

IMPACT OF GLOBALISATION ON FOOD SECURITY

**Assel
KUDABAYEVA***

MSc in International Relations, Doctoral student, Faculty of International Relations, Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov, Astana, Kazakhstan, kudabayeva_azh@enu.kz

**Seyit Ali
AVCU**

Ph.D, Associate Professor, Faculty of Political Science, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Ankara, The Republic of Türkiye, avcuseyit@hotmail.com

**Akbota
ZHOLDASBEKOVA**

Candidate of Political Sciences, Professor, Faculty of International Relations, Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumilyov, Astana, Kazakhstan, zholdasbekova_an@enu.kz

Manuscript received: 20/04/2023

DOI: 10.52123/1994-2370-2023-1057

UDC 338.2

CICSTI 11.25.91

Abstract. Globalisation by means of technological development brought changes in all spheres. Food security experiences the effect of globalisation in terms of faster transport that enhances the export and import of food, and easier financial transactions that are convenient for consumers and manufacturers. Moreover, as science develops, new innovative ways to grow, produce, deliver and store food are found. These scientific inventions are shared worldwide improving food security. However, emphasising that globalisation is a transformation, scholars agree that it does not proceed evenly. Developed countries having economic, agricultural, scientific and technological advantages are way ahead of developing countries. Developing countries in the race to follow the rules of free trade and offer a competitive price of their food products are forced to exploit their land and water resources, while developed economies enjoy cheap food which is traded unfairly. Marxist theory helps to understand globalisation and is applied in the article to analyse its exploitative nature.

Keywords: globalisation, food security, free trade, capitalism, Marxist theory.

Аңдатпа. Технологиялық даму арқылы жаһандану барлық салаларға өзгерістер әкелді. Азық-түлік қауіпсіздігі жаһанданудың әсерін азық-түлік экспорты мен импортын күшейтетін жылдам тасымалдау және тұтынушылар мен өндірушілер үшін қолайлы қаржылық операцияларды жеңілдету тұрғысынан сезінеді. Оның үстіне ғылым дамыған сайын азық-түлікті өсірудің, өндірудің, жеткізудің және сақтаудың жаңа инновациялық жолдары табылуда. Бұл ғылыми өнертабыстар азық-түлік қауіпсіздігін жақсарту үшін дүние жүзінде ортақ. Дегенмен, жаһанданудың трансформация екеніне тоқталған ғалымдар оның біркелкі жүрмейтіндігіне келіседі. Экономикалық, ауыл шаруашылығы, ғылыми-техникалық артықшылықтары бар дамыған елдер дамушы елдерден әлдеқайда алда. Еркін сауда ережелерін сақтауға және азық-түлік өнімдерінің бәсекеге қабілетті бағасын ұсынуға жарысқан дамушы елдер жер және су ресурстарын пайдалануға мәжбүр, ал дамыған экономикасы әділетсіз сатылған арзан азық-түлікті пайдаланады. Марксистік теория жаһандануды түсінуге көмектеседі және оның эксплуатациялық сипатын талдау үшін мақалада қолданылады.

Түйін сөздер: жаһандандыру, азық қауіпсіздігі, ашық сауда, капитализм, Марксизм теориясы.

Аннотация. Глобализация посредством технологического развития внесла изменения во все сферы. Продовольственная безопасность испытывает на себе влияние глобализации с точки зрения более быстрого транспорта, который увеличивает экспорт и импорт продуктов питания, а также более простых финансовых операций, удобных для потребителей и производителей. Более того, по мере развития науки находят новые инновационные способы выращивания, производства, доставки и хранения продуктов питания. Эти научные изобретения используются во всем мире для повышения продовольственной безопасности. Однако, подчеркивая, что глобализация — это трансформация, ученые сходятся во мнении, что она протекает неравномерно. Развитые страны, обладающие экономическим, сельскохозяйственным, научным и технологическим преимуществом, намного опережают развивающиеся страны. Развивающиеся страны в гонке за соблюдением правил свободной торговли и предложением конкурентоспособных цен на свои продукты питания вынуждены эксплуатировать свои земельные и водные ресурсы, в то время как страны с развитой экономикой наслаждаются дешевыми продуктами питания, которые продаются несправедливо. Марксистская теория помогает понять глобализацию и применяется в статье для анализа ее эксплуататорской природы.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, продовольственная безопасность, свободная торговля, капитализм, теория Марксизма.

