

# Globalization challenges in a globalized world

Gjon Boriçi

Dr.sc. Gjon BORIÇI

## Abstract

Globalization is an ongoing phenomenon trying to redefine the economic, social, cultural and political dynamics of contemporary societies. The communication among countries and not only them, has been increased expanding political ties, making possible greater economic integration and wider cultural relations combined with augmented global wealth across the world. But, the process of globalization is in wider terms considered a beneficial one, but also viewed by some countries as a menace to national sovereignty and national culture. This paper tries to explain the obstacles to the process of globalization and its attendant benefits. Although globalization has arisen as a result of a more stable world, the factors that had contributed to its rise also help the factions interested to bring destabilization. In an academic approach in this article, between the research and comparative methods, I have been trying to get the maxims between economy, politics and diplomacy in their efforts of affecting the global era.

**Key Words:** Globalization, economy, politics, phenomenon, order

[www.dx.doi.org/10.21113/iir.v6i2.260](http://www.dx.doi.org/10.21113/iir.v6i2.260)

ILIRIA International Review – Vol 6, No 2 (2016)

© Felix-Verlag, Holzkirchen, Germany and Iliria College, Pristina, Kosovo

## 1. Introduction

The word "globalization" was used for the first time in 1962, in an article in *The spectator magazine* (UK) (Baktiari, 2008, p. 143). Globalization is a complex process. Its importance comes because it ensures benefits. There is a large number of factors that drive this phenomenon, all of which intertwine and strengthen each other. One of the most important things derived from globalization is the political communication or only the communication itself. The scientific progress and the technological advances have brought greater global wealth and much higher standards of living. But are these achievements enough to secure peace and stability all around the world?

The late XX century brought with it the recognition that the world had become a big "global village" in the words of Marshall McLuhan (Heywood, 2007, p. 128). The comprehension of politics has completely changed with this phenomenon. During the XX century and for centuries ago, politics was understood in the traditional way of the state centric. The state was the principal actor and the government was at the centre of every political action. Of course a clear distinction between domestic and foreign policy existed, because everything took place within the nation-state. With the passing of the years, foreign policy was changed in a new discipline called international relations. In this paper attempt will be made to examine the following topics:

- How much has changed the international political economy within the globalization?
- Has the new world order been affected by the end of the Cold War?
- What are the implications of the state in the era of globalization?
- Is globalization truly a beneficial or destructive force?
- It is possible for our planet to have a world government?
- The limits of globalization
- Conclusions

## 2. How much has changed the international political economy within the globalization?

Globalization is a social phenomenon that has an enormous impact in our economic life. All around the world populations of different nations, ethnic, religious heritage are closer together. This approach makes it

possible to enjoy the benefits if this mechanism by avoiding the detrimental effects. Standard assertion claims about globalization, impact on the political life and international relations by leading to cultural hegemony of one country against another. This does not mean that absorbing all foreign influences is the key to national development, as there will always be inherent challenges and threats (Tauris, 2008, p.9). States and governments will continue to give priority to their national interests especially during short-term gain. Countries, governments, companies and individuals will have to adapt facing the new challenges of globalization in different and various levels. Globalization does pose certain challenges to societies, but these should be confronted by means of a holistic approach that balances political, economic, security and social concerns (Tauris, 2008, p.9).

In the era of globalization, real welfare is a compound of multiple dimensions. Economic development and growth may generate various negative externalities which are real costs borne by someone without compensation (Windsor, 2008, p. 27). In the empirical studies of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels concerning the least temporary negative effects of the first industrial revolution in the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Irwin, 1909, p. 920). The theory of economic development is itself a matter of considerable controversy and is constantly evolving (Adelman, 1999). Yet it's not clear how to move societies from a condition of underdevelopment to a process of economic development and growth. The general consensus seems to be that during much of the XX century (1900-1980), there was a major rise in global inequality (Sutcliffe, 2004, p.15).

The effects of economic globalization are widely seen all around the world. The term "sustainable development" encompasses three related effects. There should be continuing economic development to raise overall global wealth and improve conditions for the world's poor. This wealth increase must occur without adversely harming the natural environment of the planet (Windsor, 2008, p. 42). The population of the world tends to be a debatable issue. In June 2007 the number of the world population was 6.6 billion. It will reach 9 billion at midyear 2042 (Windsor, 2008, p. 42). The problem to this phenomenon is not the raise of the population but how can the international economy sustain this growth by a sustainable development. We don't know if the technical progress through entrepreneurship is going to be the key of sustainable development. On the other hand, the creative destruction is leading to dynamic changes resulting in a short-term benefit.

