

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN A GLOBAL WORLD

COL. (ret) Ion GHEORGHE*
LT. GEN (ret) professor, PhD, Marin ILIE **
Lecturer, PhD, Ana Mona ILIE **

* Lawyer, PhD, The Bar of Bucharest, Romania

** “Carol I” National Defense University, Bucharest, Romania

All studies about globalization justly emphasize the unprecedented effects of this phenomenon at national and international level. In this respect, it is common truth that politics, an essential element in the relationships between states, organizations and other establishments is greatly influenced by this complex process that defines contemporary society. Therefore, the aim of this article is to briefly analyze some of the features of political developments in a globalized world.

Key words: *politics, globalization, evolution, strategy.*

The beginning of the 21st century is under the influence of an increasing complexity and interdependency of human relationships triggered by the irreversible phenomenon coined as globalization. As a result, great changes have occurred in the security field.

Within this framework, many analysts believe that economic growth and state-of-the-art information technology are enough to argue that the world is treading the path of global welfare and political stability. However, there is also a certain degree of carefulness when it comes to making such statements that may prove nothing but illusions. Such reluctance can only be justified by the

common truth that the world order asks for consensus. However, unless the existing gap between the more developed, and hence, with more advantages, on one hand and the one at a disadvantage, on the other hand is bridged in such a manner that the latter can foresee the prospect of improving their current lives through their own efforts, it will be difficult to achieve stability and progress. Thus, in the absence of such a prospect for one side of the world, social unrest will continue to emerge within society and between/among states.

It is worth reminding that our world is one of interdependencies and, hence, that triggers consequences for all individuals both at a personal

and general level. In this respect, a researcher in the field of globalization noted:

“At the end of this century, all states join the globalization trend and that leads to interdependent economies. Financial markets weave an invisible web encompassing all countries and, at the same time, deprive of freedom and place constraints on governments. Thus, no state can isolate itself from the rest of the planet.” [1]

World leaders and especially industrialized democracies cannot ignore that, in many respect, the gap between the beneficiaries of globalization and the rest of the world is growing deeper and deeper and that can be better observed in the relationships established within society and among states. As a result, globalization is synonymous with growth; growth asks for capital and gaining capital involves getting the highest profits at the smallest costs and, inherently, finding those markets where the profit/risk ratio is a convenient one. Translated into practice, all this means that, one way or another, industrialized countries will absorb a high percentage of the investment capital available at a global level.

Without the right amount of capital, developing countries cannot grow, nor generate employment opportunities for their people. As such, politicians may lose their interest for drawing up and implementing the reforms that are the prerequisite for applying the globalization model. Moreover, for the companies based

in these countries it becomes more difficult to access capital from international markets. Therefore, they have to make their capital in their home country and that is possible only by paying installment interests that are higher than in the financial centers abroad. As a result, national companies become less and less competitive, especially in those economic sectors where commercial barriers are emerging.

In the end, when confronted with international competition companies from emerging markets have to choose between going bankrupt or becoming associates of multinational companies. That is exactly the opposite of what supporters of protectionism in industrialized countries foresaw when they warned against the competition of the small salaries paid to the workforce in developing countries. Thus, the long-term solution for these countries trying to enroll on the globalization trend is restructuring.

All of the above facts involve changes in state policies and such changes occur not because of the states' free will but under the pressure of numerous external factors. The latter's goals do not necessarily match those of the states and thus economic, political or tensions appear.

Regardless of the path taken, developed countries will continue to act as engines of globalization. To them, the goal of growth has become an intrinsic one since the ability to make their stocks grow represents their standard of living.

There are two contradictory tendencies in a global world. On one hand, the global market gives the opportunity of becoming extremely rich. On the other hand, it creates new vulnerabilities on the political stage. Moreover, it poses the threat of creating a new gap between a globally digitalized world and those who cannot keep up with it. The impact of these trends on an evolving world is huge. Companies from developing countries are taken over by multinationals. While this process solves the problem of accessing capital, it also increases the vulnerability to domestic political tensions, especially during crises. As a result, within developing countries a political trend directed against globalization emerges.

During the globalization process, a state's economy takes a two-fold path. Some of the domestic companies are integrated into the world economy, most of them under the ownership of international corporations. The rest of the companies remain outside the globalization trend and, thus, pay their workforce the smallest salaries possible, which leads in the end to a bleak social perspective. The national sector depends to a great extent on its ability to control political evolutions in the developing countries. As a result, both types of companies under discussion in this article launch a political challenge. On one hand, the multinationals do not seem to favor key political decisions with a say in public welfare. On the other hand, domestic companies generate political

pressures in favor of protectionism and oppose globalization.

The social level mirrors a system of dual dependency. Thus, globalized elites share a set of values and state-of-the-art technologies, while the populations that are outside the global trend are drawn into nationalism, ethnocentrism, liberation movements from what they perceive as the hegemony of globalization and, more often than not, synonymous with the American domination. As a result, anti-globalization movements that all too often resort to violence reflect this gap and are grounded in political reasons.

Therefore, the attacks against globalization could evolve towards a new ideological radicalism, especially in the countries where the leading elite is numerically small, which leads to a deeper gap between the rich and the poor. A new threat looms ahead, especially for the developing countries, and it resides in the emergence of a new category of people at a disadvantage, namely the international category of the poor. That will only make the political consensus needed for ensuring internal stability, international peace and for achieving globalization goals more difficult to achieve.

An open political challenge of the whole process of globalization may not occur too soon, but industrialized countries alongside with multinational companies are widely perceived as its main beneficiaries. However, the clash between the economic reality and the political commitments that

can be made and supported by facts could lead to an earthquake in the worldwide economic and political systems.