* Corresponding author: A. Kudabayeva, kudabayeva_azh@enu.kz

Introduction

It goes without saying that globalisation has been affecting our lives for a long time. Economies, cultures, education, health policies and many other aspects of our everyday lives are intertwined on a global scale. Local processes change and develop constantly under the influence of international progress. Food security is another vital aspect which is inevitably influenced by globalisation. Among the advantages of globalisation are fast and convenient ways of food delivery which make it possible to trade food all over the world thus people can enjoy some exotic fruit or rare delicacy almost in any place. Countries do not have to depend on their climate conditions to cultivate crops or other products, now all necessary food can be imported through global trading links. Moreover, scientific achievements and ideas enhancing food production and its quality are now available worldwide through published articles, online or distanced learning or international collaborations. Yet having numerous benefits globalisation has become a popular but highly debatable topic. For some, it means unequal distribution of wealth, unfair trade, poverty and hunger (Stiglitz, 2003), and for others liberalisation, economic growth, stability and security (Wolf, 2004).

Globalisation is highly praised by liberals. For them, it is a natural outcome of the long-time transformations taking place in the international political economy. Transport, communication and technological advancements create favourable conditions for trade. Trade increases cooperation between states, maximises wealth and sustains peaceful relationships in the world (Smith, 1776; Keohane, 1984). However, Marxists do not favour globalisation, instead, they argue that it is just the next stage of capitalism (Amin, 2014; Harman, 2010; Gill, 1992, p.270; Greider, 1998, p.31). Through the years, capitalism advanced and changed its forms, yet, it has kept its main characteristic features such as exploitation and inequality. With the help of technological progress in different spheres and institutions promoting free trade capitalists are given the opportunity to expand their markets. Now they can use the surpluses of accumulated capital not only within the local markets but on a global scale.

Methodology

Marxist theory is more than relevant in the analysis of globalisation and the effect it has on food security, as Marx was arguably the first to see the exploitative nature of progress (Harman, 2010, p.14). He (Marx, 1963, p. 27-28) observed that the bourgeoisie was created by long-time progress which improved methods of production and developed means of communication. The bourgeoisie focusing on 'selfish calculations' has become more powerful, eventually substituting moral values for exchange value, and freedoms for 'freedom of trade'. Further, he (Marx, 1963, p.85) wrote that the progress in the industrial revolution extended the markets throughout the world, thus giving the opportunity for capitalism to spread. The inventions made in transport and communication technologies connected colonies closer to their empires.

These Marxist observations of capitalism clarify the nowadays global economic situation. Capitalism in order to survive needs to increase the spheres of its influence by expanding its markets. Thus, it maximises profits by exploiting labour, the environment, water and natural resources of the developing countries by buying cheap food produced in the third world. In an era of globalisation technological progress made rich people even richer and as they value most of all profit, they strongly advocate free trade which makes them even more powerful. Certainly, trade is extremely important for food security not only for capitalists but for all countries as it is the main source of financial income and a convenient way for exporting and importing food. While development brings changes in all fields of our life, it also makes markets of other countries more accessible. However, the level of profit depends much on the number of finances that a trader can afford to invest in agriculture and food production or the price he is willing to pay for produced food. Poor countries from the very start are in worse condition than developed states. The problem is the lack of capital, absence of modern technologies and prevalence of unskilled labour.

Because capitalists own property, they are 'free and equal'. Thus, from the very beginning, they have highly developed agriculture and when they produce a variety of

commodities, they exchange their commodities for a fair price. The relations of production are very complicated. On the one hand, they generate wealth, but at the same time they result in poverty, they enhance production and likewise create oppression (Marx, 1963, p.139). As problematic relationships between globalisation and food security are better explained from the Marxist perspective, the following article is based on Marxist theory.