However, globalization goes beyond just the traditional international economic flows of goods, services, capital and labor. Globalization encompasses flows of culture, values and information (mainly electronic nowadays). Increased globalization is simply an increased volume of international interactions of innumerable types (Bergstrand et al., 2008, p. 51). As the process of "competitive liberalization" via regional and inter-regional trade agreement continues, countries like those in the Middle East will need to join this "market" or be left behind in the process of globalization (Bergstrand et al., 2008, p. 69).

### **3. Has the new world order been affected by the end of the Cold War?**

The fall of the Berlin Wall marked the end of the Cold War. The whole communist system in Europe was dismantled. In November 1990, representatives of the Warsaw Pact and NATO met in Paris formally to declare the end of hostilities, officially closing the book on the Cold War (Heywood, 2007, p. 133). But is the Cold War really over?

The debates about the end of the Cold War are mired mostly on ideological controversies. The most credited version was the structural weakness of Soviet economy. The inefficiency of the central planning economy undermined the legitimacy of Soviet Union and its satellites in the Central and Eastern Europe. The Gorbachev reforms initiated in 1985, merely brought about the collapse of an inefficient yet still functioning economic system, and, in relaxing the grip of the Communist Party, unleashed centrifugal forces that by the end of 1991 had brought about the destruction of the USSR itself (Heywood, 2007, p. 134). The end of the Cold War shaped the new world order. The global scope and speed of communication erode the distinction between domestic and international upheavals, and between leaders and the immediate demands of the most vocal groups (Kissinger, 2014, p. 356). All the nations seek for freedom as the first step towards economic welfare and political stability. Order should not have priority over freedom (Kissinger, 2014, p. 357). The fashion of the old diplomacy after the end of the Cold War has been replaced by internet, Facebook, twitter.

The end of the Cold War has been often seen as a major change in the human history. Indeed, it is. The birth of post-Cold War world was accompanied by a wave of optimism and idealism, highlighted by expectations of a 'new' world order (Heywood, 2007, p. 134). The end of

super-powers rivalry opened up possibilities for lasting peace founded on common norms of standard and morality. At the center of this emerging world order was the recognition of the need to settle disputes peacefully, to resist aggression and expansionism, to control and reduce military arsenals, and to ensure the just treatment of domestic populations through respect for human rights (Heywood, 2007, p. 135). Great statesman, however different as personalities, almost invariably had an instinctive feeling for the history of their societies (Kissinger, 2014, p. 358). In the age of internet, the leaders cannot count on willpower and charisma to dominate their societies.

It's sad but true that the imbalances have grown after the end of the Cold War. The structure of the XXI century world order according to Henry Kissinger has been revealed as lacking in four important dimensions:

First, the nature of the state itself- the basic formal unit international life- has been subjected to a multitude of pressures: attacked and dismantled by design, in some regions corroded from neglect, often submerged by the sheer rush of events. Europe has set out to transcend the state and to craft a foreign policy based principally on soft power and humanitarian values. But it is doubtful that claims to legitimacy separated from any concept of strategy can sustain a world order (Kissinger, 2014, p. 368).

Second, the political and the economic organizations of the world are at variance with each other. The international economic system has become global, while the political structure of the world has remained based on nation-state. The global economic impetus is on removing obstacles to the flow of goods and capital. The international political system is still largely based on contrasting ideas of world order and the reconciliation of concepts of national interests. Economic globalization, in its essence, ignores national frontiers. International policy emphasizes the importance of frontiers even as it seeks to reconcile conflicting national aims (Kissinger, 2014, p. 368).

Third, is the absence of an effective mechanism for the great powers to consult and possibly to cooperate on the most consequential issues. This may seem an odd criticism in light of the plethora of multilateral forums that exist- more by far than at any other time in history (Kissinger, 2014, p. 369-370).