Some of the threats mentioned in this article can be avoided by encouraging free commerce. However, even if this may be the solution, the leaders of the world should keep an eye on the political threat. Thus, they should remember the number of years needed by the American political model to become what is nowadays. Therefore, what proved to work in the USA as a result of employing such a model may not as well work in other parts of the world at a more rapid pace than in the aforementioned country. As a result, the measures already in place at a global level do not fully guarantee against a violent outbreak against globalization. It has already been three years since the world crisis began and the essential changes that took place in the political system and policies of many countries are clearer than ever. Austerity measures correlated with other measures resulting in people's rights infringement is what until a decade ago seemed impossible but now is for real. In our opinion, the current crisis is the result of globalization and, hence, the political measures taken to counter it are global by nature, too.

American specialists underline the great extent to which the crisis, that unlike other historical periods when crisis occurred but did not affect the USA (except for the 1929-1933 period), had a say in the changes made

to the USA's domestic and foreign policy. The great number of those living in poverty, approximately 45 million according to media sources, highlights the impact and seriousness of the current crisis. The forecasts range between moderate optimism and discouraging pessimism. In our opinion, the middle way is better. Therefore, we believe that, even though the crisis' effects will persist for a while, the measures already taken by the UN, USA, EU, G2, G7, G8, G20, by other international organizations, as well as by states will diminish them and, in the end, economic and political stability will be achieved.

No economic system is sustainable without a political one. The challenge for those who believe in globalization is the merger between economic growth and political creativity, as well as achieving a truce between those who view the world from a technical perspective and their critics who argue for a return to an outdated quasi socialist model of control on behalf of the government. The solution is to generate an international feeling of social responsibility without choking successful economic systems with bureaucratic rules and regulations.

Top leaders act under political pressure and are not willing to take a direct approach towards problems that are not obvious from the very beginning and that require long-term solutions that go beyond their mandates. As a result, they are tempted to think, in a conventional manner, that economic phenomena

are autonomous, self adjusting and with no connection with the political process.

According to some remarkable analysts, integration and globalization are two objective processes characteristic of the contemporary world's development. As a result, the fates of nations are deeply interconnected and that lays the ground for mutually advantageous opportunities for them to grow and adapt to the requirements of social and economic progress. However, great historical changes have been the result of humankind's need for a political vision and for a standard of justice.

Within the general framework of globalization, the military field undergoes a series of changes, as well. In this respect, the French professor, Herve Coutau-Bégarie notes:

"We can observe a general tendency towards a globalization of concepts. Such a tendency, in its turn, is the result of the existing interdependencies. Thus, security is no longer a military, but a global one, while UN human security should take into account all types of threats, including the environmental ones or the ones generated by discrimination.

There are a number of theoretical and practical counterarguments to the discussion of strategy as a global concept. Theoretically speaking, the concept of strategy is the object of fields of study that do not share any common thread. There is a political strategy, an economic strategy, an enterprise strategy... Practically speaking and excluding the concept of political globalization, globalization,

in general, runs counter the common sense since the tendency is to treat it as an ultimate goal while it is nothing but action". [2]

Moreover, the same authority in the field of strategy says:

"It is necessary to rediscover the essence of strategy. Similar to economy that is characterized by the quest for welfare, to politics in search for the common good, strategy should be based on violent conflict and thus runs the risk of being applied to anything". [3]

We believe it is important to remind that strategy is an instrument of politics. Therefore, the changes in strategy reflect the changes in politics, and all of them take place within the general framework of globalization.

On the other hand, many theoreticians of globalization notice that, as a direct result of the interconnections between the military field and a global world, there is a tendency to adapt the military culture and state policies in the military field to the new developments at international level.

In conclusion, globalization is accompanied by political development that seeks to answer the new challenges of the contemporary world.

REFERENCES

[1] Ramonet, I. (1998) Geopolitica haosului, Doina Publishing House, Bucharest, p.15.

[2] Bégarie, Hervé Coutau. (1999) Traité, de stratégie, Economica Publishing House, Bucharest, p.12.

- [3] Bégarie, Hervé Coutau. (2002) Some Notes on Strategy (Breviar de strategie), Sitech, Craiova, p.13.
- [4] *** (2000) Millenium Report of the Secretary General, United Nations, Chapter 3, pp.43-44, last retrieved from <http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/full.htm> on 08/22/01.
- [5] *** United Nations Charter.
- [6] *** - NATO Treaty.
- [7] [13] *** NATO Summit - Washington, 3-4 April, 1999.
- [8] NATO Summit - Prague, 21-22 November, 2002.
- [9] *** NATO Summit - Istanbul, 28-29 June, 2004.
- [10] *** NATO Summit - Riga, 28-29 November, 2006.
- [11] *** NATO Summit - Bucharest, 2-4 April, 2008.
- [12] *** NATO Summit - Strasbourg, France/ Kehl, Germany, 3-4 April, 2009.
- [13] *** NATO Summit – Lisbon, 19-20 November, 2010.
- [14] *** The National Security Strategy of Romania, 2007.
- [15] Claval, Paul. (2000) Geopolitics and geostrategy: political thinking, space and territory in the 20th century (Geopolitica și geostrategia: gândirea politică, spațiul și teritoriul în secolul XX), Corint, Bucharest.
- [16] Haynes, Daniel Mark (2000) World Of Risk - Next Generation Strategy For A Volatile Era, John Wiley & Sons Pte Ltd.
- [17] Dăianu, Daniel (2001) Why does globalization give rise to such debates? (De ce stârnește globalizarea atâtea pasiuni?) In “21st Century- Globalization and Identity” (“Secolul 21 – globalizare și identitate”), No. 7-9/2001.
- [18] Debray, Regis (2002) Schimbarea ordinii globale (coordinator: Nathan Gardels), Antet.