Defining globalisation

A lot of literature is written about globalisation and scholars note its various features. While there are some doubts regarding the existence of globalisation and even accusations that it is a myth (Hirst and Thompson, 1996, p.6), some scholars argue that global interconnections of modern social life are not only deepening but also widening and speeding up (Held et al., 1999, p.2; Friedman, 2012, p.10). Globalisation facilitates the economy as it makes the world borderless (Ohmae, 1995, p.2, 41). In a world where individual consumers are not constrained by time or distance, it is much easier to invest, produce and trade. Any commodity starting from food to intellectual property is internationally accessible. Fast and free exchange of goods and information seem to prioritise global networking and lessen the role of a state, however, such opinion is confronted by the argument that the significance of globalisation is exaggerated, as the nation-state still plays the dominant role in the processes of the domestic and global economy (Gilpin, 2001, p.363).

Nevertheless, nowadays national economies grow interdependent on each other and become more globalised as through their activities they blend in with the system of international trade (Oatley, 2010, p.360). Mutual interdependence, time-space compression, and intensification of cultural, social, economic and political relations are all vivid characteristics of the modern era. Although advances in technologies made life easier, distances shorter and communications better, there is a certain criticism of globalisation. There are views that only the rich can reap the benefits of globalisation, while there are no qualitative changes for the better in the lives of poor people (Payne, 2005, p.30; Hoogvelt, 2001, p.121). The bright picture depicted by the proponents of

globalisation is not working for many developing countries. While some are actively involved in the globalising process, others can be excluded.

Global capitalism. Some scholars observe that globalisation is a new form of capitalism. Hoogvelt (2001, p.121) argues that globalisation is another phase of capitalism, if previously capitalism had an expansive character, now it is distinguished by a deepening effect. Sachs et al. (1995, p.61) conclude that the global economy has not changed much and capitalism drives almost all parts of the world into the policies of free trade and regulations of the economic institutions advocating free trade. From the Marxist perspective, the main ideas of globalisation are not fresh, as they have been borrowed from capitalism (Hobden and Jones, 2014, p.141).

Capitalism which previously was the main feature of the Western economies has become global. Moreover, the capitalist class is no longer formed within a nation-state, it takes a global scale. Years ago, national corporations and joint stock companies were dominating local markets. Capital accumulated within the state shapes the national capitalist class. As national capitalists became more powerful, they gradually restructured society so that it could serve their interests. Now capitalists have the opportunity to invest money, thus making capital not simply national but transnational. Therefore, it can be said that globalisation forms a transnational capitalist class. Formation of the rich and poor class system, flows of commodities, and relationships between states and economic institutions are no longer geographically constrained but more influenced by globalisation (Robinson and Harris, 2000, p.16).

The transnationalisation of capitalism brought a dramatic increase in financial flows across state borders. Worldwide private finances were gaining the power to strengthen or weaken the processes of capital growth. Therefore, globalisation further intensifies the difference between 'North-South'. Even if the level of poverty is locally increasing in the countries of the First World, while some corporate companies of the Third World become prosperous, there is no evidence that the gap between the First and the Third Worlds is decreasing. The policies of direct investment and financial flows reinforced the

existing difference between the wealthy North and poor South (Arrighi, 2002, p.472-473).

Trade is the motto of capitalism and in the epoch of globalisation free trade is widely promoted. Liberalists consider that if countries open their markets to the commodities and services of other countries, then everyone would benefit. However, many doubt if all states equally benefit from free trade. Indeed, the gap between poor and wealthy countries is still striking.

Free trade and food security

There has been some controversy surrounding agricultural trade liberalization. Liberalizing agricultural trade has been alleged to be a threat to food security. Undernutrition in developing countries is caused primarily by attempts to force weak economies to open their borders and trade on the same terms as developed countries. The most common argument made by opponents of free trade is that the competitiveness of developing countries is insufficient to take advantage of the opportunities which are promised to be gained by the proponents of free trade.