Fourth, the contemporary quest for world order will require a coherent strategy to establish a concept of order within the various regions, and to relate these regional orders to one another. These goals are not necessarily

identical or self-reconciling: the triumph of a radical movement might bring order to one region while setting the stage for turmoil in and with the others. The domination of a region by one country militarily, even if it brings the appearance of order, could produce a crises for the rest of the world (Kissinger, 2014, p. 371).

The international order thus faces a paradox: its prosperity is dependent on the success of globalization, but the process produces a political reaction that often works counter to its aspirations. The economic managers of globalization have few occasions to engage with its political processes. The managers of the political processes have few incentives to risk their domestic support on anticipating economic or financial problems whose complexity eludes the understanding of all but experts (Kissinger, 2014, p. 369). A reassessment of the concept of balance of power is in order. In theory, the balance of power should be quite calculable; in practice, it has proved extremely difficult to harmonize a country's calculations with those of other states and achieve a common recognition of limits (Kissinger, 2014, p. 371).

#### **4. What are the implications of the state in the era of globalization?**

One of the greatest implication of the states during the era of globalization is beyond any doubt the migration. What are the challenges that it poses upon governments and states? In this paper, it is very difficult to give an appropriate answer for the simple reason that globalization is not a homogenous process. Globalization is differently understood and takes different shapes in different parts of the planet. The cross-border migration is shaped by specific political and economic developments. Because of the diversity of the economic values of the states, to better understand the implications of the states in this kind of challenge [immigration] it is necessary to have a comparative approach in order to better assess the demographic changes created for origin and recipient states.

The end of communist dictatorships in southeastern European countries allowed workers to leave their countries as a cause of decadent economic situations. For their origin countries, migration proved beneficial for three specific reasons:

First, the domestic unemployment was reduced. Second, the domestic dissent was also reduced, because the majority of those who left the

country were mostly young people. Thus, sending out the young people diminished the political opposition. Third, emigrant workers sent part of their wages home as remittances, amounting to approximately US\$ 1 billion for each million migrants (Schaeffer, 1997, p. 67). Remittances sent from the migrants were a sort of source of hard currencies used to import oil and manufactured goods by states facing persistent trade deficits (Keyder, 1985, p. 141). Remittances together with income from the tourist industries in these countries described from one scholar as "Market Fascism" enabled the dictatorships to sustain modest level of economic developments (Schaeffer, 1997, p. 67).

Global developments in the 1970s created problems, for states that relied on migration as key to their political legitimacy and economic development. The 1971 dollar devaluation, Soviet grain shortages throughout the decade, and the 1974 OPEC oil embargo, created a series of problems for dictatorships in Southern Europe (Tauris, 2008, p. 76). During this period, communist dictatorships in East Germany, Cuba and Vietnam also adopted policies to manage the exit of domestic migrants, largely to reduce dissent. Between 1949 - when Germany was divided - and 1961, 3.4 million East Germans left the country (Tauris, 2008, p. 77). By 1989, another 500.000 East Germans had applied for official permission to leave the country (Tauris, 2008, p. 77).

This kind of state policy induced migrations, led to a number of immediate and ongoing problems. First, the great powers that partitioned the remnants of communism did not expect people from these countries to migrate in large numbers, and so were unprepared to deal with the related problems that emerged. Second, these migrations were extremely disruptive and led in some cases to conflict and violence. Third, although many people migrated across newly drawn frontiers, groups of people stayed behind creating largely minority populations (Tauris, 2008, p. 79).

Democratization in Eastern Europe and the subsequent expansion of the European Union has led to large-scale migration within EU and the entry of workers from countries outside the EU (Tauris, 2008, p. 79). Unprecedented is the current migration crises that is taking place ultimately in Europe as a cause of Middle East turmoil. Millions of refugees left their homes from Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, etc., to reach Western Europe. At this moment the European politics is divided. The visit of Pope Francis to the island of Lesbos, Greece on April 16<sup>th</sup> 2016 (Tauris, 2008, p. 82) is a clear sign of the gravity of the problem. Some former communist

countries have raised walls of barbed wire by thousands of kilometers to obstruct the entry of these people from Middle East to pass through their territory. The problem with the new emigrants, found Western Europe unprepared. It's unavoidable for Brussels to close the eyes in front of the gravest humanitarian crises after the end of the Second World War as was described from the Pope Francis during his visit in Lesbos (Tauris, 2008, p. 82).

