

GLOBALIZATION

– a New Theoretic Paradigm
of the Organization of the “Global Society”
and/or a New Imperial Project of Great
Powers – a Sociological Picture

Suljo Borovina, PhD

University of Sarajevo – Faculty of Political Science

Summary

In these historic changes of capital, being a social relation (Marx) and capitalism, organization of labor and mode of production, have changed not only its environment of organization – periphery of capitalism, but also its own “center” – capitalistic society, accompanied heavily by ideology of (neo)liberalism. The world of peripheries – developing countries and post-socialistic countries do change themselves now, by processes of transition and transformation, to become more similar to western societies. The final goal of neoliberal ideology is the global world reduced to globalization, that is, the one limiting itself down to “ideology of the world market”, that is, “market fundamentalism” (Soros, 1999). Such a framework of globalization (market capitalism and political liberal democracy) has been “programmed” exclusively to maintain global capital.

Key words: Globalization, *Global Society*, *Great powers*

THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD, its comprehension and understanding, has been more and more limited down to one determinant – the era of globalization, which is enough to explain and understand it. The changes that took place at the end of the 20th century lead to significantly different relations: economic, political, military and other, and they truly mean “world transition”. The pace of these changes has been so big that this fact represents the essence of determination of the notion globalization. New technologies created possibilities for the integration of world market; they change the nature of labor and labor relations and capital. Capital creates a new techno-structure and imposes different modes of time and space consumption, dramatically changes everything from the labor, education and politics to everyday life. Certainly, the world of labor and its transformation within this process is a key determinant of the globalization and all radical changes, which it carries along, primarily in the field of economy but also in all other spheres of life. In this context, the globalization is the extension of the century long process of capital accumulation.

It is quite clear that it, in its manifestation, has both a positive and a negative side, and particularly disputed is whether this is the process of integration of culture, market and state communities, or if this is a project of great powers and their interest through influences on liberal economy and world market. The planetary expansion of capital is so obvious, while connecting states through international world organizations and institutions: International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization (WTO), World Bank (WB), UNESCO, United Nations (UN) and other, but it remains disputed whether globalization means an expansion of human freedoms and rights or it brings along their limitation, both at individual and collective plan. Neither theory nor practice provided any answers to these questions.

In the contemporary social science, the theory of globalization started shaping and developing on the assumptions of theory of neo-liberalism of the last century 70'. It is not a coincidence, considering that “eternal truths of capitalism – growth, full employment, financial stability, growth of real per diems, seem to disappear“¹. Thus, to

¹The records suggest that the world economy grew 5% by the year 1970; it grew 3.6% in 70', 2.8% in 80' annually. Capitalism lost in 20' about 60% of the developing programs.

understand the social context in which the theory of globalization developed, it is important to point out two key forces: new technologies and new ideologies, and also, not less important factor, destruction of socialism and its vanishing as the opposition of capitalism. This fact is extremely important, as the capitalism could adapt to a newly emerging situation. Theoreticians still debate about the meaning of the notion globalization, and what we call globalization today. Some think that it began some 5,000 years ago, others related its emerging with the big world religions as they all has their global intentions, and the third find that the colonization of the world is its true beginning.

In addition to the dispute about beginning, theoreticians debate also the mainstream of the globalization of: labor, capital, information, subjects in transnational processes – corporations, media and nongovernmental organizations, and the focus is usually directed towards the political globalization (shaping public opinion, forms of ruling and decision-making – democratization). So, one loses the fact from perspectives that this is a multidimensional process of economic, political, communication, cultural and environmental factors at the level of world system. There is no coherent and comprehensive understanding of the effects of globalization, primarily economic one. It is apparent that it brings along the increased poverty, jeopardizes mother cultures and destroys the environment and so much more negative, which is related to the “instruments” of its expansion – multinational companies supported by World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization, and other international world institutions. There is a general consensus that the global system may be understood only through the logic of capitalism,² on the three levels of transnational activities: economic, political, and cultural-ideological. “First level are

In the period 1973-1994, the entire Western Europe did not create a single new job. In this period, USA created 38 million new jobs. GDP grew by 36%, but the real per diem decreased by 14%. Of the total number of incomes, 64% belonged to 1% those on top. (Thurow, 1997:3).

