependence.