

GLOBALIZATION AND PROGRES

(A multi-disciplinary Approach)

Getnet Tamene Kassa

Résumé

Globalizácia a pokrok (Globalization and Progress) je príspevok multidisciplinárneho charakteru k diskusii, ktorá v súčasnosti prebieha na celom svete. Je geniálny pokrok stále možný? Je trvalý vývoj možný? Ohrozuje globalizácia pokrok, alebo mu pomôže? Je pokrok vôbec spojený s globalizáciou? Sme pripravení na globalizáciu?

Obava o trvalú budúcnosť nie je nová - vždy sa vyskytlo niečo čo ju ohrozilo - nástrahy, ako napríklad, že svetu hrozí nedostatok surovín, že je ohrozený mier a iné. No vždy boli statoční ľudia v minulosti, tak ako aj v súčasnosti, ktorí sa snažili poskytnúť konštruktívne a optimistické odpovede k týmto nástrahám zatiaľ čo ostatní sa stali fatalistami - vybrali si prijímať úpadok namiesto toho, aby ho odvrátili.

Pred polstoročím učitelia položili podobné otázky národu, ktorý prijal potenciál a potrebu hospodárskeho rozvoja. Ale v súčasnosti, potenciál rozvoja je sám veľmi otázný. Mier je ohrozený. Existuje fundamentálna obava z prekážok smerujúcich proti rozvoju a zároveň vládne pocit, že systém v ktorom dnes žijeme nie je vytrvalý.

Amerika ostáva stále dominantne optimistická, ale v Európe výskumy poukazujú, že takmer polovica obyvateľstva stratila svoje nádeje na pokrok, zatiaľ čo v krajinách 3. sveta, alebo takzvaný juh, sú pokrok a jeho filozofia úplne v kríze. Možno vidieť vzostup materiálneho života, ale väčšina obyvateľstva neverí, že zajtraší svet bude miesto v ktorom sa dá lepšie žiť.

Prečo? Čo vyvoláva tento pesimizmus? Na to existuje súhrn kľúčových faktorov ako je: tlak z rastu obyvateľstva, tlak urbanizácie, nedostatok čistej vody, environmentálne zmeny. Znečistenie oceánov a životného prostredia, strata druhov spôsobená transformáciou nálezísk, existuje tiež množstvo dôkazov o tom, že ľudské aktivity predstavujú podstatné hrozby pre podnebie.

Tlak a stres, ktorý vytvorí svet v ktorom fungujú globálne trhy 24 hodín denne, sedem dní v týždni oproti tradičnému spôsobu života.

Žijeme v svete, kde nie je istota - okrem istoty zmien. Žijeme v svete, kde národné kultúry a dôveryhodnosť inštitúcií demokracie sú pod hrozbou globálneho konkurenčného tlaku.

Hore uvedené neistoty a fatalizmus sú tiež ovplyvňované pochybnosťou aj o vede. Niektoré z jej činností, napríklad genetické modifikácie obilia, vyvolávali obrovský verejný skepticizmus a strach. Napriek tomu, že v USA prevláda názor, že pokrok sa priamo spojí s vzostupom technológie a s jej globalizáciou sú v Európe dve tretiny obyvateľstva skeptické o tejto spojitosti.

"Globalizácia" a jej povaha sa stáva predmetom multi-disciplinárneho prístupu. Toto štúdium preto kombinuje rôzne disciplíny ako medzinárodné vzťahy, svetovú politiku a globálnu ekonomiu pri jej analýze. Toto štúdium tiež zahŕňa vysvetlenie o svetových pohľadoch a ich vzťahoch s globalizáciou.

Táto práca prezentuje akceptovateľnú definíciu globalizácie, jej hybné sily a historický vývoj, jej budúcnosť, názory jej zástancov a jej oponentov, jej výhody a nevýhody, nespokojnosť, ktorá sa s ňou spája, jej perspektíva a nevyhnutné opatrenia, ktoré sú veľmi dôležité počas globalizačného procesu.

The debate on progress has usually been at the heart of discussion, all over the planet, by stream of people, who refused to accept the world as they found it and instead applied their knowledge and intelligence to create something better. It is this sense of progress in relation with the impact of globalization which is the subject under discussion in the present study.

Is genuine progress still possible? Is development sustainable? Is globalization helping or hurting? Or is progress linked with globalization? Is globalization doomed? Is it not wicked and dangerous? Is there no limit to the crime for which globalization must be held to account? Is globalization causing discontent to millions of world population that the next generation won't have a bright future?

Concern over future sustainability is not new – there's always been something which appeared to threaten it – fears, for example, that the world would run out of resources, peace and other challenges.

And at such times there were, as now, people who responded constructively and optimistically to such challenges- while others were fatalistic – willing to accept decline rather than determined to reverse it.

So are we just then rerunning history... a moment which, in retrospect, will seem to future generations no different from those of the past?

I'd like to be able to say „yes“.

But the answer, I'm afraid , is „No“.

No, because the challenges are now more numerous and more complex. No, because the necessary answers can't be reduced to a single breakthrough.

Before half a century or so scholars posed similar questions to a nation that accepted the potential and the need for economic growth.

But today the potential for growth itself is in question. Peace is in danger. There is a fundamental concern about the limits to growth, and a feeling that the way we now live is not sustainable.

America still remains predominantly optimistic but in Europe in particular, including Britain, opinion surveys show that almost half the population have lost their faith in progress, leave alone developing countries the so called 3rd world or South, where progress and its philosophy are in crises. Material living standard may be rising but very large number of people no longer believe that the world of tomorrow will be a better place in which to live.

Why? What has created this pessimism? It seems more and more clear that it is the cumulative impact of key factors such as:

The pressures of population growth. The pressure of urbanisation. Water shortage.

Environmental challenges. The quality of the air we breathe. The pollution of oceans. The loss of species as habitats are transformed. The gathering evidence of a fundamental change to the climate caused by human activity.

Sustainability is about the environment and biodiversity, but there are other factors as well. Such as problems related to world politics and international relations, problems of peace and security, poverty and the like.

The pressures created by a world in which global markets operate for 24 hours a day, seven days a week. ...and by the removal of the comfort and protection of the old ways of working.

We are in a world without certainty – except for certainty of change. A world where national cultures and the credibility of institutions of democracy are challenged by global competitive pressures.

The aforementioned uncertainty and fatalism is also fuelled by doubts about science itself. Some of its uses – such as the genetic modification of crops – produce huge public scepticism, and even fear. Again, while US opinion continues to believe that progress is directly associated with the advance of technology and its globalization, in Europe two thirds of people are sceptical of the link.