From the historical experiences, states assign different legal statuses to cross-border migrants (Schaffer, 1999). The resident populations have been divided in three groups. The first group is treated as "citizens" which means they can vote, bear arms, hold property and access the government's legal system. In the past, states granted these rights only to adult males who were born or naturalized in the country. In the second group, states treat some people as "denizens", which means they have some but not all the rights given to the citizens. In the past, states granted restricted rights as denizens to women, minors and immigrants. In the third group, states treat some people as "subjects", which means they possess few, if any, legal rights. In the past, slaves, debtors, indentured servants, convicted criminals, illegal foreigners, indigenous people, the mentally ill and people with tuberculosis were assigned to this status (Schaeffer, 2008, p. 86).

Over the last 200 years, states have generally extended the status of citizenship to a wider group of people and narrowed the definition of denizen and subject, though they still remain as status categories, even in the most "democratic" states (Schaeffer, 2008, p. 86). Earthquakes are difficult to predict - but so too are the aftershocks and the development of new fault lines. We cannot predict where the next large migration is likely to occur, nor can we predict those nations in the future that will become attractive as potential permanent homes for immigrants. What we possibly can predict are the continuous large migrations and that people will move to other countries to improve their lives and that of their families (Schaeffer, 2008, p. 86). As such, strategies to deal with migration, immigration and possible fault lines should be considered immediately and constantly reviewed as circumstances change. We should also be prepared to learn from experiences with different nations and cultures and adapt accordingly (Mahon, 2008, p. 104). Maybe this can be the most important challenge that migration poses to states.



## **5. Is globalization truly a beneficial or destructive force?**

The distribution of wealth remains one of the most sensitive questions in the global era. The dynamic accumulation of the private capital brings towards the concentration of the wealth in few hands. Perhaps this means we are facing a comeback of the XIX century? The modern economic growth, and the knowledge humanity has used in the beginning of the XXI century, made possible the avoidance of Marxism apocalypse but still have not structured capital and its inequalities (Piketty, 2013, p. 16). The issue of wealth distribution is very important and this cannot be only handled by the economists, sociologists, historians or the philosophers. This is a matter of the entire world. Rural or urban, laborer or industrialist, waiter or banker, everybody that has a position of a spotter, is able to understand the important relations between power and different social groups and from there create their own concept of what is right or wrong (Piketty, 2013, p. 17).

The process of wealth distribution has brought an increase of inequalities (Piketty, 2013, p. 56). This for the fact that convergent forces from the developed countries to the under developed countries have always existed. In the traditional societies the greatest opposition is between worker and boss. Since the establishment of the first trade unions, the battle between bosses and workers has been bloody. The latest happened in the global era in Marikana near Johannesburg in South Africa, where the miners clashed with police and as a consequence 34 miners were killed (New York Times, August 17, 2012). The mine was in propriety of Lonmin group based in London (Piketty, 2013, p. 71). Unfortunately, the murdering of workers is not only an attribute of XIX and XX century but also of XXI century. This massacre brought into the light once again the question: is globalization a beneficial or a destructive force?

Even in the global era, the rich countries have made their distinctions with the poor countries. In 2010, every resident in the developed countries was earning 30 thousand Euros per year and possessed 180 thousand Euro in immobile properties (Piketty, 2013, p. 92). Since the end of the two world wars in the first half of the XX century, and after the end of the Bolshevik revolution, the fall of Wall Street in 1929 and the fall of the private capital in 1950-1960, began an unprecedented global movement to globalize the economy with its peak in 1970-1980. (Piketty, 2013, p. 76).

Was precisely this unstoppable economic movement that healed the western economy for another 30 years till the crises of 2008? The transformation of national economies in global ones among the developed countries inevitably brought the comparison with the poor countries. Between 1900 and 1980, Europe and America have concentrated 70% to 80% of the world production in their own hands (Piketty, 2013, p. 105). Here begins the biggest problem of inequality. In the sub-Saharan countries and in India the annual revenues are 3000 Euro (Piketty, 2013, p. 111). A little better is China because the monthly revenues are 600-800 euro (Piketty, 2013, p. 111). It's normal that with such a big gap, these countries might look at the globalization with a skeptical eye. Another problem for the non developed countries is the uncontrolled growth of population. In Asia and Africa natality is much higher than in Europe. In the XX century natality in these countries reached 1.5%-2% per year, fivefold higher than in Europe (Piketty, 2013, p. 133). Egypt was counting 10 million inhabitants at the beginning of the XX century, now it has more than 80 million. Nigeria and Pakistan together at the beginning of the XX century were counting 20 million inhabitants, now have overpassed 160 million (Piketty, 2013, p. 133). The growth of population in these countries does not match with their economic development and as consequence has brought big problems for the developed countries.