Liberalists argue that states would benefit from liberalised economies as they bring prosperity and promote peace (Keohane, 1990, p.166-7). For them, all actors in international politics can benefit if they would choose not relative but absolute gains. These absolute gains can be achieved only if states are rational. It means that taking economic decisions, they need to choose those variants where they would have bigger profits, even if their partner gets a better deal in such an agreement. Therefore, Smith (1776, p.452-472) advocates freedom of trade and claims that it is senseless to produce commodities, that could be cheaply bought from other countries. Therefore, if countries prohibit foreign imports and instead support domestic monopolies, such a situation is not advantageous for the state as a whole. Countries are supposed to profit more from international trade, rather than from protecting their markets from foreign food imports.

In free trade, countries compete with each other to produce commodities and services that would most suit the interests of consumers. Such a high level of competition leads to progress, as producers pay more attention to the quality of their goods and tend to reduce the price. With the absence of

monopolies, consumers win, because they have a wide range of choices and they are free to choose products according to their taste and financial ability. Markets are full of local and foreign products, prices vary from cheap to expensive according to the quality of the item and consumers enjoy the possibility to buy from daily consumed products to exotic or high-priced food that requires special climate conditions or innovative agricultural approach.

Each country is supposed to produce commodities in which it has an advantage. Ricardo (1997, p.74-77) argues in favour of the comparative advantage theory. For him, each country has a natural advantage of producing and selling some goods. He believes that states should put much of their finances and effort to develop those industries which give them superiority. Further, all would benefit, as each country has goods that others would like to purchase. Indeed, some countries are better at producing cars, computers, and other manufactured goods, while the rest can offer tea, coffee or bananas. However, the gap in the price of such commodities would be naturally significant. Therefore, countries that can produce only agricultural or raw materials will always gain less benefit. Even if they accept the rules of free trade and comply with regulations of the economic institutions and trade as much as developed countries, the striking gap between their profit is not likely to decrease.

The negative outcomes of free trade for developing countries make scholars turn to Marx's writings for some explanation. Though the Soviet Union hegemon which strongly advocated Marxism to be the only right theory collapsed, interest in his writings has not withered. Concepts of Marxism seem to be even more relevant nowadays, as they help to see the whole picture of globalisation.

Unfair trade

If developed countries are seen as capitalists and developing as proletariat, then it is clear that the former has a sufficient amount of money to produce commodities, while the latter has to borrow money in order to start a business. There are several economic institutions whose primary goal is to reduce the poverty. The WTO, the IMF and the World Bank have many programmes that give countries loans so they could start producing goods and services. The WTO stands for non-discrimination, openness, transparency,

competitiveness, favourable conditions for developing countries and protection of the environment (WTO, 2023). The IMF policies promote economic stability and the improvement of life standards (IMF, 2023), while the World Bank gives zero to low-interest loans helping poor countries to develop spheres in education, health, environment, agriculture and others (World Bank, 2023). Altogether these international organisations provide programmes that directly or indirectly might stabilise the situation with food affordability, accessibility and availability. Thus, projects, that are supposed to support the economy and agricultural sector in developing countries, could have a positive effect on food security. However, no matter how noble the goals of these economic institutions are, there is some doubt that their policies are created to support developing countries. Instead, they drive poor countries into debt and credits which are not aiding much to their development.

These economic institutions providing developing countries with loans set up several rules with which states must comply. Opening markets, lowering tariffs and cooperation with other countries in free trade are the main principles of the WTO, IMF and World Bank (Watson, 2014, p.422-425). However, the aim of the bourgeoisie is to exploit the market by increasing production and consumption (Marx, 1963, p.30). As poor countries do not have sufficient finances to buy commodities produced by developed countries, with the help of loans and credits they are forced to embrace 'civilisation to become bourgeois themselves' (Marx, 1963, p.31). Developing countries taking loans and complying with the regulations of free trade face obstacles to trading. As they have a comparative advantage in agriculture, it would be best for them to trade in agricultural commodities, however, developed countries prefer to protect their national industry, thus, depriving poor states of their income. While poor countries were compelled to liberalise their markets for the import of manufactured goods, states with high incomes were not in a hurry to do the same for agricultural import. Developed countries only see developing countries as their trading partners in raw materials and cheap labour.