² One can acknowledge entirely what one creates, and as nature was created by anyone, it cannot be acknowledged (Hobs). Accordingly, Luhman says that in the “endless universe” – reality as “heterogenic continuum” (Weber) which is completely non-acknowledgeable, one can acknowledge only its individual and societal activity, and with it place the focus of its understanding on “fragments” of reality only, so to make this simplified reality understandable.

multinational companies, second level is at the political – transnational capitalistic class, while the third is related to the ideology of consumption”. (Skler, according to: Vukelić, 2001:95). Due to all this, the first and initial ideas of globalization may definitely include the theoreticians of imperialism³ although the pursuits for universal answers to universal questions existed, and yet the internationalization of capital was first mentioned by theoreticians of imperialism. Internationalization of capital resulted from the colonization of the world, which was justified by the critiques as “progress” brought by colonial countries. Colonization is therefore considered the beginning of globalization of the world.

Modern theory of the society sees globalization as a theory of the expansion of modern, not a new paradigm of division of living requirements. It argues that this is a cosmopolitan, radicalized modern, and finds its theoretical fundament in enlightenment, which found in the unity of mankind the foundation of cosmopolitanism. In the center of works of social theoreticians and sociologist of the 19th century, one will find the questions which we name today globalization.⁴ Theoreticians of this modern “cosmopolitan” theory in its entirety (philosophy of history, theory of capital and theory of technopole) believed that the difference between Europe and the rest of the world would be diminished, that is, the mankind would be Europeanized accompanied by the necessary consequence of the universalized European culture and political history. But, the history rejected this project of cosmopolitanism by establishing

³ Rudolf Hilferding, V. I. Lenin and Rosa Luxembourg, and precedents of their ideas are in the study of S. Simon, O. Kont about pan-European government, Marx ideas about proletariat which needs its own state, Spencer ideas about direct line development of societies on several degrees, Dirkem and Weber ideas of specialization and rationalization that have universal meaning, and Tönnies ideas of “Gemeinschaft“ and “Gesellschaft”.

⁴ Primarily, this is the learning of Kont, Sen Simon and Marx, and with subsequent enhancing the national state and nationalism, the problems of so-called classic sociology would get more complicated. This process of simultaneous nationalization and “globalization” (cosmopolitanism) will give life to modern sociology in its true meaning. Works of E. Dirkhem, M. Weber, G. Zimel, F. Tönnies and their contemporaries were seriously interested in issues of globalization through notions such as “sociability”. They all considered very important what we call today modernity, as they analyzed internal matters of “modern societies”. Later, in time of “mature” classic sociology, this issue was in focus of other sciences, primarily communication science and cultural studies. Interest in globalization became multidisciplinary, and the reasons behind this vary.

as “counter-thesis the multiculturalism, society of risk, chaos, and globalism”. (Rodin, 1999:15)

Postmodern theory will understand globalization as a project, and if this proves to be true, its leader will be Anthony Giddens. For him, globalization is the derivate of modernization “in four dimensions: world capitalistic economy, system of national states, world military order and international division of labor”. (Vukelić, 2001:95). National states dominate the world political stage, and multinational corporations the economic, whereby the economic stage is not controlled at all. Globalization of the military power relates to armament, unions among states and war, while international labor division relate to industrial development and is carried out depending of the level of development of a region. These four institutional dimensions of modernity allowed the western systems to become leaders in the economic, political, and military domain. Expansion of these modern institutions to an ever larger number and all the countries in the world means (for Giddens) the process of globalization. Similar to Giddens, Ulrich Beck sees globalization as a consequence of “other modernity”, which is radicalized. It brought the world to the state of risk from pollution, which is not evenly distributed. That is a threat, which determines our thoughts and actions. He sees the exit from this problem in creation of cosmopolitan democracy, which cannot exist outside cosmopolitan consciousness, institutions of global civil society and public opinion. Without them, it will remain a utopia and façade for imperial power.

Immanuel Walerstein will develop his theory of “world system”, realized so far only in two cases: Roman Empire and “world capitalistic economy”. He develops the concept of geographic division of labor in world economy through “center, periphery, and semi-periphery”, where “center” dominate the world economy and exploits the rest of the system. Periphery secures the raw materials, and semi-periphery is between the exploited and the exploiters. So, this is the international labor division which began in late 15th century with the overseas colonization. Different parts of the capitalistic world system “specialized” for different functions: Africa secured slaves, south Europe cheap labor, and Western Europe was the center of paid workers, ruling classes and supervisory staff. Only this combination represents the essence of capitalism – the world system of economy.