Although the history of concerns relating to the role of business in society can be traced back to the beginnings of business as a socially accepted activity, the focus now is more and more on the challenges of responsibility (Cavanagh, 1984). In the period after the end of the Second World War, it could be argued that only the United States of America had the luxury of considering either business beyond profitability (Wartick, 2008, p. 110). But the whole thing is threatened by proponents of theory is that predict a clash of civilizations or indeed religions- such as Samuel Huntington (Baktiari, 2008, p. 152). Huntington theses has been widely criticized for its pessimistic, if not paranoid conclusions (Baktiari, 2008, p. 153). But, what has recently happened in Paris (January and November 2015) and in Brussels (March 2016) the idea of clash of civilizations has again captured the attention of the world. It is important to note that in the struggle over globalization, religion is the most known form. Religion is global. Especially after the 9/11 attacks, Islam is more and more in the center of attention. In this view Thomas Friedman pays particular attention

to Islam and Muslim communities living in societies with a secular tradition. There is a quote that illustrates Friedman's views of Islam:

*"A south Asian Muslim friend of mine once told me this story. His Indian Muslim family split in 1948, with half going to Pakistan and half staying in Mumbai. When he got older he asked his father why the Indian half of the family seemed to be doing better than the Pakistani half. His father said to him, "Son, when a Muslim grows up in India and he sees a man living in a big mansion high on a hill, he says, 'Father, one day I will be that man.' And when a Muslim grows up in Pakistan and sees a man living in a big mansion high on the hill he says, 'Father, one day I will kill that man'" (Baktiari, 2008, p. 154).*

There are a lot of people that don't want to treat Muslims as an aberration. But Thomas Friedman sees it as a cultural issue: "For complicated cultural and historical reasons, many Muslim countries are not able to manage the pressures of globalization that require both openness to the outside world and an ability to assimilate transformation" (Baktiari, 2008, p. 154). From many societies in the Middle East and not only there, the European and American advancement is seen as a new sort of colonization. These societies are lacking the right pillars of understanding what globalization brings. Using religion as a form to fight globalization is very wrong and also wrong is to use the religious identity against globalization. The majority of religious people around the world will not mindlessly contest globalization; they derive meaning from it, which a minority of fundamentalists might interpret as threatening while others derive more peaceful visions (Baktiari, 2008, p. 155).

## **6. Is it possible for our planet to have a world government?**

Empires were the most prominent world governments. After the end of the Cold War the term "empire" seems to preoccupy the most of American intellectuals (Rapley, 2008, p. 157). The most successful of all empires during the world history, beyond any doubt, was the Roman Empire. But, nowadays it's impossible to compare Rome with the United States of America. Most of American publicists and politicians refuse to consider their country as "empire". The classic form of "empire" collapsed after the end of the Second World War and that was the British one. Empires have always distinguished themselves from the other part of the world. The

most visible thing nowadays between an "empire" and a third world country is inequality. As long as they [third world] try to penetrate into the industrial world the more they feel controlled and dominated by the first world countries. In this discussion the scholars found themselves included into a wide debate facing two propositions:

- first, has inequality worsened as a result of free market reform programs?
- second, has inequality led to social upheavals throughout the world?

Rome has not collapsed within a day. Nor the Ottoman Empire. Of course the United States and the Western Hemisphere would not collapse within a day. But the signs are good. Today Europe is facing one of the most dramatic changes in the Middle East. The emigrants are flooding the eastern part of the Old Continent. What would be the outcome? Centuries ago, Rome itself was threatened by the waves of the migrants coming from the East. Without doubt, naturally comes the question: are the migrants of today the new barbarians?