Opponents of free trade consider that labour rights have been systematically abused (Kuruvilla and Verma, 2006, p.42). Poor

countries in the race to make their food products competitive may seriously violate labour standards. International labour standards become a highly debatable topic because farmers and owners of the factories need to choose between profit and fair working conditions. Governments of such countries should take measures for its improvement yet as their population is mostly unskilled and poor they are left with the option to apply cheap labour in the agricultural field. Indeed, many agricultural commodities which developed countries consume have been produced with the use of cheap labour in developing countries.

Marx (1963, p.34) wrote that as common people own only labour, they must sell it as any other commodity, therefore labour is vulnerable to competition and crises in the market. Low-cost labour is extremely attractive for free trade. Food-producing companies from developed countries benefit from it greatly, as they can use cheap labour for manufacturing goods and then sell it to consumers at a competitive price. Employers reduce the cost of produced commodities at the expense of work conditions and wages, moreover, they also use child labour (Barrientos, 2000, p.565). Children from poor countries are forced to work instead of studying and are not paid accordingly for their hard labour. As workers from the Third World are limited in their choices, they have to put up with unfair remuneration for their work and unfavourable conditions of work. Moreover, children and women get paid even less than average workers. Thereby, globalisation facilitates this vicious circle where developed countries are allowed to maximise their profits and lessen expenses by usurping the rights of children and women, forcing them to accept unfair working conditions.

Environmentalists argue that free trade leads to environmental degradation. McMichael (2017, p.250-252) posits that 'development' has been neglecting the environment for a long time, however, dramatic changes in climate force people to understand that the problem is acute. Yet Stewart (1992, p.1331-1332) suggests that some countries could use environmental issues for protectionist purposes, while free trade should not be restricted by different kinds of barriers as local consumers would be first to suffer. Copeland and Taylor (2003, p.2) consider that trade oriented on income can be

dangerous for the environment, moreover, he suggests that rich states tend to transfer polluting industries to poor countries. In his chapter 'Capitalism and Man's conquest over nature' Marx wrote (1963, p.93-94) that people using agricultural chemistry destroy soil's fertility. For him, it was one of the main features of a capitalistic economy, that 'it robs the soil of many fertilising substances'. As developing countries have soil that could be used for rent by countries that are more developed, their soil, water and other natural resources needed for farming can be exploited. In an attempt to maximise the harvest countries renting the land apply pesticides and chemistry that pollute the environment and destroy flora and fauna.

Furthermore, free trade pressures developing countries to exploit nature in order to produce more commodities for trading. As developing countries are the main exporters of agricultural commodities, yet they do not possess the necessary advanced technologies and equipment they have to exploit the environment, in the race to produce food products cheaper and faster than other competing states. They pollute air and water, cut forests, and use harmful chemicals for soil fertilising in a desperate attempt to catch up with developed countries and earn so much needed capital, but not thinking about the consequences. And the consequences of this trade marathon are disastrous not only for the environment of developing countries but for the whole world. Therefore, measures that capitalist countries take to make development more sustainable are motivated by selfish economic interests as ecological crises affect production and trade (Bohm et al. 2012, p.1632; Moore, 2011, p.2).

Many scholars believe that globalisation drives states to a 'race to the bottom'. Nowadays free trade is not constrained, moreover, investors are given the freedom to choose any country which will be the most advantageous for business (Rudra, 2008, p.2). Capitalists are hostage to their own capital. When the local market is conquered, they have to search for others, otherwise, their profits will decrease, and they will lose competitive capacity. Marx argued that free trade would eventually exhaust itself because

it is prone to a cycle of 'stagnation, prosperity, over-production and crisis' (Marx et al, 2001, p.18). As developing countries depend greatly on their wealthy trading partners or investors, they take extreme measures to make their markets attractive. One such measure is rapid capital in- and outflows, allowing stakeholders to invest or withdraw money easily. However, because the basic principle of free trade is absolute gains, capitalists will be always on the hunt for a more profitable case. If another market becomes more advantageous, they would withdraw money immediately, leaving the developing country in crisis. Thus, capitalism will always follow its vicious cycle from prosperity to crisis while developing countries undergo dramatic changes trying to meet the requirements of free trade yet unfair trade.