The conscience about globalization cannot be denied any longer, even the conscience about world economy as a whole, as the globalization relates to unification of different forms of living, which simple definition of “consequences of modernity” (Giddens) cannot define precisely. Particularly, globality and globalization cannot be explained from the position of results of the western world and project of “modernization”, given that civilization, ethnic, and individual conscience about the world is getting stronger and globalizes faster with all its difference and specifics. Globalization, hence, is a new notion⁵, but not a new phenomenon. This is a luckily found expression to “capture” big and fast changes in the world caused by the development of technology and destruction and falling apart of the socialist world system. In conditions when capitalism stayed without any alternative, it was necessary to built a new theoretical position (“nothing is so practical as a good theory” – K. Lewin) that is, the change of ideology, as no society can develop successfully without believing (ideas). Capitalism managed throughout the history to secure its own vitality by successful changing of its own ideas and methods, as it did not have any problem to acquire those, which emerged in socialism.⁶ In the altered circumstances, capitalism knew how to give up on the old traditional form and hierarchy and allow those at the bottom of the social organization to participate in decision-making.

Starting assumptions of the true consistent theories of globalization were set by Roland.

Process of globalization is a multi-layer phenomenon and in practice it is burdened with ample controversies. It is crucially linked with the processes of democracy, which shows its impotence due to its bonds

⁵ First time, the term “globalization” was used by professor Roland Robertson, Cambridge economist in his papers in 1966 and 1968. In 1992, he provided a complete theory of globalization, as an analytical scheme based on which the phenomena can be considered and described, which have supranational, universal, global meaning. Also, Z. Brzezinski in 1968 mentioned “the system of global planning and long-term perspectives of global resources”, as US strategic goal. (Globalization comes from the English word “globe” meaning – planet Earth.)

⁶ When caught in crisis in 30’s of the 20th century, “the social state” was created (“new industrial state”, K. Galbreith) – state of well being, to save it. When caught in another crisis in 90’s, given that the opponent communism collapsed, it “terminated” the state of well-being, that is, it forced the pulling out, and even Sweden could not resist it.

with the boundaries of the national states, while at the same time, the matters of markets, environment, migrations, organized crime, mass communications, and others cross all the state boundaries. Globally, this market does not need states any more, not even the states of well being, which destroys the historic compromise between capitalism and democracy. “Globality and globalization understand non-global state. More precisely: global society without global state and global government.” (Beck, 2003:269). In this complexity (“world society without a global government”), Beck argues that one should differentiate “new simplicity of globalism” understood as the rule of global market. The notion “globalism” reduces the complexity of globalization to economic dimension only, as permanent dependence on world market. All the other globalizations (environmental, cultural, political, etc.) are only epiphenomenon of the economic dimension. Supporters of this globalization argue that the free world trade is a prerequisite for well being and development throughout the world, even in matters of environment protection, as the competition in this field secures the best conduct and attitude towards nature. Such arguments, as already proven in terms of world trading and fair competition, are least to say funny and cynical. From this state of globalization, that is, its reduction to globalism as theory, arise all the misconception in this process.⁷

It is apparent that one faces internationalizations of relations between the global states of America, Asia, and Europe, not the globalization, as the states in Eastern Europe and Asia, members in “free world trading” participate only with ten percent, mainly competing with their cheap labor and natural resources. Neoliberal globalism, as theory, tries to subject politics, culture and science to the primate of the economy – dictatorship of the market, although it tries to show itself as being apolitical. It uses one proven instrument of “staging threats” (Beck) that everything could be worse if ..., so, it develops a kind of public discourse that spreads fear. This may be best seen in the actions of some of its key actors: World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, United Nations, and others, which on their way of advocating convergence in fact work on the expansion of market.

⁷ Beck listed ten of them: metaphysics of the world market; so-called free world trading; economic (still) internationalization, not globalization; dramaturgy of the risk; lack of politics as revolution; myth of linearity; criticism of catastrophic thinking; black protectionism; green protectionism and red perfectionism.

