

PYQ Vault

560

questions

50

days

10

years of PYQs

DAY 30

Globalisation · 10 questions

Every question carries a Flow Snapshot — and a handwritten model answer on the channel.

No PYQ will be unfamiliar.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2016 · 10 marks

Discuss the impact of globalization on the internal functioning of the state.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 globalisation multidimensional (economic/political/social/cultural) → question is not "does it end the state" but "how far does it loosen the state's grip" → realists: erosion of sovereignty // liberals: capacity-building **R2** political globalisation erodes sovereignty despite the Westphalian principle → nation-state's weight falls, other actors rise → domestic control becomes the real pressure point

Body flow

economic pressure first (**Nye** → MNCs press governments, control over currency & foreign trade weakened) → authority sideways to society (**Simmons** → NGOs set agendas, confer legitimacy on policy) → power upward (**Rodrik** → post-sovereign, transnational governance fills regulatory voids)

Counter-view

not pure loss → same openness brings integration, technology transfer, better governance & rule of law → state gains capacity even while ceding autonomy (liberal read against the erosion thesis)

Conclusion routes

R1 transforms, does not abolish → decisions move upward (international bodies) + sideways (markets, civil society) → policy & welfare space shrinks, worst in developing countries **R2** double-edged: state neither fully sovereign as before nor obsolete → it survives by adapting → developing states most squeezed

Globalisation i.e. economic, political, social and cultural reshapes how a state governs at home. The issue is not whether it ends the state, but how far it loosens the state's grip on its own affairs.

Realists view this as an erosion of sovereignty; liberals, as a chance to build capacity. Joseph Nye shows that multinational corporations press governments directly & indirectly, weakening control over currency and foreign trade. In P.J. Simon's account, NGOs shape domestic and foreign policy by setting agendas and conferring legitimacy.

Power also shifts upward, as states enter post-sovereign, transnational arrangements to fill regulatory voids no government can manage alone.

The same openness brings economic integration, technology transfer and pressure to improve governance and the rule of law. The state therefore gains capacity even as it cedes autonomy.

Globalisation does not abolish the state but transforms it. Decisions move upward to international bodies and sideways to markets and civil society, while policy space and welfare choices shrink most of all in developing countries.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2017 · 10 marks

Critically examine the Globalisation in the past 25 years from the perspectives of the Western world.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 West authored globalisation, defended as universal good → 25 years turn confidence into unease **R2** West as architect and chief gainer → yet by 2017 its loudest sceptic → arc of promotion to backlash

Body flow

champions' faith: **O'Neill** (world better, MDG poverty halved 2015) + **Bhagwati** (In Defence, trickle-down to poor states) → doubt from within: **Stiglitz** (Discontents, neo-liberal assumptions distort gains, spread unevenly) → 2008 crash sharpens the shift → backlash at home: **Mehta** (Western stagnation, anti-immigrant sentiment, ethnic chauvinism, xenophobia; West among losers) → policy turn: moderate, not discard → Brexit, America First, new protectionism, resist Doha

Counter-view

the establishment's success story of shared gains (**O'Neill**, **Bhagwati**) set against the West's own middle-class stagnation and protectionist recoil

Conclusion routes

R1 globalisation a double-edged sword for the West → demand is reform, not reversal → humane Globalisation 4.0 **R2** West seeks not the end of globalisation but a moderated, inclusive version → openness balanced against protection

The West authored globalisation and long defended it as a universal good, but 25 years have turned that confidence into unease. Tim O'Neill argued that globalisation made the world a better place, with the UN meeting its Millennium development goal of halving poverty by 2015.

Jagdish Bhagwati, in 'In Defence of Globalization' pointed to trickle-down growth that benefited even poor states.

Joseph Stiglitz, in Globalization and its Discontents, showed how neo-liberal assumptions distorted these gains and spread them unevenly.

The deeper shift came at home, sharpened by the 2008 crash.

Pratap Bhanu Mehta calls the stagnation in Western living conditions and the rise of anti-immigrant sentiment, ethnic chauvinism and right-wing xenophobia.