To understand this, it is good to focus on the world cities. For the first time in history, most of the human populations inhabit urban areas (Rapley, 2008, p. 158). European and world's national governments maintain immigration policies which limit the flow of populations from Third World to First World cities (Rapley, 2008, p. 158). The migrations has caused not few problems. Many migrants coming from the Middle East are pernicious. Because of the similarity to the political structures emerged in much of the Western Europe after the fall of Rome, these types of structural criminal groups have been called as neo-medieval (Rapley, 2008, p. 158). The so-called neo-medievalism has been so far confined to the first world but this does not mean that it will not spread. If we dare to make a comparison with antiquity, when the Rome began to break, the nobility started to make allegiance with the war lords of the East. This has happened even today. We have different European political leaders that aligned themselves with the "eternal sultans" of the third world, compromising their reputation. The most visible allegiance was between former French president Nicolas Sarkozy and Libyan dictator Ghadafi. The Libyan regime supported the presidential electoral campaign of Sarkozy with an amount of 50 million Euros (Faligot et al. (2012, p. 644).

The global decline into violence resulted from a decline in warfare and in particular the war from within. The criminal terrorist networks knew an

unprecedented media coverage resulting into a global network government of terror. Their unpredictability makes this kind of network violence unpredictable. Worsening the division of the "one world" by the most ardent supporters of globalization and the skeptics of globalization, is the fact that the prime until now is resulting into a cultural rather than an economic reality. Culturally, our planet is advancing considerably. Especially the urban environments are making huge consumptions of every kind. Trends that are emerging in the world's cultural capitals are spreading very quickly across the world. The population in the cities is growing even faster as a result of migrants. In the world cities citizens are likely to be exposed towards the cultural trends. The big cities are more integrated with other cities rather than with their own traditional hinterlands. Now they are being called "global city" (Rapley, 2008, p. 163). Speaking proverbially, Johannesburg and Soweto in South Africa may now be separated by huge distances, but their citizens having work to build the same global economy, may return home to watch the same television programs and eat the same food at the end of the day, only in different economic spaces (Rapley, 2008, p. 163).

From here comes another problem: the gap between rich countries and poor countries has been increased from roughly from 3:1 in 1800 to 60:1 at the turn of the XXI century (Financial Times. London. March 17, 2000). In front of this fact, the rich countries tend to find solutions in locking their existing wealth rather than consuming it by investing in the underdeveloped countries. There is an explanation about this. In order to invest, one has to find a safe location. The third world, especially the major part of Middle East is in turmoil. History gives us a lot of examples of what to expect when the rich try to keep their wealth from the poor. This was an attribute of the fall of the Roman Empire to nowadays decay. What precipitated the fall of Rome was not the shortcomings of wealth, but the invasion of the poor barbarians coming from the periphery. The same danger is today. Is the western civilization going to fall in front of huge masses of people coming from its peripheries? European Union is facing this vicious circle. European Union is not a global government. The internal misunderstandings are corroding the very bases of the Union. Great Britain threatens to leave the Union by referendum on June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2016. Earlier, the Greek economic crises divided Europe on the matter how to deal with it. Brussels as the "new Rome" of the European continent is not feeling strong. To use the contemporary terminology, that the choice between growth and

development, the Early Middle Ages favored the latter (Rapley, 2008, p. 167). The lesson that comes out from the absence of a global government is that when the wealth of the empire is readily apparent to people everywhere in the world but not accessible, illicit forms of raiding become likely options. In legal ways too, opportunities to gain a share of the "empire's" wealth have been opening up which have consequently facilitated the spread of illicit activities (Rapley, 2008, p. 170). As population growth slows in a few rich countries, it has already begun to go into reverse, governments confront a dilemma: either they accept a slowing of or even a reversal of growth, since manpower remains the key input to the production process; or they maintain the prosperity of their societies by importing labor. If Rome's expansion necessitated recourse to mercenary armies, today's empire has come to depend not on imported soldiers but on imported workers (Rapley, 2008, p. 170).

Under these circumstances naturally comes the question: is the sovereignty of the rich countries being negotiated? The nation-state still claims control over the territory it governs; no foreign government contests that claim: no associations within its territory challenge it. Thus, the formal requirements for sovereignty that are said under the Westphalian auspices remain untouched. Perhaps the Westphalian system of 400 years ago, has cursed the global governments.