All theoreticians of (positive) globalization agree about the fact that the existing transnational political institutions and organizations (UN and all subsidiary organizations) should be additionally improved, democratize, and made more efficient. Along with them, new powers of supervision should be established, thus secure safety of the global economy. But, their response to the question from where should these incentives come does not appear convincing. They all believe this should be the civil society, as transnational society. If one wishes to have a realistic concept of democracy, then the abstract society cannot perform this role and replace existing institutionalized state, as it is by itself limited in this segment. Only the institutional forms of authority, as the current transnational organizations and national states are, may play such a decisive role. Civil society may only be “added” as the help in building ethical norms and values, including building solidarity, necessary for the establishment of values in the installation of positive globalization.

So, concept of positive globalization, due to the demands of its technological dimension (rise of information and communication technology), require some kind of “polycentric global policy”, in which “transnational organizations like World Bank, Catholic Church, McDonalds, VW, drug cartels, Italian mafia and new International of nongovernmental organizations act next to each other, in harmony or one against the other”. (Rosenan, according to: Milardović, 1999:105). The logic does not go in favor of this opportunity, given that the appearance of consciousness about the cosmopolitan solidarity within framework of existing civil society and political public is the limiting element, as the “transnational states are possible only through the consciousness, through advocating the need for transnational states”. (Beck, 2003:258). So, with the emerging globalization, the end of national state is expected, including democracy as its habitat, and the end of both of them lead to disappearance of politics and emerging of “society of post-democratization”, which borders with utopia. In a realistic concept, it may survive and develop only in the shadow of current strong national state and state power, as development of international market relations cannot avoid conflicts.⁸ The speech about “stateless” global

⁸ According to Robbins, there are three positions about conflicts: 1. Traditionally seen as exclusively negative and unnecessary for organization; 2. Position of “human relations” finds them realistic, and 3. Position of interaction finds them required, if they

society is therefore a fiction. Global society is unsustainable due to: “first, there is no order, and the second (still) without institutions, meaning nonintegrated, non-territorial, and nonexclusive”. (Gilpin, according to Milardović, 1999:110).

All the theories of globalization, until present day, have as their result the catastrophic situation in the world due to the enormous growth of poverty and concomitant growth of technopole, which makes humans incapable to organize and live their lives. This is a completely new experience in the world, given that every place on the globe is accessible to everyone. One does not talk any longer about the borders of national states, but “deconstruction of ideologies”, “conflicts of civilizations”, “end of history”, and similar, and in fact one talks about multinational corporations that have “global” boundaries, about boundaries of religions and cultures, which altogether means: one talks about “new” boundaries, that is, new division of the world. Therefore, we face the insecurity throughout the world; anyone can be monitored at all places, which causes anxiety. The world became tight, as the spatial and temporal dimension shrank, it is a “global village”, with a difference that this “village” does not have primary links and communities of direct interaction, but rather the opposite, one deals with the interests, numbers, networks, without any human image. Globalization does not diminish the boundaries between people; it establishes them in a different way, not territorial and temporal but informational and communicational. Hence, this is “a new demarcation of living resources on the globe“ (Rodin, 2004:12). “There is only to be divided: The Antarctic, big seas and universe: 4, 5, 6, and 7 sky (Smith). First three are already divided”. (Rodin, 2004:23). It means that the new restructuring, political demarcations and differentiations are now in place. Although it appears that the Western European world acknowledged the fact that there cannot be Europeanization of the Second and the Third World as they thought, it did not completely get rid of its prejudice and delusions. The ways of enslavement, colonization and capitalization are the failed concept as the rest of the world “got out of control”, developed its own forms of rationalization in their respective cultures and found ways not only to survive but also to develop.⁹ That

do not exist they should be created so that an organization can function.

⁹ Japan did it yesterday, China and perhaps India today, tomorrow Turkey and who knows who else. Latin American countries, lead by Brazil, broke the cooperation with

is why the world faces processes and forms of establishing the links, which are different from those established by free market, technopole and forced interventions in other cultures that became “live” although they did not have universal (European) philosophy, capitalistic economy and technopoles. Asian (cultures’) countries developed and they still develop their economy (layer of capitalism), by assuming European, western incentives, adapting them to their own capacities and needs of their cultures. Niklas Luhmann argues that the postmodern, European expansionism is exhausted, and that “globalism is a response to this exhaustion, as imperialism and colonialism were response to exhaustion of the capitalistic industrialism”. (according to: Rodin, 2004:19).