The nature of the phenomenon which has been referred to as “globalization” deserves to be a subject of multi-disciplinary approach. This topic, thus combines various disciplines such as international relations, world politics and global economy, to elaborate „globalization“. The study will also provide explicit explanation about **world images**, and their connection with globalization. By now it would be appropriate to define the term „globalization“itself.

What is „globalization“?

The Dictionary Definition: The dictionary definition is a great deal drier. Globalization (n) is “the process enabling financial and investment markets to operate internationally, largely as a result of deregulation and improved communications” (Collins) or – from the US – to “make worldwide in scope or application” (Webster).

What is “globalization”? Dominant number of scholars elaborate that it consists of processes which lead towards global interdependence and increasing rapidity of exchange across vast distances. The word “globalization” is itself quite new, but the actual processes towards global interdependence and exchange started centuries ago.

So globalization, as such, is not quite a new phenomenon to history, what is, probably, new is that we people are not willing to learn much from history.

Forces That Propel Globalization

Four forces have been major engines behind globalization across time. These have been **religion, technology, economy and empire**. These have not necessarily acted separately, but have often reinforced each other. For example, **the globalization of Christianity** started with the **conversion of Emperor Constantine I of Rome in 313 C.E.** The religious **conversion of the head of an empire** started the process under which Christianity became the **dominant religion not only of Europe** but also of many other societies thousands of miles from where the religion started. (eg. The Copt, the Ethiopian orthodox church, where I come from).

The **globalization of Islam** began not with converting a ready-made empire, but with **building an empire almost from scratch**. The Umayyads and Abbasides put together bits of other people’s empires(former Byzantine Egypt and former Zoroastrian Persia, for example) and created a whole new civilization.

Voyages of exploration were another major stage in the process of globalization. Vasco da Gama and Christopher Columbus in the **fifteenth century** opened up a whole **new chapter in the history of globalization**. Economy and empire were the major motives. There followed the migration of people symbolized by the **Mayflower**. The migration of the **Pilgrim Fathers** was in part a response to religious and economic imperatives. Demographic globalization reached its height in the Americas with the influx of millions of people from other hemispheres. In time the population of the United States became a microcosm of the population of the world – with immigrants from every society on earth.

The industrial revolution in Europe from the **eighteenth century** onwards was **another major chapter in the history of globalization**. A marriage between technology and economics resulted in levels of productivity previously unknown in the annals of the history of man. Europe’s prosperity whetted its appetite for new worlds to conquer. The Atlantic slave trade was accelerated, moving millions of Africans from one part of the world to another. Europe’s appetite also went imperial on a global scale. The British built the largest and most far-flung empire in human experience. Most of it lasted until the end of WW II.

The two WWs were themselves manifestations of globalization. The twentieth century is the only century which has witnessed globalized warfare – one from 1914 to 1918 and the other from 1939 to 1945. The Cold War was another manifestation of globalization (1948-1989) – because it was power-rivalry on a global scale between two alliances, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. While the two WWs were militarily the most destructive empirically, the Cold War was the most dangerous potentially. The CW carried the seeds of planetary annihilation in the nuclear field.

The final historical stage of globalization came when the industrial revolution was mated with the new information revolution. Interdependence and exchange became dramatically computerized. The most powerful single country by this time was the United States. Pax Americana mobilized three of the four engines of globalization – **technology, economy and empire.** Pax Americana in the second half of the twentieth century did not directly seek to promote a particular religion – but it did help to promote secularism and the ideology of separating church from state. On balance, the impact of Americanization has probably been harmful to religious values worldwide – whether intended or not. Americanized Muslim youngsters are far less likely to be devote to their faiths than non-Americanized ones.

The Westernization of the world has been part and parcel of the phenomenon which we have come to refer to as “globalization” in the cultural sense. **The economic meaning** of “globalization” refers to the expansion of world economic interdependence under Western control. **The informational meaning** of “globalization” refers to the triumph of the computer, the Internet and Information Superhighway. **The comprehensive meaning** of “globalization” refers to all the forces which have been leading the world towards a global village. Globalization in this third sense has meant the villagization of the world.

In the economic and information meaning of globalization, the West has been the primary engine of global change. However, in the comprehensive meaning of globalization (leading towards the global village) some other civilizations have been equally crucial at other stages of history.

The West’s triumph in the last two or three centuries has led to the claim that Western civilization has universal validity. Such a claim faces three challenges – **the challenge of historical relativism** (what was valid in the West a hundred years ago is not necessarily valid today), **the challenge of cultural relativism** (what is valid in the West may not be valid in other cultures and civilizations) and **the challenge of empirical relativism** (not only does the West fail to meet its own ethical standards, but those standards are sometimes better fulfilled by other cultures than by the West).

We can conclude that, in distribution, Western civilization is the most globalized in history. No other civilization in the annals of the human race has touched so many individual members of that race, or so many societies in the world. But global distribution is not the same thing as universal validity. After all, Marxism was once globally distributed to almost a third of the population of the world. That did not give Marxism “a third of universal validity”. Indeed, we now know that Marxism and communism have shrunk in distribution almost overnight.

If there is a universal ethical standard in the world, we have not yet discovered it. It is certainly not the Western ethical standard – otherwise the United States would not be wondering whether the death penalty is moral or not. Nor would racism still be prevalent in the Western world.

Human history is a search for the Universal. The Western world has not found it – but it has certainly taken us a step or two towards it. The West has also helped to create the conditions not only for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, but also conditions for the pursuit of the Universal for generations to come.

Globalization and World Images

Globalization is also a subject of Intl. relations. Intl. relation, as a social science, evaluates the political and economic behavior of nations in the international arena. We may well say that it analyses various relations among **states or a group of states and other actors**. This leads to mean it evaluates the phenomenon of globalization.

But, the process of evaluating such phenomenon like political, economic and other relations or behavior of nations does not take place in one and single uniform way, because of varieties of minor and major reasons. One of the major reasons is the difference between scholars who deal with this field in **outlook or world images**.

This amounts to saying that scholars who attempt to evaluate intl. relations between states and other actors are influenced by various factors, such as experience, educational background, stiffness or openness to change, age and the like, which shape the way how they look at intl. events.

Thus, each of these scholars eventually evaluate or analyse relations of international actors from the point of view of his or her favourite world image.

Images(out looks) are, however, not theories. They are spectacles through which one can watch the world. They help to understand intl. political, economic, cultural, power...environment in a better way and also help to form an intl..theory. For example images try to answer such fundamental questions like:

1. Why has our political system taken the form it now has?
2. What would be the ideal political system? Would it benefit all or some? How would it be established? (See Lawson, K., 1993, pp. 57, 58).