Conclusion

Globalisation is an inevitable part of progress. It has plenty of benefits such as quick distribution of various food products, fertilisers and grains, an online market which allows consumers to buy groceries from any part of the world, an excellent communication system and an almost unrestricted financial flow on a world scale. In a globalised world food as an item can travel smoothly facilitating its accessibility. Yet when it comes to the question of affordability then globalisation is accused of an uneven distribution of wealth and prosperity. While some are left impoverished, others enjoy financial growth and stability. Certainly, globalisation promotes some growth in developing countries, however, it lacks equity. The prophetic character of Marx's work proves the uneven nature of globalisation. Exploitative terms of free trade and protectionist policies of developed countries that support their agricultural sector destabilise food security. Unless some measures are taken to regulate free trade, the world will be chasing profits neglecting labour rights, the environment and poverty. Although proponents of globalisation claim that free trade is mutually beneficial, in reality, poor countries are exploited in interests of capitalism, while developed countries and big Transnational companies reap the fruits of this capitalistic race.

REFERENCES

1. Amin, S. (2014). *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization: The Management of Contemporary Society*. London: Zed Books (Economic Controversies). <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bristol/detail.action?docID=1619939>, Accessed: 09.03.2023.
2. Arrighi, G. (2002). "Global Capitalism and the Persistence of the North-South Divide," *Science and Society* -New York, 65, pp. 469–475.
3. Barrientos, S. (2000). "Globalization and Ethical Trade: Assessing the Implications for Development," *Journal of International Development*, 12(4), pp. 559–570. doi: 10.1002/1099-1328(200005)12:4<559::AID-JID691>3.0.CO;2-G.
4. Bohm S, Moog S and Misoczky M.C (2012). "Greening Capitalism? A Marxist Critique of Carbon Markets," *Organization Studies*, 33(11), pp. 1617–1638. doi: 10.1177/0170840612463326.
5. Copeland, B. R. and Taylor, M. S. (2003). *Trade and the Environment: Theory and Evidence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (Princeton series in international economics). <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bristol/detail.action?docID=1538270>, Accessed: 11.03.2023.
6. Friedman, T. L. (2012). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*. 1st Picador edn. New York: Picador.
7. Gill, S. (1992) "Economic Globalization and the Internationalization of Authority: Limits and Contradictions," *Geoforum*, 23(3), pp. 269–283. doi: 10.1016/0016-7185(92)90042-3.
8. Gilpin, R. and Gilpin, J. M. (2001). *Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
9. Greider, W. (1998). *One World, Ready or Not : The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism*. New-York: Simon Schuster.
10. Harman, C. (2010). *Zombie Capitalism: Global Crisis and the Relevance of Marx*. Chicago, Ill.: Haymarket Books.
11. Held, D., McGrew, A. G., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
12. Hirst, P. Q. and Thompson, G. (1996). *Globalization in Question: the International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. 1st edn. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
13. Hobden, S. and Jones, R. W. (2014) *Marxist Theories of International Relations*. In: J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens, Sixth edition. *The Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Ch.9.
14. Hoogvelt, A. (2001). *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: the New Political Economy of Development*. Second edition. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
15. International Monetary Fund (2023). *The IMF At a Glance*. <https://www.imf.org/en/About>, Accessed: 08.04.2023.
16. Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
17. Keohane, R. O. (1990). *International Liberalism Reconsidered*. In: R. O. Keohane (2002) *Power and governance in a partially globalized world*. London: Routledge (Ingram Digital E-books (T & F), 2008-2014). <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/bristol/reader.action?docID=180846&ppg=8>, Accessed: 08.03.2023.
18. Kuruvilla, S. and Verma, A. (2006). "International Labor Standards, Soft Regulation, and National Government Roles," *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 48(1), pp. 41–58.
19. Marx, K. (1963). *Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*. Unspecified. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?collection=cow&handle=hein.cow/comanif0001&id=97&men_tab=srchresults, Accessed: 10.04.2023.
20. Marx, K., Aveling, E. B., Engels, F. and Moore, S. (2001). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. London.
21. McMichael, P. (2017). *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. Sixth edn. Los Angeles: SAGE.
22. Oatley, T. H. (2010). *International Political Economy*. Fourth edition. Pearson new international edn. Harlow, Essex: Pearson.
23. POhmae Ken'ichi (1995). *End of the Nation State: the Rise of Regional Economies*. London: HarperCollins.
24. Payne, A. (2005). *The Global Politics of Unequal Development*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
25. Ricardo, D. (1997). *On Foreign Trade*. In: A. Amawi, G. T. Crane, Second edition. *The Theoretical Evolution of International Political Economy: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
26. Robinson, W. I. and Harris, J. (2000). "Towards a Global Ruling Class? Globalization and the Transnational Capitalist Class," *Science & Society*, 64(1), pp. 11–54.