Hence the developed world seeks to moderate globalisation, not discard it. Brexit, America First and a new protectionism resist the Doha Agenda.

To the West, globalisation is a double-edged sword, and the demand is a reformed, humane Globalisation 4.0.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2017 · 15 marks

How has the development of Global Capitalism changed the nature of socialist economies and developing societies?

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 global capitalism beyond borders (transnational capital / class / state) → Soviet collapse removes the socialist alternative → spreads via neo-liberal Washington Consensus **R2** end of Cold War = triumph of capitalism over socialism → one market model now imposed on socialist + developing economies alike

Body flow

Neo-Gramscian hegemony of market fundamentalism (1980s–2008) → IMF Structural Adjustment (reduced govt, liberalisation, privatisation) → debt-hit socialist + developing states open markets → socialist *de jure*, *de facto* mixed (East Europe) → developing societies liberalise/privatise (India's LPG) → East Asian crisis 1997 dents IMF, but growth + falling poverty sustain commitment → 2000s power shift → 2007 IMF/World Bank voting favours developing countries → India & China rise within the same system

Counter-view

Wallerstein: transnational division of labour keeps developing countries subordinate; states cannot regulate MNCs or sustain welfare → 2008 crisis confirms → **Ngaire Woods**: states vs markets, who really benefits

Conclusion routes

R1 West retreats to protectionism while developing countries defend free trade → capitalism now a single world-system **R2** the nature changed decisively — no socialist or developing economy now stands outside global capitalism; only its terms remain contested

Global capitalism works beyond national borders. It rests on transnational capitalist class and a transnational state.

The collapse of the Soviet Union ended the Cold war, removed the socialist alternative, and let the system spread under the neo-liberal Washington Consensus. Neo-Gramscians describe a hegemony of market fundamentalism from the 1980s to 2008, carried by the IMF's structural Adjustment Programs. These pushed reduced government, liberalisation & privatisation on states weakened by debt.

Under this pressure both socialist and developing economies opened their markets. East European states remained socialist de jure but became de facto mixed economies.

The East Asian crisis of 1997 dented the IMF's standing, but fast growth and falling poverty kept many committed to the neo-liberal path.

By the 2000s economic power began to shift. Voting-share changes in the IMF and World Bank in 2007 favoured developing countries and India and China gained prominence within the same system.

According to Immanuel Wallerstein, the transnational division of labour keeps developing countries permanently subordinate, while states struggle to regulate multinationals or sustain welfare. The 2008 crisis confirmed this. Ngaire Woods shows how it exposed the tension between states and markets and the question of who really benefits.

Today the west turns to protectionism while developing countries defend free trade. It is a proof that capitalism now works as a single world-system.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2019 · 20 marks

Explain the relevance of the Marxist approach in the context of globalization.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 liberal framing (prosperity / integration) → Marxism reframes as extension of capitalist exploitation → relevance follows from the reframing
R2 economic structures / class relations / historical materialism → classes, not states, as primary actors → exposes hidden inequality and dependency

Body flow

Rosenberg: globalisation not new, built into the capitalist world-system / uneven and combined development → **Amin + Wallerstein**: neo-imperialism, Global South, unequal trade-debt-extraction → **Lenin** lineage: WB / IMF / WTO widen the rich-poor gap → **Harvey**: "race to the bottom" + "accumulation by dispossession," precarious labour → **Piketty**: haves / have-nots, critique alive post-2008 → explains resistance: Battle of Seattle, World Social Forum, wealth in a global elite

Counter-view

reductionist → oversimplifies globalisation, understates state and non-state agency → charged with Eurocentrism

Conclusion routes

R1 inequality / dependency / exploitation persist → indispensable as a critique **R2** emancipatory theory → not merely to interpret globalisation but to change it

Globalisation is presented as an engine of prosperity and integration. The Marxist approach understands it differently i.e. as the worldwide extension of capitalist exploitation. This reframing is what keeps it relevant.