There are at least three such major world images. They are:

- Realism**
- Pluralism(Liberalism) -part of globalization**
- Globalism(Socialism)**

(Some scholars insist a possibility of additional images or try to combine those mentioned above. Others do not see the possibility of any additional images. (For instance, Viotti Paul in his book Intl. Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism,

Globalism and Beyond, as the very topic of the book indicates, tries to give a hint of looking for something new beyond these three images, whereas for Fukuyama nothing is there beyond Pluralism/Liberalism – to him it is the end of history).

The Origin of the Images and How They Relate to Globalization

Realism is associated with classical realists such as :

- Thucydides (5th C. B.C.), it emerged during Peloponnesian War –between Sparta and Athens, he developed concepts of Anarchy, Power and Fear
- Machiavelli, Niccolò (15th C.) developed it further by introducing additional concepts of Self-interest, Alliance
- Hobbes Thomas (16 C.) added the concept of System
- Morgenthau, Hans (20th C.) advanced it. He added the concepts of National interest and Balance of Power

Realism's Basic Assumption

- A. About human nature: individuals are self-interested (interest motivation is separate from ideas motivation).
- B. About international environment: international environment is in Anarchy; for realists, Anarchy does not mean chaos; anarchy means no central authority.
- C. About power: power is the central means by which self-interest is obtained in a condition of anarchy

Realism's Assumptions about Intl. Relations

1. States are the main actors in intl. relations.
2. States are unitary actors(they speak with one voice)and act rationally.
3. States pursue their own national interest.
4. States use power to obtain their national interests(„High Politics“) Eg. (It is possible to globalize the whole world through the use of power)

Pluralism / Liberalism has its root in the teachings of classical scholars of 17th and 18th C. such as:

- John Lock(1632 - 1704) and Jean Jacques Rousseau(1712 – 1778) both assumed that people first lived in „the state of nature“
- people later decided to make social contract to improve their life.

- with such people like David Hume 18th C., Adam Smith 18th C., Jeremy Bentham 18th-19th C., and John Stuart Mill 19th C. its development was induced.
- Liberalism became strongly functional, particularly, since 19th C. John Ruggie is among the recent representatives of this school
Eg. (Liberalization, which is spearheaded by liberalism, is part and parcel of globalization)

Globalism/ Socialism has emerged as an image since late 1970s; it is the youngest of all images.

- globalism is against the process of globalization it is not one and the same.
- it focuses on the patterns of domination and dependency relations between North and South, where states of the later are not able to secure their national interest. According to this school, South is placed on the periphery of the political, economic., cultural process of world development far from the main stream, jus as a row material supplier, suppressed by the coalition of intl. and national elits.
- They are Marxists and nonMarxists
- Immanuel Wallerstein is among the representatives

For eg. It insists the notion that (Not every state is capable of securing its national interest by use of power; the relation between South and North is based on win loose game, it has not ever been even sum, South is always the under dog)

Relations of the Three Images

In some cases, these three images own something in common. A point or points of intersection or a common ground. But, in many ways they do not agree to eachother. They conflict and their assumptions are thus incommensurable.

They affect the possibility of generating one global philosophy, which could have been, most probably possible if they had united.

How to establish a reasonable intl. relation theory, which would emerge on the common grounds of these three images and could serve all mankind on the planet is, therefore, one of the major issues that lies at the heart of today's dynamic field of intl. relations theory.

Before examining each of the images, let us ask some questions of intl. relevance to be elaborated or evaluated on the bases of these images: To elaborate this, let us take a bird's eye view about the real world –

Is there a crisis in the world today?

Yes there is. |.....almost all the images agree in this|

What are these crises?

- Crisis of violence
- Crisis of misery
- Crisis of repression
- Crises of terrorism
- Crises of corruption of all sort political, religious and the like
- Crisis of environment and the like are some of the crises which can affect all of us or the whole intl. system. |.....almost all the images agree in this|

What's at the root of the crises?|here they differ|

- some scholars would have us believe that the root crisis is primarily a resource crisis
- others would have us believe price crisis
- others would have us believe civilization and culture crisis|Huntington|
- others population crisis
- still others think the crises as human nature and unavoidable
- others insist on the crisis of improper world structure |this last assertion leads to political analysis|

What this last party says is:

- for the problems of violence, arms control and proliferation / nonproliferation policy at macro and micro levels have been tried
- for misery, transfer of technology, capital and social structure also known 1st as „aid“ later as „cooperation“ have been tried
- for the problem of price, intl.conferences to „stabilize prices“ have been tried
- for the problem of repression there is the whole national and intl. system of legal norms, adjudication, possibly administration of sanctions
- for the twin problem of depletion and pollution, recycling constitutes a typical solution and,
- for the population problem there is of course family planning and birth control , and all of these have been tried
- for the problem of international terrorism there is anti terrorism coalition at international level
- for the problem of corruption there are a stream of democratic and religious institutions

We, they say, do not want to belittle those solutions, but in reality what has been changed? The aforementioned changes are mere technical and an eye wash. It is like symptom curing. The main problem is still there, without cure. It is even mounting. So the real solution together with the problems lies in the heart of world political structure, which is improperleads towards a notion known as structuralism or social constructivism.

Such identical questions usually lack identical answers due to various reasons. One main reason is the difference in World Images(Out look)

between scholars, who attempt to answer the questions. The more different images the more different and incommensurable answers.

The following tables provide judgement about these differences by comparing the assumptions of the 3 major World Images:

Assumptions and Differences about Intl. Relations

	REALISM	PLURALISM/LIBERALISM	GLOBALISM/SOCIALISM
1	States are the main actors in intl. relations	Nonstates + states are. MNCs, INL.Orgs., TNCs & others stand for political and economic globalization. They are DPP (Demo. prom. & protectors)	Nonstates+classes+states+societies etc. are. The global context within which these subjects interact is the point of analysis intl. relations.
2	States are unitary actors(they speak with one voice) and act rationally. They are independent variables.	States are not unitary actors(they are not physical beings w/c act with single mind).But they can be independent variables.	States are dependent variables. World capitalist system w/c is currently in place accounts for their creation.
3	States pursue their own national interest.	States are not rational actors, they cannot pursue national interest. Eg. Question of consensus or minimum wing coalition is usually hard to meet.	Not all states are strong enough to advance and secure their national interest. There is dependency relation b/n north and south. Remotcontrolled.
4	States use power to obtain their national interest(High Politics)	Intl. politics is intensive. Not only military security issue, but national interest should focus on econ. & soci. Issues as well.	Econ. Factors are keys to understanding today's intl. relations. For the south the bargains are zero sum game. Its predetermined to maintain the world capitalist system and the benefit of few group of classes.