## **7. The limits of globalization**

In the realm of political action, laws are far and few indeed: skills are everything (Freedman, 2013, p. 613). This phrase of Isaiah Berlin challenged the idea of good judgment in politics. Globalization is a political factor before being economic factor. First of all it requires a political will to fulfill the economic interests. If we need to accept globalization as an economic and political system, we have to recognize its limits. We have to know not only the benefits of globalization but also its domain. Boundaries are required. The word "globalization" has become ubiquitous, so that every decision on it risks to be meaningless lacking any true distinguished feature. One obvious boundary is to insist on its irrelevance in situations involving inanimate objects or simple tasks (Freedman, 2013, p. 610). In my opinion globalization begins with an existing state of affairs and only profits meaning by an awareness of how, better or worse, it could be accepted. Globalization tends to be luxurious. Globalization is business. In

the words of Alfred Sloan in the summer of 1921, he tended to stretch beyond the limits of his business by saying:

*"We said first that the corporation should produce a line of cars in each price area, from the lowest price up to one for a strictly high grade, quantity production car, but we should not get into the fancy price field with small production; second that the price steps should not be such as to leave wide gaps in the line, and yet should be great enough to keep their number within reason, so that the greatest advantage of quantity production could be secured; and third that there should be no duplication by the corporation in the price field or steps (Freedman, 2013, p. 485).*

In other words, the business of business is business (Freedman, 2013, p. 474). Globalization needs sane business fields in order to be adopted. Globalization excludes war. But at the same time, I believe that wars would be inevitable, because this planet has not endorsed the alliance between democracy and capitalism. It has required more than 200 years for Europe and America to understand the importance of democracy tied with capitalism in order to avoid wars. Now, the Western Hemisphere needs new frontiers to invest, but these are not possible to be reached within a short time. The underdeveloped countries are in turmoil. Technology is an avant-garde of globalization, but still limited in the third world countries. For the moment the achievements of globalization are valid for Western, educated, industrialized, rich and democratic (WEIRD) societies in which the bulk of experiments were conducted (Freedman, 2013, p. 594).

Being limited only in this area, globalization has remained politically and above all economically fragmented. If this limitation persists, it makes the rich countries lose their functions as centers of bureaucratic economic and political control. This limitation brings the threat of monopoly which in the words of Max Weber "legitimizes the sources of violence" (Weber, 1918). In Europe the violence as a consequence of stopped globalization has endorsed the extreme right resurrection. Unknown political parties are now part of the system. Former British premier Tony Blair put it emphatically:

*"The whole world has a Donald Trump problem" (New York Times. May 5. 2016)*

The rhetoric of hate and violence is occupying the daily news. This is a sort of return in the Dark Ages which brought political instability, state weakness and economic stagnation. What would survive if we fall in this hubris? After the fall of the Roman Empire, the Roman spirit survived through literature and monuments. But a thousand years were required to achieve Renaissance. Will we rebirth after this age of turmoil? The best lesson Rome teaches to the modern world for not having limits is to try to augment a state's wealth while perpetuating the marginality of the populations in the periphery - particularly when those populations are more numerous than those in the heartlands - is a recipe for tension and anti-systemic tendencies. It is perhaps tendentious to argue that "raiding" activity from the periphery is mere barbarism, and thus uncivilized. After all, one would be within one's right to at least question the civility of an economic regime which more or less excludes four-fifths of the planet's population from the fruits of the economic boom of the last two centuries. The ability to fiddle while parts of the planet burn around it, was not a vice confined to ancient Rome (Rapley, 2008, p. 178-179). This is important to avoid the spell of new Robin Hoods which are saying:

*"We want it. They've got it. Let's go get it" (Schweizer, 2009, p. 1).*

## **8. Conclusions**

The belief that globalization has been so visible in most aspects of the humanity is here by the fact that it has reached a success by removing some sort of barriers in the world's region, unthinkable sometimes ago. The end of the twentieth century found the world facing new frontiers, especially those in less developed states. They were unaware of the effects of globalization as a phenomenon by means of a framework to regularize the process in a way that states and citizens are able to adapt and understand it.