Centred on economic structures, class relations and historical materialism, it treats classes rather than states as primary actors and exposes the inequality and dependence the mainstream overlooks.

Justin Rosenberg argues that globalisation is not a recent development but a fundamental feature of the capitalist world-system. This roots globalisation in capitalism itself, not in technology or policy alone.

Samir Amin & Immanuel Wallerstein treat it as neo-imperialism, exploiting the Global South through unequal trade, debt dependency and resource extraction that mirror colonial patterns.

Extending Vladimir Lenin's account of imperialism, World Bank, IMF and WTO widen the gap between rich & poor nations.

David Harvey calls this a "race to the bottom", alongside "accumulation by dispossession" through privatisation and displacement. Thomas Piketty shows that neo-liberal globalisation has produced a world of haves and have-nots, keeping the critique alive after 2008.

The same lens explains the resistance it provokes ie Battle of Seattle and the World Social Forum against an order that concentrates wealth in a global elite.

Critics argues it can oversimplify globalisation, understate the agency of states and non-state actors and is charged with Eurocentrism.

But as inequality, dependency and exploitation persist, Marxist approach remains indispensable and not merely to interpret globalisation, but to change it.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2020 · 10 marks

Critically examine the impact of the process of globalization from the perspective of the countries of the global south.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 globalisation splits the South → globalists: ladder out of poverty vs dependency school: fresh channel of exploitation **R2** globalisation a contested promise → whether it lifts or exploits the South turns on its terms

Body flow

optimist case not empty → **Bhagwati**: growth trickles down, inter-nation inequality narrows → China 36% (1990) → 6% (2011), Vietnam to middle-income

Counter-view

aggregate still skewed → North = 23% of people, 85% of income → **Frank & Wallerstein**: drain periphery → core, Southern elites captured by MNCs → **Nkrumah**: neo-liberal openness → neo-colonialism, WTO shifts wealth South → North → **Roy**: "mutant variety of colonialism"

Conclusion routes

R1 harm lies in the terms, not globalisation itself → **Stiglitz**'s democratic-deficit reform + **Sen**'s infrastructure/governance → opportunity becomes real gain **R2** on present terms globalisation deepens dependency → need is the right balance of openness and regulation

Globalisation has divided opinion in the South: globalists call it as a ladder out of poverty, while the dependency school sees a fresh channel of exploitation.

According to Jagdish Bhagwati, growth has trickled down and inequality between nations has narrowed. China's poverty fell from 36% in 1990 to 6% in 2011, and Vietnam rose to middle-income status.

Though only 23% of humanity lives in the industrial North, it earns 85% of world income. A.G. Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein trace this to a drain of wealth from periphery to core, with the ruling elites of the South captured by MNCs.

Kwame Nkrumah holds that neo-liberal openness paves the way to neo-colonialism, the WTO transferring wealth from South to North. For Arundhati Roy, globalisation is simply "a mutant variety of colonialism".

As Joseph Stiglitz argues, connecting the democratic deficit in the IMF, UN and WTO with the infrastructure, regulation and governance. Amartya Sen stresses could let the South convert opportunity into genuine gain.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2021 · 15 marks

What is globalisation? Why is there an intense debate about globalisation and its consequences?

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 define via **Giddens** → intensification of worldwide social relations / time-space compression → theme is interdependence **R2** globalisation = overlapping, contradictory processes → resists a single definition → the contest starts with "what it even is"

Body flow

definition (integration + interdependence) → disagreement over the state → **Ohmae** (real, borders/sovereignty erode) → **Gilpin** (buzzword, states in command) → **Held** (reshapes, states remain) → shift to consequences → **O'Neill** gains (inequality down, poverty halved, fewer battle deaths) → **Mehta** (Western stagnation, xenophobia) → **Thakur** (soft imperialism, uncivil society)

Counter-view

liberal optimism (**O'Neill**'s gains) set against the Marxist-postcolonial charge of neo-imperialism and the dark side (**Thakur**) — one process, opposite readings

Conclusion routes

R1 intense because it is a double-edged sword with unevenly shared gains → contested across rival lenses **R2** prosperity for the liberal, new imperialism for the Marxist → hence the call for a humane, inclusive Globalisation 4.0

Globalisation is the process by which people, goods and ideas spread worldwide, deepening the integration of cultures, governments and economies. Anthony Giddens describes it as the intensification of world-wide social relations, distant events shape local life and the reverse, compressing time and space.