Global era imposed global issues like social justice and justice in general, issue of global warming and environment, global security and similar. But no one tries to answer these questions, and they do not have any answer. The biggest fear and resistance to globalization lies in this fact, as it has to destroy the social state if it wishes to be successful. The main achievement of the 20th century is the “the state of well being”, whose foundations in Europe were placed by Bismarck with his ethos, which expects the state to be responsible for the well-being of its citizens. Globalization is a product of different ideas of liberalism, that wish capitalism without “human image” and thus it cannot succeed without big international agreement against exclusion of all those groups of whom capital does not acquire any direct benefit. Europe and EU needed to be answer for (positive) globalization, but they remained an illusion. Economic globalization (globalism) cannot be tamed any longer (the genie is out of bottle). It captured everything in its trap, and individual and collective way out is not possible, but only transnational that means cooperation and possibility of democratic control. Otherwise, the bad side of postmodern, postindustrial globalism will start realizing and implementing with quite certain possibilities of a new world cataclysm. The USA came out of all turbulent events in late 20th century as a superpower and it became, with its unilateralism, an obstacle for all attempts for global, democratic order, which would be based on multilateral cooperation and fairness. The USA built a

IMF, and face today enviable development and prosperity: Argentina 2001, Brazil 2002, then Bolivia, Uruguay, Venezuela... Seven countries of Latin America with total of 280 million residents rejected neoliberal capitalism and hegemony of USA, and then noted the economic growth during the last decades.

hegemonic, unilateral, political world order which they legitimize with the raw power and absolute military supremacy. It has to be stated that the American citizens give them also this legitimacy at all elections. So, this is an American strategy which does not have any alternative, concealing less visible economic interests, while emphasizing interests of global peacekeeping jeopardized, in their opinion, by global terrorism.¹⁰ Within the framework of global, a special focus was placed on “Islamic terrorism” which serves to justify the “interventions” of big powers (in oil fields) in Islamic countries of Arabia, Asia, and Africa.

This American strategy was based on “Washington consensus”,¹¹ on traditions of liberal economy, through control of oil resources in the world, as a key issue of the “covert” economic program. There is no space there for multilateralism and all projects of theoreticians of positive globalization are already outdated. This is the matter here of management of processes of economic, but not only economic, imperialism. Alternative cannot be seen, and the only potential one was European Union and creation of new coalitions that could, through own processes of democratization, influence the USA public, by supporting the project of global democratization and fairer world order. It seems that our hopes failed due to the inner weaknesses and differences in European Union. The last hopes are placed in a weak, international civil society, which unsuccessfully tries to develop an anti-globalist movement. It seems that it and international social democratic forces will not reach consensus in the near future and respond to challenges and threats of neo-imperialism and neoliberal globalization. So, globalization, as we know it today, does not show only its dark side (poverty, wars, terrorism, epidemic illnesses, etc.), and it cannot succeed from its position of the

¹⁰ “More children die daily than the total number of victims of all terrorist acts in the world. So, is combating global terrorism the most important for the future of mankind (as USA teaches us) or it is combating hunger, poverty and misery. More so over, as the reasons for terrorism lie in poverty, misery, and injustice produced by wanton dictatorship of capital”. (Tomic, 2004:176).

¹¹ “Washington consensus” (agreement) was signed in 1980. Williamson codified it in ten points (“ten commands”), such as: macroeconomic stability, liberalization of free trade and privatization. These three elements ensure a high degree of economic growth and expedited economic development. That is the overall concept of neoliberalism, usually called market fundamentalism (private property (“privatize or die”), free market – *laissez faire, laissez passer*”, and political principles (terminate social state and establish a state which will serve capital).