NEOREALISM→(States+System) = Structuralism→ Soft politics→they define national interest not in terms of military security (bipolar system was) but econ.	NEOLIBERALISM→(Institutionalism) = It upholds the continuing importance of nonstate actors. It also acknowledges states that continue to play a prominent and often decisive role.	Like neorealists, globalists also stress the importance of system.They both uphold the structuralist point of view. They focus on the economic aspects. (Ken waltz & Wallerstein)
--	--	---

And soc. Security. - Kenneth Waltz - Richard Rosecrance - Kissinger		
--	--	--

Common Grounds between the Images

Globalists have some elements which can match that of the other 2 perspectives:

1. Pluralists and Globalists have common interest in political econ., transnational actors and welfare issue (though they deal these topics in fundamentally different ways).

2. Globalists focus on examining about hegemonic state or group of states that reflect the distribution of power during particular historical epoch. This is also characteristic of classical realism.

Difficulties between the Images

The main difficulty between the 3 images is the basic incommensurability of the images:

Realists might examine → the balance of power

Pluralists..... → transnational process / globalization

Globalists..... → pattern of domination

These different topics require :

1. Not only the use of different level of analysis but also conflicting assumptions.
2. Meanings are often incommensurable, i.e. the same term is defined in different ways by different theorists. Because of difference in outlook.

Terms like **imperialism** or **globalism** are but two good examples.

For eg. The concept of **imperialism** is understood in several ways that it conflict with each other:

Morgenthau Hans defines it as „a reverse of the power relations between two or more nations“.

V.I. Lenin defines it as “the highest stage of capitalism“

According to the theory of imperialism:

- imperialism should not necessarily be attached to capitalism.
- colonialism alone cannot be reason for imperialism.
- Neither is the merging of finance capital with industry capital, that spreads as foreign investment to „support periphery“

There are varieties of theories that show that imperialism is not only capitalist based. Some of the theories are:

- cultural imperialism
- political imperialism
- economic imperialism
- resource exploiting imperialism

- territory aggrandizing imperialism so on.

Robert Keohane & John Ruggie (realist +pluralist) for instance argue, to construct theory of intl.relations, that one must begin with the realist notion about power and the state.

Where as Structural analysts(globalist + neorealists –Wallerstein and Waltz) by stressing the importance of system provide critical context which help to analyz pluralist insights.

Notwithstanding the apparent incommensurability of the 3 images, earlier and recent work often defies easy categorization in just one of the images.

For eg. Such works being done, in social institutionalism on hypothesis concerning common global culture compete with those of realism and pluralism.

Elements of **social constructivism** and **institutionalism** can be found not only in realist and pluralist or neoliberalist schools but also in globalist scholarship.

These 3 images remain a durable guide to the theoretical work in the field of intl. relations. It would, thus, be reasonable to search for the root of realism, liberalism and socialism(globalism) as **global philosophy**.

Can Globalization Exist Without Global Philosophy?

The term globalization is extremely controversial. Debates currently raging about globalization include **whether it even exists**(Unger, 1997), whether it is more **important now than at some earlier date**(Bord Schengreen, and Irwin, 1999), whether it is **displacing the national state** (Strange, 1996; Wade, 1996), and whether it is more **important than regionalism** (Fishlow and Haggard, 1992) or **localism** (Rosenau, 1997). Also, of course, there are endless analyses as well as polemics about whether the **results are going to be good or bad and for whom**. Recently, such controversies have spilled over from academic journals to the streets in locations as diverse as **Seattle, Davos, and Bangkok**.

With respect to this list of issues, **I take it for granted in this lecture that globalization exists and that it is very important phenomenon** without entering into the various comparisons with the past or other parallel processes. The main objective will be to make some comments on the impact of globalization, particularly in terms of its **effects and discontents on multitudes of the population of the world**.

Globalization is a multifaceted, multidisciplinary topic in its broadest reaches. It includes not only economic topics, but also political, social, cultural, and ideological ones. For example, political scientist **Rosenau, defines it as “a label that is presently in vogue to account for peoples, activities, norms such as, goods, services, and**

currencies that are decreasingly confined to a particular geographic space are local and established practices”(1997b,p.360). Deciding to focus on the economic aspects of globalization still leaves many doors open since economic globalization has both microeconomic and macroeconomic aspects. The former refer to the technological revolution and the impact at the firm level while the latter are related to the integration of markets for goods and services (Oman,1994).

Macroeconomics of globalization (trade and finance), requires the need of drawing general distinction between globalization and liberalization. Developing countries themselves had to take some important steps before the full impact of globalization could be felt. Specifically, they had to open their own economies, to lower the barriers to trade and capital flows that had been an important component of the important-substitution industrialization model that almost all followed for some period. Without these policy shifts, globalization would be much less relevant than it is today, specially in the developing world. Liberalization, then, is the other side of globalization.

The Future of Globalization

Many pundits declare that globalization is dead since the terrorist attacks on the US on September 11. Some of them say this in joy and others in despair. They argue that the attacks have undermined the confidence on which international economic integration depends. But rumors of the death of globalization are exaggerate. Should it die, it will not be of natural causes but because leaders of the world richest countries choose to murder it.

The events of September 11 apparently pose a threat to the integration of the world economy through trade and globalization. The global economic integration of the late 19th and early 20th centuries ended in the chaos of two wars and an intervening great depression. But even before that, the rise of an array of collectivist ideas – nationalism, imperialism, socialism, communism, fascism and racism – had undermined belief in a liberal world economy.

Similar forces seem to be working today: anti-globalization protesters supply the anti liberal fervor; financial markets provide the economic instability; and terrorists provide the conflict. Add these three forces together is set to repeat history itself. The world is, some argue, waking from a liberal dream of global harmony to the reality of chaos and conflict.

Actually this historical parallel is unpersuasive because it is disproportional. The opposition movements of the late 19th and 20th centuries were equipped with well organized political movements and supplied with apparently coherent alternatives to liberalism, in protectionism, planning and state ownership. By these standards the anti – globalization movement today is infantile. It knows what it is against but offers no intellectual coherent or politically organized alternative.

No compelling reason exists for the death of economic integration, market or globalization. But, as some scholars argue(Stephan Roach) that movement of people

and goods, though not of information, will become somewhat more difficult due to the threat of low-technology terrorism, which is less dangerous threat compared to that posed by the old Soviet Union. It needs no vast armies, navies and air forces to be contained but superior intelligence and better security. This need not cost a fortune.

Most important, “terrorism of global reach”, in the words of George W. Bush, the US president, has brought the current and prospective great powers – the US, western Europe, Russia, China and India – on to the same side and has forced the US to re-engage with the world, as did the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. The world’s sole superpower has discovered it is not safe. It has learnt, once again, that its greatest strength lies in its historically unique capacity to create global institutions and lead multilateral coalitions.