Hyperglobalists like Kenichi Ohmae see a real and transformative force, a world where political borders matter less & sovereignty erodes. Sceptics like Robert Gilpin treat it as more a buzzword than a reality, one that still remains within the command of states. Transformationalists such as David Held take a middle path: globalisation reshapes societies and governance while states remain central.

Jim O'Neill points to inequality falling between countries, global poverty halving and fewer people dying in war.

For Pratap Bhanu Mehta, the reality is stagnant living standards in the west and rising anti-immigrant sentiment. Ramesh Thakur calls globalisation a soft form of imperialism that breeds a global uncivil society of terrorism, crime & trafficking.

This is why the debate stays intense. Globalisation is a double-edged sword whose gains are unevenly shared. The same process is prosperity to a liberal and a new form of imperialism to a Marxist, feeding today's demand for a humane and inclusive Globalisation 4.0.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2022 · 10 marks

What are the main challenges faced by the developing countries in the era of globalisation?

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 globalisation promised integration → but redistributed economic power → developed nations dominant → challenges = unequal terms of entry **R2** South enters late and weak → openness on others' terms → dependency, not partnership

Body flow

economics first → skewed balance of trade (imports > exports) → job losses despite higher productivity → village/small-scale industry crushed by MNC technology → poverty + income gaps → **Wallerstein**: drain periphery → core = development of underdevelopment → dependence on developed nations + IMF/WTO (favour industrialised) → sovereignty eroded, external shocks → cultural erosion + environmental degradation + labour exploitation

Counter-view

Sen and **Bhagwati** → right mix of openness, regulation, infrastructure, governance → developing countries can gain

Conclusion routes

R1 not globalisation but its present terms → vulnerable states need regulation + equitable distribution → exposure into benefit **R2** challenge is management, not rejection → strategic planning turns integration from trap into opportunity

Globalisation promised worldwide integration, but for developing countries it has redistributed economic power, leaving already-developed nations dominant. The main challenges flow from the unequal terms on which the South enters this order.

The pressures are first economic. Imports tend to outpace exports, producing a skewed balance of trade. Despite higher productivity, job losses have grown on an unprecedented scale and village & small scale industries cannot compete with MNC technology, accelerating poverty & widening income gaps.

Immanuel Wallerstein argues that globalisation drains wealth from the periphery to the core, producing the development of underdevelopment. This dependence on developed nations and on institutions like the IMF and WTO seen to favour industrialised nations.

It erodes economic sovereignty and exposes states to external shocks. Alongside run cultural erosion, environmental degradation from lax regulation and labour exploitation by MNCs.

Amartya Sen and Jagdish Bhagwati hold that with the right mix of openness, regulation, infrastructure and governance, developing countries can gain. The challenge is not globalisation but its present terms.

It means being more valuable, low-income countries need robust regulation and equitable distribution to turn exposure into benefit.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2023 · 20 marks

Critically examine the impact of Globalisation on the developing countries of the world.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 globalisation reshapes developing world (economic/social/cultural) → record two-sided → opportunity bundled with dependency + inequality
R2 verdict neither rejection nor celebration → stake the line: the case is for reform

Body flow

gains real: markets opened, exports + FDI up, growth (China, India), tech transfer → **Bhagwati** (*In Defence of Globalization*): tool against poverty → China 36% → 6%, Vietnam middle-income → social gains (health, education, exchange) → but gains unevenly captured → North = 23% of people, 85% of income → **Stiglitz**: rich-poor gap widens, advanced nations reap disproportionate rewards → dependency school (**Frank, Wallerstein**): drain periphery → core = development of underdevelopment; Southern elites tied to MNCs → IMF/WTO reliance narrows sovereignty, invites external shocks → cultural imperialism + environmental degradation + labour exploitation → **Roy**: "mutant variety of colonialism"

Counter-view

against dependency pessimism → benefits real but conditional → **Sen**: gains need infrastructure + governance → **Stiglitz**: fix democratic deficit in IMF/WTO

Conclusion routes

R1 opportunity real, but present terms deepen dependency + inequality → reform, not rejection, for inclusive growth **R2** double-edged process → the need is the right balance of openness and regulation

Globalisation has reshaped the developing world across economic, social and cultural life and its record there is two-sided.