Globalization has increased the engagement to fill gaps among different parts of the world. This is a movement towards integration and interdependence between the different countries in the world in the economic, social, technical, cultural and political fields as well as in security-sensitive areas such as environment conservation and the regulation of intricate and interrelated relations between people and states. Globalization refuses isolation. The theory of Iron Curtain which placed



strict constraints among people was based on complete isolation. Isolation entailed ideological, intellectual and military conflict, accelerated arms races and the development of arms of mass destruction. The fall of the Iron Curtain opened new routes of communication and doing well. Also, it increased the challenges. The major challenge is to reduce the gap between advanced and less-advanced countries. The latter are excused if they fear the danger of hegemony of the strong. This is because not only militarily, the strong will dominate the weak. The strongest economy will dominate the weaker ones, will possess major markets and prosper at the expense of the weaker economies. The solution cannot be by asking the advanced countries to stop their advancement. There is no logic in it. But also, no one can ask the underdeveloped countries to undertake a great leap forward to modernity in order to reach advanced nations. But what will they do to keep the rhythm? This is the most sensitive dilemma between advanced and non-advanced countries.

Some direct outcomes for globalization exist. There are deeper and broader impacts in relation with the re-formulation of the international order, specifications of nation-state, sovereignty in the political sense, rather than in the geopolitical and regional ones. Reciprocity is another milestone to be accepted in a global political order. It not confined only in diplomatic matters, because what matters is the dignity of the country and the avoidance of being seen as weak. In this sense are we facing new rules?

If we are to accept gradual integration and the removal of barriers between states and nations, the first and the simplest prerequisite would be an equitable distribution of wealth, opportunity and privilege that treats the world as a village, as long as we accept it as such, and interacts with the destinies of the world as a whole. Living together in one village necessitates fairness and equality. There is enough to make sharing possible without the need for great sacrifices on the part of those who have more than others (Nimah, 2008, p. 204).

## List of References

- Adelman, I. (1999). "Fallacies in development theory and their implications for policy", University of California at Berkeley. Working Paper no. 887.
- Baktiari, B. (2008). "Globalization and religion". (ed.) Globalization in the 21st century; how interconnected is the world? The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research. Abu Dhabi: United Arab Emirates.
- Brown, J. F. (1991). "Surge to freedom: The end of communist rule in Eastern Europe", Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Cavanagh, G. F. (1984). "American Business Values in Transition". 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Foreign Affairs. vol. 85. no. 3.
- Faligot, R., Guisnel J. and Kauffer R. (2012). "Histoire Politique des services Secret Français; de la Seconde Guerre Mondiale á nos jours". Paris: La Decouverte. Financial Times. London. March 17, 2000.
- Freedman, L. (2013). "Strategy: a history". New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heywood, A., (2007), "Politics", London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Third Edition.
- Irwin, Douglas (1909). "Against the tide". op. cit., John Stuart Mill, Principles of Political Economy. London: Green.
- Keyder, C. (1985). "The American recovery of Southern Europe: Aid and hegemony", in Giovanni Arrighi (ed.), Semi peripheral Development: The politics of Southern Europe in the Twentieth Century. Beverly Hills. CA: Sage.
- Kissinger, H. (2014). "World order: Reflections on the character of nations and the course of history", London: Allen Lane.
- Konrad H. J. (1994). "The rush to German Unity". Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Melvin C. (1992). "Germany and Eastern Europe", Joseph Held (ed.), The Columbia History of Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century. Columbia University Press.
- New York Times. 5.5.2016.
- Piketty, Th. (2013). "Le capital au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle". Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Tauris, I. B. (2008). "Globalization in the 21st century; how interconnected is the world?" The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research. Abu Dhabi: United Arab Emirates.
- Schaeffer, K. R. (1997). "Power to the people: Democratization around the world". Boulder Co., Westview Press.

- Schweizer, P. (2009). "Architects of Ruin; How big governments liberals wrecked the global economy-and how they will do it again if no one stops them". New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Sutcliffe, B. (2004). "World inequality and globalization", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 20, no. 1.
- The constitutional and political regulation of ethnic relations and conflicts. Ljubljana: Institute for Ethnic Studies.
- Windsor, D. (2008). "Free trade and open market policies: Who benefits?", (ed.) *Globalization in the 21st century; how interconnected is the world?* (2008), The Emirates Center for Strategic Studies and Research, Abu Dhabi: United Arab Emirates, p. 27.