Would a retreat from globalization, if not predestined, be a desirable response to the terrorist threat? The answer to that is a definite “no”.

International economic integration did not cause this form of terrorism. Nor would its disappearance end it. But the outrage was targeted against any concept of a tolerably harmonious and open global order. The right response is to make the process of integration work better for more people. This would demonstrate fruitful co-operation in the huge coalition of states that recognizes the threat to order posed by freelance terrorism on such a scale.

Some argue the attacks have a lot to tear down a potent symbol of America’s economic might, of its ideas and values, of capitalism. The shock of the attack and the war against terrorism do lead to global recession, as many fear the west’s faith in market economics may indeed be tested. Regarding this **John Gray, a professor at the London School of Economics and a much – quoted thinker on these matters, declares that the era of globalization is over.** “The entire view of the world that supported the markets’ faith in globalization has melted down... Led by the United States, the world’s richest states have acted on the assumption that people everywhere want to live as they do. As a result, they failed to recognize deadly mixture of emotions – cultural resentment, the sense of injustice and a genuine rejection of western modernity – that lies behind the attacks of New York and Washington...The ideal of a universal civilization is a recipe for unending conflict, and it is time it was given up.

According to critics, globalization has a lot to answer for. Is globalization doomed? Is it not wicked and dangerous? Is there no limit to the crime for which globalization must be held to account?

Not only does it oppress the consumers of the rich West, undermine the welfare state, emasculate democracy, despoil the environment, and entrench poverty in the third world; we knew all that already. **In addition, we now find, it is a utopian scheme for global ideological conquest** – like Stalinism, minus the compassion. Truly, the idea that people should be left free to trade with each other in peace must be the most wicked and dangerous doctrine ever devised.

Western governments do a poor job of explaining and defending globalization – so poor as to breed disaffections with democratic politics.

Supporters' Argument

The supporters of globalization argue that it undermines neither the welfare state nor democracy, our survey argues they say; it is entirely consistent with sound environmental policies; above all, far from increasing poverty in the third world, it is the most effective force for reducing poverty known to mankind.

The view that globalization is a kind of cultural conquest, too is plainly wrong. Under a market system, economic interaction is voluntary. This is the market's greatest virtue, greater by far than its superior productivity. So there is no reason to fear that globalization itself threatens traditional non – western cultures, such as Islam, except in so far as individual freedom threatens them. McDonald's does not march people into its outlets at the point of a gun. Nike does not require people to wear its trainers on pain of imprisonment. If people buy those things, it is because they choose to, not because globalization is forcing them to.

In some countries, governments may see globalization as a threat to their power. But in any case, where governments reflect preferences and beliefs of most citizens, democratically or otherwise, and where these preferences call for cultural distinctness and non-western values, economic integration does not militate against diversity, least of all against religious diversity. In the west, globalization has been running at full power for years. Has it mashed the United States, France, Italy, German, Sweden and Japan into a homogeneous cultural putty? It has not, and there is no reason why it ever should.

This does not mean that the future of globalization is assured. Far from it. Economic liberty suffered a terrible reverse in the 1930s, thanks to war, financial breakdown and bad government. That brought one era of globalization to an end, and history could repeat itself. Let us at least agree, however, that if governments allow this to happen it would be a tragedy – and not for the rich North, first and foremost, but for all the poor of the developing world.

Oponents' Argument

Protestors ask right questions, yet they lack the right answers. Something went suddenly so wrong with globalization. Until recently even progressive intellectuals were singing the praise of a worldwide market, which, they said, would bring prosperity and well-being to countries where before there was only poverty and decline. And they were right.

Experience has shown the per capita income of a country's population rises 1% for every 1% it opens up its economy. This explains the wealth of Singapore, which contrasts so sharply with the poverty of a closed economy such as Myanmar. In short, prior to Seattle, globalization was not a sin but a blessing for mankind.

Of course, globalization, as a movement that disregards national borders, can easily deteriorate into a form of “selfishness without frontiers”. For the rich west, free trade is naturally something that should be embraced wholeheartedly as long as it is not in products that can harm western economies.

No sugar, cotton or other resources from third world countries. In this regard anti globalization protests are well founded. Free world trade moves largely in one direction: from the rich North to the poor South.

When it comes to migration, globalization suddenly becomes an aim. Large numbers of homeless people drift along the borders of Europe and North America, staring wide-eyed into the shop windows of a prosperous society. Millions of illegal immigrants live as homeless pariahs, in pitiful conditions, hoping against hope that somehow they can tap into western riches. **But it is precisely the absence of free trade and investment that drives them to the west in the first place.**

I do not think it makes any sense to be unreservedly for or against globalization. The question is rather how everybody, including the poor, can benefit from the manifest advantages of globalization without suffering from any of its disadvantages. When can we be sure that globalization will benefit not only the happy few but also the massed ranks of the third world’s poor?

Maybe more globalization is the right solution to those valid questions. That is the paradox of anti globalization. Globalization can serve the cause of good just as much as it can serve the cause of evil. What we need is a global ethical approach to the environment, labor relations and monetary policy. **Global legal norms that would bind all international actors without distinction. We do not have this yet. But we run globalization without global rules,** in an environment of anarchy, where only the powerful can secure his interest and other poorer and smaller entities live under fear, insecurity, despair; spread by the powerful as a means of global control or imperial out-stretch.

The challenge we face today is not how to thwart globalization but instead how to give it an **ethical and legal foundation**. Some call this “ethical globalization”, a triangle consisting of free trade, knowledge and democracy; alternatively trade, aid and conflict prevention.

Democracy and respect for human rights are the only sustainable ways of avoiding violence and war and of achieving trade and prosperity. The international community has still not managed to impose a worldwide ban on small arms or set up a permanent international criminal court and effective rules that regulates all international actors, where it would be possible to enforce the in-compliance of impious entities, based on the consent of West or East, North or South.

Increased aid is needed from the rich west. It is shameful that large number of people do not have access to medical care or a decent education particularly in the developing world. Trade alone will not be enough to solve the problems of the least developed nations. Even with more trade there is still a need for increased development co-operation to build harbors and roads, schools and hospitals, and to construct a stable legal system.

Finally, world trade needs to be further liberalized. If all world markets were opened up to competition then the total income of developing countries would be boosted by 700 billion USD a year, or 14 times the total development aid they currently get. No more dumping of western agricultural surpluses on third world markets. No more exceptions for bananas, rice or sugar. The only trade ban would be on arms. "everything but arms" must be the motto of all future World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiating rounds.