Open markets brought opportunity, but on present terms that opportunity comes bundled with dependency, inequality and cultural erosion.

Jagdish Bhagwati, in *In Defence of Globalization* argues that China's poverty rate fell from 36% in 1990 to 6% in 2011, and Vietnam reached middle-income status. Wider trade also brought better healthcare, education and cultural exchange.

Though only 23% of humanity lives in the industrial North, it earns 85% of world income. Joseph Stiglitz shows that globalisation widens the rich-poor gap within & between nations, with advanced economies reshaping disproportionate rewards.

André Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein describe a drain of wealth from periphery to core, producing the development of underdevelopment, with the ruling elites of the South tied to MNCs. Reliance on developed economies and on the IMF & WTO narrows sovereignty and exposes states to external shocks, while cultural imperialism, environmental degradation & labour exploitation follow. Arundhati Roy calls it "a mutant variety of colonialism".

As Amartya Sen argues, developing countries gain only with the right infrastructure and governance; and Stiglitz would correct the democratic deficit in the IMF and WTO.

Globalisation offers real opportunity, but on present terms it deepens dependency and inequality. The task is not to discard it, but to reform it for inclusive growth.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2024 · 20 marks

“Deglobalisation is displacing globalisation.” Comment.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 advance never smooth → hyper-globalisation (1990–2008) → 2008 crisis + trade wars + single-partner dependence → “slowbalisation” → displacement or rebalancing? **R2** developed world's three phases: promotion → scepticism → deglobalisation → stake the line: erosion, not replacement

Body flow

case for displacement (Brexit, America First, Ukraine, supply-chain, energy, falling FDI) → drivers: pandemic + ideology + green transition → resilience/reshoring → institutions strained (WTO/NATO under populism; WHO + UN failures; AUKUS 2021 split) → **Varshney**: retreat/erosion feeding Trump, Boris Johnson → pivot: retreat ≠ replacement → **Mehta**: Pincer movement → mutation into Glocalisation → **Nayyar**: “economics global, politics national/local” + needs a hegemon (US decline vs China rise)

Counter-view

Baldwin et al.: trade won't reverse → goods trade stagnant but e-services expand → “derisking,” not collapse

Conclusion routes

R1 balance between globalising & deglobalising forces, not displacement
R2 **Rodrik**'s “thinner model” → globalisation thins and reforms, not displaced

6 decades of deepening integration, including the hyper-globalisation of 1990-2008, were checked by the 2008 financial crisis. The trade wars, a disenfranchised middle class, and over-reliance on single partners settled into a stagnant "slowbalisation".

Developed countries have moved from promoting globalisation to scepticism and now deglobalisation. It is a less connected world of powerful nation-states, local solutions and border controls. Brexit, US first, the Ukraine war, supply chain shocks, the energy crisis and falling FDI mark the turn.

Populist politics targets the WTO and NATO, the WHO faltered in the pandemic, the UN could not answer Russia's war and the 2021 AUKUS treaty divided France, the UK & the USA. Ashutosh Vashney calls this as globalisation in retreat, in erosion feeding leaders like Trump and Boris Johnson.

Pratap Bhanu Mehta sees a "Pincer movement" i.e. pressure from both developed and developing states that mutates globalisation into 'Glocalisation' rather than ending it. Deepak Nayyar argues that "economics has become global, but politics remains national and local" and warns that globalisation needs a hegemon, so US decline alongside China's rise unsettles it.