27. Rudra, N. (2008). *Globalization and the Race to the Bottom in Developing Countries Who Really Gets Hurt?* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
28. Sachs, J. D., Warner, A., Åslund Anders and Fischer, S. (1995). "Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1995(1), pp. 1–118.
29. Shirong Lü (2016). "Marx's Thoughts on Economic Globalization," *Social Sciences in China*, 37(2), pp. 5–19. doi: 10.1080/02529203.2016.1162008.
30. Smith, A. (1776). "Of Restraints upon the Importation from Foreign Countries of such Goods as can be produced at Home". In: W. B. Todd, ed. *The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith*, Vol. 2: *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. <https://www.oxfordscholarlyeditions.com/view/10.1093/actrade/9780199269563.book.1/actrade-9780199269563-div2-31>, Accessed: 09.01.2023.
31. Stewart, R. B. (1992). "International trade and environment: Lessons from the federal experience", *Washington and Lee Law Review*, 49(4), 1329-1372.
32. Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.
33. Wolf, M. (2004). *Why Globalization Works*. New Haven: Yale University Press (Yale Nota bene).
34. World Bank (2023). *Financial Products and Services*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/about/what-we-do>, Accessed: 09.04.2023.
35. World Trade Organization (2023). *What We Stand For*. https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/what_stand_for_e.htm, Accessed: 09.04.2023.

ЖАҢАҢДАНДЫРУДЫҢ АЗЫҚ ҚАУІПСІЗДІГІНЕ ӘСЕРІ

Әсел Кудабаяева, халықаралық қатынастар магистрі, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, халықаралық қатынастар факультетінің докторанты, Астана, Қазақстан, kudabayeva_azh@enu.kz

Сейит Али Авджу, Ph.D, доцент, Анкара Йылдырым Беязит университеті, саясаттану факультеті, Анкара, Түркия, avcuseyit@hotmail.com

Ақбота Жолдасбекова, саяси ғылымдарының кандидаты, Л.Н. атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті халықаралық қатынастар факультеті «Аймақтану» кафедрасының профессоры. Гумилев, Астана, Қазақстан, zholdasbekova_an@enu.kz

ВЛИЯНИЕ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ НА ПРОДОВОЛЬСТВЕННУЮ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ

Асель Кудабаяева, магистр международных отношений, докторант факультета международных отношений, Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан, kudabayeva_azh@enu.kz

Сейит Али Авджу, доктор философии, доцент факультета политических наук Анкарского университета им. Йылдырыма Беязита, Анкара, Турция, avcuseyit@hotmail.com

Ақбота Жолдасбекова, кандидат политических наук, профессор кафедры регионоведения, факультета международных отношений, Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан, zholdasbekova_an@enu.kz