More free trade, more democracy, great respect for human rights and more development aid: is that enough to make ethical globalization a reality? Certainly not! What is missing is a powerful instrument to enforce it. We need a global political body as powerful as the globalised market in which we already live.

The Group of Eight (8-) of the rich countries must be replaced by a G-8 of existing regional partnerships, a G-8 where the south is given an important and deserved place at the table to ensure that the globalization of the economy is headed in the right direction.

We need to create a forum where the leading continental partnerships can all speak on an equal footing: the European Union, the African Union, Mercosur, Asian, the North American Free Trade Agreement, etc.

This new G-8 can and must be a place where binding agreement on global ethical standards on working conditions, intellectual property and good governance can be entered into. The renewed G-8 could lay down the guidelines and give encouragement to the major international organizations and negotiating bodies such as the WTO, the World Bank and Kyoto. This G-8 would no longer be dominated by the big wealthy countries; instead, everyone in our world community would be represented. In this way it could provide an answer to global problems such as international trafficking in human beings.

We saw such a process emerge in an embryonic stage at the Kyoto Protocol talks in Bonn, where finally a breakthrough was made thanks to agreements between the Umbrella Group, the European Union (EU) and the group of less developed nations, against the wishes of the greatest power on earth, the US.

The rich have reason to rejoice, because such leaders like president Bush of US and his cronies seem to believe they have a mandate to outdo themselves in rewarding the corporate class that helped bring them to power.

Bush kept on preparing the nation for war – selfishness is back in style for those at the top of the economic pyramid. Sacrifice and "compassionate conservatism" are out.

It almost calls for resurrecting the phrase "ruling class," a notion once popular in left-wing circles that claims that the primary function of the highest levels of government is to protect the interests of the very rich. According to this view, big business and the ultra rich influence government at various levels through campaign contributions, personal relationships and ideological affinity. Policy-making becomes not a

“mediation” of competing interests but a not so subtle capturing of policy-making institutions by the rich and powerful.

The Bush administration is doing all it can to focus our attention on the threat of Iraq and Al Qaeda to the “American way of life” and shapes the foreign policy in this direction, suppressing all legitimate oppositions, through out the world and within the country, against the world dictate of America, discernable in the areas of economy, politics, culture and the like. The Bush administration perfects the most blatant version of ruling-class politics.

Globalization needs to get lesson from the Great Depression of 1930s. “Globalization” is here. Signified by an increasingly close economic interconnection that has led to profound political and social change around the world, the process seems irreversible. Lessons from Great Depression, however, provides a sobering historical perspective, exploring the circumstances in which the globally integrated world of an earlier era broke down under the pressure of unexpected events.

In his book, *The End of Globalization*, Harols James, Professor of History at Princeton University declares that one of the great historical nightmares of the twentieth century could be underlined as the collapse of globalization in the Great Depression. Analyzing this collapse in terms of three main components of global economics – capital flows, trade, and international migration – he argues that it was not simply a consequence of the strains of WW I but resulted from the interplay of resentments against all these elements of mobility, as well as from the policies and institutions designed to assuage the threats of globalism. Could it happen again? Could present day globalization collapse? Are we in uncertain world? According to Harols there are significant parallels today: highly integrated systems are inherently vulnerable to collapse, and world financial markets are vulnerable and unstable. He provides a cautionary tale in which institutions meant to save the world from the consequences of globalization – like WTO and IMF, in our own time – ended by destroying both prosperity and peace.

The Essence of Contemporary Globalization

Globalization has various features, and could be generally defined as the increasingly close integration of markets for **commodities, labour and capital**. Modern globalization has been a recognized force for at least 30 years. Today, academic journals, the media, and political discourse are dominated by globalization events. For many, it is a positive force, but for others it may appear a negative force.

The financial markets, however, are where the story of contemporary globalization begins.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the business model termed the “globalised” financial market came to be seen as an entity that could have more than just an economic impact on the parts of the world it touched. Globalization since, came to be seen as more than simply a way of doing business, or running financial markets – it became a process. From then on, the word took on a life of its own.

It was the anti-globalization movement that really put globalization on the map. As a word it has existed since the 1960s, but the protests against this allegedly new process, which its **opponents condemn as a way of ordering people's lives**, brought globalization out of the financial and academic world and into everyday current affairs jargon.

The anti-globalization forces argue that the process of globalization practices replace domestic economic life with an economy that is heavily influenced or controlled from overseas, then **the creation of a globalised economic model and the process of globalization can be seen as a surrender of power to the corporations, or a means of keeping the poorer nations much more poorer, in a position of raw-material suppliers.**

The anti-globalization movement is famously broad, encompassing environmentalists, unionists, the hard left, some of the soft left, those campaigning for fair development in poorer countries and others who wants to tear the whole thing down, in the same way that the original Luddites attacked mechanized spinning machines, before centuries together with others, who expressed their discontent against industrial revolution.

Not everyone agrees that globalization is necessarily evil, or that globalised corporations are running the lives of individuals or are more powerful than nations. Some say that the spread of globalization, free markets and free trade into the developing world is the best way to beat poverty – **the only problem is that free markets and free trade do not yet truly exist.**

Globalization can be seen as a positive, negative or even marginal process. And regardless of whether it works for good or ill, globalization's exact meaning will continue to be the subject of debate among those who oppose, support or simply observe it.

According to many others, globalization is merely a new name for an old idea. The word may be new but the phenomenon it describes is not new at all. Skeptics believe that it refers to the latest incarnation of a process that has been going on for many centuries; still some argue that the current international economy is in many ways less open and integrated than it was in the period leading up to the first world war. Another point regularly made is that the international economy of the present day is not really global at all and, just like before, it is dominated by a small number of players. In 1914 there were eight great powers, now there is the G8. The difference now, according to Paul Hirst, professor of social theory at Birkbeck College, is that now the Russians have turned up as poor guests and Austro-Hungary has been replaced by Canada.

The opposite view – that globalization is indeed a new phenomenon – has been articulated by many writers such as Naomi Klein and Noreena Hertz, to name but two. They believe that the development of the past few decades have spurred changes so large that the world has indeed entered a qualitatively new (and unwelcome) era.

The statistics are certainly convincing: since 1950, the volume of world trade has increased by 20 times. And from just 1997 to 1999, flows of foreign investment nearly doubled, from USD 486bn to USD 827bn.

Thomas Friedman, a New York Times columnist and author of an oft-cited book on globalization, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, argues that today's era of globalization is different both in degree and in kind from previous eras.

He says while the previous era of globalization was built around falling transport costs, today's globalization is built around falling telecommunication costs, which are able to weave the world together even tighter.