Against outright collapse, Richard Baldwin and colleagues argue trade will not reverse. Goods trade has stagnated while digitally enabled services expand and de-risking gains ground.

Deglobalisation is therefore viewed as a question of balance between globalising and deglobalising forces. For Dani Rodrik, market integration came at the cost of domestic disintegration.

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2025 · 15 marks

Global South-sensitive model of globalization would prevent the danger emanating from overcentralized globalization. Discuss.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 claim rests on a real diagnosis → over-centralisation = rule-making + gains locked in a Northern core **R2** danger is genuine, but curable by reform, not by dismantling globalisation

Body flow

danger is structural (**Wallerstein** → periphery-to-core drain → underdevelopment) → danger is institutional (IMF/WTO/UN favour the North → **Stiglitz's** democratic deficit, the affected have least say) → South-sensitive model = decentralise rule-making + rebalance representation → South's agenda: fairer multilateralism, SDG finance, climate justice (Loss and Damage) → voice of the South (Ukraine, Gaza, climate)

Counter-view

Nayyar → globalisation needs a hegemon → remove the coordinating core → fragmentation, not fairness → decentralisation without reformed leadership solves little

Conclusion routes

R1 reform, not replacement → build the South in → more equitable + resilient, less backlash **R2** qualified yes → the model reduces the danger only by reforming leadership, not by removing it

Over-centralised globalisation concentrates rule-making & gains in a small Northern core. A model attentive to the Global South can correct this but the correction lies in reform, not in dismantling globalisation itself.

Immanuel Wallerstein shows how globalisation drains wealth from the periphery to the core. On present terms, integration deepens the very underdevelopment it promises to cure. IMF, WTO and UN were built to favour the industrialised world. Joseph Stiglitz locates the fault in a democratic deficit within these bodies. Those most affected by the rules have the least say over them.

A global south-sensitive model answers this by decentralising rule-making and rebalancing representation. The global south countries with colonial pasts & belated development has long been underrepresented in global institutions.

It now presses for a fairer multilateral order, finance for the SDGs and climate justice through the Loss and Damage Fund. Its voice is already asserted across Ukraine, Gaza and the climate crisis.

Deepak Nayyar argues that globalisation needs a hegemon to hold together. Strip out the coordinating core and the risk is fragmentation, not a fairer order. Decentralisation without reformed leadership solves little.

The way forward is therefore reform, not replacement. Building the South's concerns into the system makes globalisation more equitable and resilient. It also reduces the backlash that over-centralisation itself provokes.

PYQ VAULT · DAY 30 · GLOBALISATION

All 10 questions — PDF + handwritten answers

The complete Day 30 set — every PYQ with its Flow Snapshot and the handwritten model answer — in one PDF on the channel, free.

Download on Telegram

@psirbyamitpratap

560 questions · 50 days · ten years of PYQs — nothing left out

Tomorrow — Day 31. Don't break the chain.

PSIR OPTIONAL · FOR MAINS 2026

ATS 2026

AUGMENTED TEST SERIES

BATCH 3 05 JULY

BATCH 4 19 JULY

BATCH 5 26 JULY

TEST SERIES INCLUDES

- ◆ Sectional + Full-Length Tests + Simulators
- ◆ In-depth discussion with Model Answers
- ◆ One-to-one expert evaluation & mentorship

TO ENROL OR FOR GUIDANCE, CALL

93117 40432

AMIT PRATAP SINGH

PSIR FACULTY · FORUMIAS

PSIR OPTIONAL · FOR MAINS 2027

OCP 2027

OPTIONAL GUIDANCE PROGRAMME

COMMENCES

6 JULY 2026

BATCH 1 · ONLINE & OFFLINE

PROGRAMME INCLUDES

- ◆ 35 live classes – entire PSIR syllabus
- ◆ 35 Daily Answer-Writing Tests
- ◆ Full-Length Tests with Model Answers
- ◆ One-to-one evaluation & mentorship

TO ENROL OR FOR GUIDANCE, CALL

93117 40432

AMIT PRATAP SINGH

PSIR FACULTY · FORUMIAS