declared objectives. There may be some assumptions for the success in other areas and in a different way. Its possibility is in attractiveness, but the problem is in its inability to control the efficacy. The entire world history tried to control everything, for which reason it supports globalization and encourage supranational, social and political forces of the contemporary world (primarily in the undeveloped states of the Third World), as the acknowledged that the processes may not be controlled by mere system of existing national states. Something that cannot be controlled cannot be subjected to any rules, and this jumps out of the framework of capitalistic system logic that has clear prerequisites for functioning. Profit in such a system is the result of innovation, risk, and managing in the chaos. Thus, the process of globalization is burdened with large dangers for life on Earth. It is borne by new liberal forces that oppose the traditional, conservative forces, and the conflict is inevitable. The globalism, thus, should not be understood as implementation of capitalism throughout the globe (and it is now), but as the process in which different cultures act simultaneously in the processes of cooperation. It is apparent that the globalization means departing from the project of cosmopolitanism, ethnocentrism, global capitalism and socialism, and then it can be comprehended only as a “produced” jungle in which logos is not longer a direction for the chaos of multilayer reality, or better to say, certain uncertainty.

The develop countries of the West have started suspecting whether system of “global” capitalism can resolve global issues of social justice, security, environment, and others. The anti-globalization movement arises from this fact, not from the fact of organized work of civil society. Essentially, this is an anti-capitalist movement. For this reason, the French philosopher Jacques Derrida will subject every political ideology to deconstruction, but he is so focused on deconstruction and devaluation of capitalism. Learning of Michel Foucault suggests that the domination and power results in “antirational approach which contests the legitimacy of academic disciplines, even economy, and doubts their ability to understand ‘the truth’.” (Bhagwati, 2008:114). Francis Fukuyama, on the other hand, with his book “End of history and the last man” tied to justify liberal-democratic ideological universalism. “End of history” means the end of a coherent, evolutionary process that has to result in liberal democracy of a larger portion of mankind. Samuel Huntington will subject to criticism Fukuyama’s “naïve” optimism, by

formulating its “theory of conflict of civilization” representing it as “theory of global chaos”, being the leader. His explanation lies in the fact that more and more people, due to the trend of spreading western “values”, are forced to face them. The result of this confrontation is demolishing traditional values, and the fight for the re-traditionalization is difficult and cruel, and therefore results in the expansion of irrational violence reflected in tribal massacres, fundamentalism, and ethnic cleansing. Crimes, wars, and genocide multiply and evade any control, Huntington finds, and the process of globalization, which destroyed the communism, is threatening now to undermine the foundation of western civilization, and brings the world to a state of overall chaos.¹² So, the key role in creating “tribal society” at “the end of history” lies in the culture, as liberal democracy is not completely “modern”. To become modern, and in order that the institutions of democracy and capitalism function, they will have to coexist with a certain pre-modern cultural habits that ensure their proper functioning. “Law, contract, and economic rationality are necessary, but not sufficiently sufficient condition for stability and prosperity of postindustrial societies. They also have to be supported by reciprocal moral responsibility, feeling of accountability towards community, and trust based on customs instead of rational calculation”. (Fukuyama, 1997:21). Fukuyama does not find this anachronism in modern society but condition without which a

¹² This, according to him, happens because:

- first time in history, the world politics is multi-polar, meaning multicivilizational;
- modernization is separate from Westernization and does not produce universal civilization;
- balance of forces changes and the relevance of West declines. Asia rises economically, militarily, and politically; Islam rises demographically, which has destabilizing effect on the entire world, and in general terms nonwestern civilizations reaffirm values of their respective cultures;
- new world order is based on civilizations;
- societies, whose cultures are close, cooperate and gather around the leading countries, and the attempts to join societies of one civilization to another keep failing;
- western universalistic tendencies get in conflict with other civilizations, primarily Chinese and Islamic; survival of the West depends on Americans who reaffirm their western identity and Westerners who have to understand their civilization as unique, not universal, and
- global war of civilizations depends on selection of leaders to maintain multicivilization character of global politics. (Huntington, 1996: 23-29.)

modern society cannot successfully function.