The technologies according to him mean that developing countries don't just have to trade their raw materials to the west and get finished products in return; now, developing countries can become big producers as well.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Globalization

There are both positive and negative aspects of increased integration into the global economy. One of the positive aspects is that there has been an additional amount of external finance – investment. This relaxes the foreign exchange constraint that had held back growth. In addition, an increasing share of the new funds has consisted of foreign direct investment that is currently highly valued by the governments of most developing countries. At least this adds to the capital accumulation process and thus makes possible higher growth both in the present and in the future. Moreover, such investment tends to embody new technologies that increase the productivity and, thus, the competitiveness of developing countries. (It is noteworthy that it also frequently brings more environmentally friendly technology than would be used by local firms.) .

The increasing role of the capital markets(specially institutional investors trading in bonds and stocks) are assumed to be more compatible with democracy and transparent government than is often believed, the argument is that capital markets may usually contribute to democracy by dismantling monopolistic corporate structures in developing countries, and that the demand for additional information on the part of foreign investors(and the IMF) may increase private and public-sector transparency.

Among the good sides of globalization are benefits such as:

- opening new foreign firm, which may, of course hurt state owned enterprises, but introduces new technology, know-how, job
- it is a source for foreign aid or investment
- It is a phenomenon that enhances close integration of countries and people of the world – by breaking down artificial barriers to the flow of goods, services, capital, knowledge and to lesser extent also people across borders.
- those who vilify globalization overlook its benefits, they assert that it is the best solution to principal human problems. According to them, **globalization**(which typically is associated with the triumphant capitalism, **American style**) **is progress**; the whole of humanity should accept it. Particularly, developing countries must

accept it if they are to grow and beat poverty effectively in the fight.

On the other hand Globalization has failed to rid the world of poverty. It **promises riches to everyone** but only **delivers to the few**. According to the proponents, in the developing world globalization has not brought the promised economic benefits. Although global average per capita income rose strongly throughout the 20th century, the income gap between rich and poor countries has been widening for many decades. Globalization has not worked. **The reason why it has not worked is because the rich countries haven't got rid of all their protectionist measures.** The 3rd world is in dire poverty, living in less than a dollar a day. Despite repeated promises of poverty reduction made over the last decades of 20th c., the actual number of people living in poverty has actually increased by almost 100 million. This occurred at the same time that total world income actually increased by an average of 2.5 per cent annually.

Among the bad side of globalization are the following points:

- The industrial countries are in favor of trade liberalization only if it directly benefits them.
- In too many instances, the benefits of globalization have been less than its advocates claim, the price paid is more than the benefits:
- The environment has been destroyed as political environment has been corrupted
- The rapid pace of change has not allowed countries time for cultural adaptation
- Crises have been brought in the wake of globalization massive unemployment
- It enhances longer-term problems of social dissolution – discernible from urban violence in Latin America to ethnic conflicts in other parts of the world, such as Indonesia.
- These problems are hardly new – but they were silenced by the dictate of powerful international actors and their media bias, which disseminates insulated and one-sided news only in the direction of their profit interest – demonizing any body who opposes them
- For decades, the crises of the poor in Africa and other parts of the developing world have been largely unheard in the west that is why protestors flooded the streets of Prague, Seattle, Washington and Geneva – they have put the need for reform on the agenda of the developed world.
- The proponents of globalization support the positive aspects of globalization – it is the more narrowly defined economic aspect of globalization that have been the subject of controversy, and the international institutes that have written the rules, which mandates or put things like liberalization of capital market – as the only prescription for progress.
- The idea the intl. financial institutions were created for was good but they gradually moved away from the goal. Their governance is dominated by wealthiest industrial countries and also by the

- commercial and financial interests in those countries, and the policies of the institutions naturally reflect this.
- Today the process of **globalization is on going at the absence of world government – accountable to the people of every country**, that would oversee the globalization process in a fashion comparable to the way national government guided the nationalization process – instead **we have a system that might be called global governance without global government**, one in which **few institutions -that are closely linked for certain financial and commercial interests dominate the scene**. Those who are affected by their decisions are left voiceless. There is a misgovernment of globalization.

Discontent of Globalization

The result of globalization in many parts of the world is that poorest countries actually made worse off. Liberalization has thus, too often, not been followed by the promised growth, but by increased misery and insecurity.

Policy makers wedded to outdated economic models and using ‘Washington consensus’ and doctrines based on them to design policies that had disastrously bad result.

There is a damaging desire within the institutions of globalization, for secrecy, that exacerbates mistakes at the same time as it inhibits positive changes. There is lack of transparency, citizens who are directly affected by their policies do not have a great say or participation. Many problems arise because so much goes on behind close doors. Somebody decides for you.

The so-called multilateral organizations like the IMF, World Bank and World Trade Organization are not elected, they do not have the right to tell countries how countries should run their own affairs. It is obvious that these organizations only serve the interests of the US and to a lesser extent the other rich countries. Their only role is to peddle the neoliberal orthodoxy – the Washington consensus – that only impoverishes the poorest nations and maximizes the profits of multinationals.

Good economic policy should be able to change the lives of billions who live in extreme poverty domestically and at an international level.

Globalization shouldn’t mean to be able to buy quality goods in department stores like TESCO in cities and not finding anything in the villages, where urbanization has been increasingly growing weakening down rural activities.

Policies should help not only that countries grow but should also ensure that growth is shared more equitably. For eg. We support privatization (selling off government monopolies to private companies) but only if it helps companies become more efficient and lower prices for consumers. This is likely possible when markets are competitive. So strong competition should be in place.

Markets alone cannot solve any societal problems. Inequality, unemployment, pollution... the problem is still there. These were crucial issues that governments had to focus upon rather than just serving as a puppet for super powers and multilateral organizations to secure their post.

Countries all over the world were instructed to accept political conditions and ideologically guided policy, which IMF imposes on them for instance without any alternative opinion. IMF structural adjustment policies – policies designed to help a country adjust to crises, to the contrary, led to hunger and riots in many countries, those at the bottom even to greater poverty.

We may need to pay some sacrifice or experience some pain on the way to becoming a successful market economy. But the level of pain created in the process of globalization and development as it has been guided by the IMF and the International economic organizations has been far greater than necessary.

The backlash against globalization comes not only from:

1. The **policies based on ideology and did damage to 3rd World countries**, but also from
2. **Inequities in the global trading system.**

Today, many hypocrites pretend they are helping developing countries by forcing them to open up their markets to the goods of the advanced industrial countries while keeping their own markets protected. These are policies that make the rich richer the poor poorer and increasingly angry.