So, the American unilateralism will not be the only reason for failure of globalization, but also the theoretic incompleteness and contradiction. It is difficult to presume that it is possible to establish complete and fair competition in the envisaged “global society” (even theoretically) and the global market, or even establish the centralized global system. Even if the economic globalization, with all the deficiencies, is possible, it is difficult to imagine that the unity of cultural, democratic, economic, political, and environmental areas is possible. Nothing supports this idea nowadays, let alone already the too powerful USA as the only imperial force (at least militarily) too weak European Union politically (as a possible alternative). However, the most important changes are in culture, particularly so-called mass culture, as global culture spread by means of so-called popular culture (film, music, etc.), and the USA is against a leader here representing a sort of “cultural imperialism”.¹³ Cultural changes become more important in the global world, so they are, according to Huntington, the key reason for global conflicts. Cultural identities are particularly important to small nations; they are basis of their self-determination and future evolution. Only in the era of globalization, the “small nations” got the possibility to create their own national states and live their national identity, which they logically understand as the framework for the protection of their freedom and sovereignty. To end that, the process of globalization for the small countries appear as neocolonialism and imperialism, which is only a new form of great powers’ hegemony that remove, in peace or by force, all the obstacles on the path of “ownership of capital”. The globalization thus appears as sophisticated hegemonism and imperialism – turbo-imperialism. It is promoted by new subjects in international relations – transnational corporations which for their purpose establish transnational banks, investment funds (insurance, pension, etc.), NGO’s, and similar.¹⁴

¹³ The USA, through its communication systems, strong technical and military power, using attractiveness of their democratic principles and institutions, promote their entertainment industry and mass culture, attractive for the young throughout the world. American TV programs and films cover three quarters of the global market.

¹⁴ Religions, mafia, diaspora, megalopolis and other networks develop at the same time, which also enhance and support the processes of globalization. Drug business

But, every reform of a society is limited to (im)possibility to change the consciousness of humans. Unlimited drive for private wealth and power¹⁵ brings more violence and corruption in the vision of neoliberal capitalism. Despite the wishes of proponents, globalization provides poor chances for the increase of wealth and peace in the world. Economic neoliberal science persistently imposes the competitive model of free market as universal, and this is in fact an ideological violence over experience and true needs, imposition of quasi-needs and ideology of consumerism to hide interests of holders of power in capital. “Vultures rule the world, and their only objective is to increase profit and power. The rule of “vultures” is possible thanks to the mercenaries of globalism, global and national institutions and organizations, which impose the system of values of free trade, open society, protection of capital and spreading of its power”. (Tomic, 2004:177). Thus, the dangers of globalization, indicated by anti-globalists¹⁶, cannot be so easily marked. Along with the legitimate processes, the illegal proceed across the national borders, including nontransparent investments of transnational companies. Everything goes around the “main” globalization – economic, followed by others: “ideological”, cultural, and more importantly, media, being its first follower (CNN, BBC, etc.). Its key agents are transfers¹⁷ of

does not know any borders, as the drugs are ideal product of global market, with the character of local and global.

¹⁵ Global super rich elite had, by the end of 2010, at least 21 trillion USD hidden in secret tax heavens, banks and on investment accounts. Number equals the extent of American and Japanese economy together, according to BBC. Economist James Henry) wrote a book “The Price of Offshore Revisited”, in which he published this record.

¹⁶ They are lead by controversial Noam Chomsky, professor, independent intellectualist. The strongest attacks are against IMF and WB, where they try to tell them about their inconsistency towards developing countries, allowing the transnational corporations to eliminate competition in the market by way of cooperation with the political structures of these countries. Criticism is dual: one deal with critical view towards economic neoliberalism, and the other with inefficiency and outdate techniques of their activities. They are particularly criticized for giving advantage to political over economic objectives and highlighting the role in smaller countries, of the so-called SME's without strong state. So, they are always left in the inferior position compared to the developed and maintain the state of permanent huge indebtedness.

¹⁷ During two years of 90's around 114 billion USD were invested to Southeast Asia, and in 1997 within only 12 hours, 35 billion were pulled out, which destroyed “tigers”. Only Malaysia saved itself by closing its borders, controlling the banks and termi-

capital and technology. The new technology established and made it possible. It starts the globalization and vice versa, and this is exactly the place where the process may step out of control, which is also an attractive side of globalization – evading control. However, a conflict is possible there between quality of life and possibilities of technology. Abuse by technology is possible here, which already occurs with some transnational companies in undefined space that emerges after the fall of national states. Ample transnational companies are more powerful than the states in which they operate. Speculative financial activities with virtual finances jeopardize the entire states, and in line with the needs they change or destroy governments.¹⁸ Free competition is only an appearance, as a very organized, subordinated and controlled system is getting established. Majority of states is marginalized and re-colonized.¹⁹ Thus, global techniques remove all obstacles and established, as a mega-machine, their rules, and standards for the entire world to secure unlimited free market for multinational capital and profit.

nating agreement with IMF, and in that way stopped the inflation at 40%, while the surrounding countries (Thailand) had inflation even at 600%.