As a global community we need to follow some rules so that we can live together. The rule must be fair and just – should work for both the poor and the powerful – rich(even sum game)-social justice. In today's world these rules have to be arrived at through democratic process. Those whose lives are directly affected by the policies of international actors (financial or others) should have voice, authorities should work on the bases of this voice.

In order to make globalization more human, effective and equitable, the globalizers, i.e. the international economic and financial institutions – which are not democratic themselves should **reform themselves** 1st before they tell others to change. Or they **should never claim they are DPPs.**

Of equal concern is what globalization does to democracy. Globalization, as it has been advocated, often seems to replace the old dictatorships of national elites with with new dictatorships of international finance. Countries are told if they don't follow certain conditions, the capital market or the IMF- a public institution will refuse to lend them money. They are basically forced to give up part of their sovereignty, by "disciplining" them, or telling them what they should do and should not do. No choice.

The crisis brought to the fore the sense that something was wrong with globalization, and this perception mobilized critics across a wide landscape of issues, from

transparency to poverty to the environment to labor rights. The problems have been recognized, but the reforms of the international financial system are quite slow.

It would be thus very important in the road ahead:

1. To undertake adequate reform in the international financial institutions.
2. Providing assistance without imposition of political conditionality.
3. Debt forgiveness
4. Balancing the trade agenda through reforming the WTO
5. Implementation of globalization with more human face(you don't need to use bombs to change the world towards your interest, where they need bread to it.)
6. Creation of appropriate global legal norms and ethics
7. Replace the unfair structure of Intl. economic and political dictate of few by proportional way of participation of the people of all regions
(A different kind of G-8, reinforced UN or World government what so ever)

8. Efforts towards confederal status of the world, based on participation of regions, which ultimately lead towards world federal structure would seem to be more appropriate to ensure stability and a feeling of better participation for all rather than devising the creation of vassal states, by use of power politics, all over the planet. This might probably lead towards strengthening, more impious, hegemonic state or states, but it would not solve the problems that would arise as a result of inappropriate division of power among regions.

Conclusion

Globalization has various features, and could be generally defined as the increasingly close integration of markets for **commodities, labour and capital**. Modern globalization has been a recognized force for at least 30 years. Today, academic journals, the media, and political discourse are dominated by globalization events. For many, it is a positive force, but for others it may appear a negative force.

The anti-globalization movement is famously broad, encompassing environmentalists, unionists, the hard left, some of the soft left, those campaigning for fair development in poorer countries and others who want to tear the whole thing down, in the same way that the original Luddites attacked mechanized spinning machines, before centuries together with others, who expressed their discontent against industrial revolution.

Not everyone agrees that globalization is necessarily evil, or that globalised corporations are running the lives of individuals or are more powerful than nations. Some say that the spread of globalization, free markets and free trade into the developing world is the best way to beat poverty – **the only problem is that free markets and free trade do not yet truly exist**.

Globalization can be seen as a positive, negative or even marginal process. And regardless of whether it works for good or ill, globalization's exact meaning will continue to be the subject of debate among those who oppose, support or simply observe it.

I do not think it makes any sense to be unreservedly for or against globalization. The question is rather how everybody, including the poor, can benefit from the manifest advantages of globalization without suffering from any of its disadvantages. When can we be sure that globalization will benefit not only the happy few but also the massed ranks of the third world's poor?

The challenge we face today is not how to thwart globalization but instead how to give it an ethical and legal foundation. Some call this 'ethical globalization', a triangle consisting of **free trade, knowledge and democracy**; alternatively **trade, aid and conflict prevention**.

The opposite view – that globalization is indeed a new phenomenon – has been articulated by many writers such as Naomi Klein and Noreena Hertz, to name but two. They believe that the development of the past few decades have spurred changes so large that the world has indeed entered a qualitatively new (and unwelcome) era.

The statistics are certainly convincing: since 1950, the volume of world trade has increased by 20 times. And from just 1997 to 1999, flows of foreign investment nearly doubled, from USD 486bn to USD 827bn.

Thomas Friedman, a New York Times columnist and author of an oft-cited book on globalization, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, argues that today's era of globalization is different both in degree and in kind from previous eras.

He says while the previous era of globalization was built around falling transport costs, today's globalization is built around falling telecommunication costs, which are able to weave the world together even tighter.

The technologies according to him mean that developing countries don't just have to trade their raw materials to the west and get finished products in return; now, developing countries can become big producers as well.

Democracy and respect for human rights are the only sustainable ways of avoiding violence and war and of achieving trade and prosperity. The international community has still not managed to impose a worldwide ban on small arms or set up a permanent international criminal court and effective rules that regulates all international actors, where it would be possible to enforce the in-compliance of impious entities, based on the consent of West or East, North or South.

Finally, world trade needs to be further liberalized. If all world markets were opened up to competition then the total income of developing countries would be boosted by 700 billion USD a year, or 14 times the total development aid they currently get. No more dumping of western agricultural surpluses on third world markets. No more exceptions for bananas, rice or sugar. The only trade ban would be on arms. "everything but arms" must be the motto of all future World Trade Organization (WTO) negotiating rounds.

More free trade, more democracy, great respect for human rights and more development aid: is that enough to make ethical globalization a reality? Certainly not! What is missing is a powerful instrument to enforce it. We need a global political body as powerful as the globalized market in which we already live.

The Group of Eight (8-) of the rich countries must be replaced by a G-8 of existing regional partnerships, a G-8 where the south is given an important and deserved place at the table to ensure that the globalization of the economy is headed in the right direction.

We need to create a forum where the leading continental partnerships can all speak on an equal footing: the European Union, the African Union, Mercosur, Asian, the North American Free Trade Agreement, etc.

This new G-8 can and must be a place where binding agreement on global ethical standards on working conditions, intellectual property and good governance can be entered into. The renewed G-8 could lay down the guidelines and give encouragement to the major international organizations and negotiating bodies such as the WTO, the World Bank and Kyoto. This G-8 would no longer be dominated by the big wealthy countries; instead, everyone in our world community would be represented. In this way it could provide an answer to global problems such as international trafficking in human beings.

We saw such a process emerging in an embryonic stage at the Kyoto Protocol or talks in Bonn, where finally a breakthrough was made thanks to agreements between the Umbrella Group, the European Union (EU) and the group of less developed nations, against the wishes of the greatest power on earth, the US.

Globalization needs to be regulated to make it work better for more people. The rules of the game should not enable only the rich to rejoice while living behind billions of people, in despair, all over the planet.

If we are to address the legitimate concerns of those who have expressed a discontent with globalization, if we are to make globalization work for the billions of people for whom it has not, if we are to make globalization with a human face succeed, then our voices must be raised. We should not stand idly by.