¹⁸ Example 1. Election of Allende for president of Chile. Multinational companies in Chile with the support of Henry Kissinger and CIA, ITT and Pepsi (Chilean extreme right wing run these) and Chase Manhattan threw down and killed Salvador Allende. The then US president Nixon personally owed to Donald Kendal, Pepsi cola president. Nixon talked to Kendal (Pepsi-cola), then David Rockefeller (Chase Manhattan Bank) and CIA Director Richard Helms and asked them to spare 10 million USD “for the best available people... and destroy economy. 48 hours deadline for the action plan”. Example 2. Democratic election of Patrice Lumumba for president of Congo, who declared in 1960 independence from Belgium. He was thrown down in the same year and killed in 1961. Moise Tshombe came instead as a marionette. The business was “completed” by Belgium corporation “Union Mamier”. The only sin of Lumumbe was his anticolonial and left-wing conviction.

¹⁹ Economic map of the world is terrifying: it is the map of the undeveloped, poverty, malnutrition, famine in more than 130 countries with 75% of world population, producing barely 20% of GDP, while the wealth is on the other side in only about 30 developed countries. (Drašković, 2001:145)

Reference

- Anthony Giddens, *Posledice modernosti*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 1998.
- Bagvati Jagdiš, *U odbranu globalizacije*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd, 2008.
- Beri Norman, *Uvod u modernu političku teoriju*, Sl. glasnik, Beograd, 2007.
- Beck Ulrich, *Rizično društvo*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 2001.
- Beck U., *Šta je globalizacija*, Vizura, Zagreb, 2003.
- Castells Manuel, *Uspon umreženog društva*, Golden marketing, Zagreb, 2000.
- Drašković Veselin, *Globalizacija i tranzicija*, Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, 2001.
- Friedmann Milton, *Kapitalizam i sloboda*, Global Book, Novi Sad, 1997.
- Fukujama Frensis, *Sudar kultura*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd, 1997.
- Galbreith J. Kenneth, *Nova industrijska država*, Stvarnost, Zagreb, 1978.
- Huntington P. Samuel, *The clash of civilizations*, Simon-Schuster, New York, 1996.
- Hodžić Kadrija, *(Re)privatizacija i globalizacija*, Forum Bosna, Sarajevo, 2003.
- Horvat B., *Ekonomika brzog razvoja*, Forum Bosna, Sarajevo, 2001.
- Luhmann Niklas, *Teorija sistema*, Globus, Zagreb, 1981.
- Meyer Thomas, *Globalizacija i demokratije*, Fakultet političkih znanosti, Zagreb, 2004.
- Mesarić Milan, *Socijalizam – utopija, zabluda ili realna alternativa kapitalizmu*, Sveučilišna knjižara, Zagreb, 2011.
- Milardović Anđelko, Zbornik radova “Globalizacija”, Panliber, Zagreb, 1999.
- Prpić Žarko, *Globalizacija i demokracija*, Politička misao, Zagreb, 2004.
- Robertson Roland, *Globalizacija*, Pan liber, Osijek-Zagreb-Split, 1999.
- Robbis Stephen P., Judge Timothy A., *Organizacijsko ponašanje*, MaTe, Zagreb, 2009.
- Rodin Davor, *Globalizacija i demokratije*, Fakultet političkih znanosti, Zagreb, 1999.
- Rodin D., *Globalizam ili putovanje u novu podjelu globusa*, *Globalizacija i demokratija*, FPN, Zagreb, 2004.
- Soros George, *Kriza globalnog kapitalizma*, Rabic, Sarajevo, 1999.
- Tomac Zdravko, Zbornik radova “Globalizacija i demokracija”, FPN, Zagreb, 2004.
- Thurow C. Lester, *Budućnost kapitalizma*, Mate, Zagreb, 1997.
- Vukelić Vladimir, *Globalizacija i tranzicija*, Institut društvenih nauka, Beograd, 2001.
- Wallerstein Immanuel, *Globalizacija ili period tranzicije*, *Globalizacija – mit ili stvarnost*, Zbornik radova (pripremio: Vladimir Vuletić), Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Beograd, 2003.