

Duško DIMITRIJEVIĆ¹
Mihajlo VUČIĆ

GLOBALISATION AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER²

ABSTRACT

In this study, authors attach great importance to the theoretical examination of the relationship between the concepts of globalisation and “the New World Order”. Efforts to democratise international relations after the Second World War led to the intensified determination of the international community to resolve in a new manner the question of progress of mankind, which is connected to the solution of the crucial problems in the sphere of international politics, economics, social and humanitarian relations. Because of the inherited global problems, reflected in the irreconcilable aspirations of developed and developing countries, unadjusted interests of North and South, relations between large and small states, in general because of the immaturity of political and social conditions, the influence of political opportunism in international relations was strongly felt so that the world reached now the crossroads where it should decide, whether it will go through the development of democracy and the rule of law or it will stop at the “relativism” of the international legal order. With regard to the continuity of international relations, one can only assume that the international community, through the process of globalization, can succeed in upgrading the existing international system by achieving universal social progress and improving general living conditions.

Key words: Globalisation, the New World Order, international community, interdependence, internationalisation, state, sovereignty, international organizations.

1) International community and the New World Order

The transformation of the international community that occurred after the Second World War still affects the role and contents of the international legal

¹ Duško Dimitrijević, PhD, Professorial Fellow, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade. Mihajlo Vučić, PhD, Research Fellow, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade.

² This paper was created within the project “Serbia in contemporary international relations: Strategic directions of development and firming the position of Serbia in international integrative processes – foreign affairs, international economic, legal and security aspects”, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia, number 179029, for the period 2011-2015.

system. Its existence is directly conditioned by the changes in the sphere of state authority. The consequences of these changes are in the function of establishing concepts of “the New World Order”. This concept arose from the new social structure, which is a consequence of global political changes, the internationalization of the world economy and scientific and technological revolution. It has an important task to legitimate the new political *status quo* of the great social changes that occurred. In turn, to understand properly the significance of this phenomenon, it is enough to recall the concept of interdependence which mainly existed in earlier stages of development of the international community. Interdependence had been primarily the social concept, which reflected exclusive relationship of cooperation and transport between two or several states. Today, the meaning of the concept of interdependence greatly expanded.³ The contemporary international community is characterized by two essential new elements distinguishing it from the so-called classical period, which broke down initially in 1914 and finally during the Second World War: the network of various forms of international organizations, culminating with the United Nations, and the increase in the number of states to around four times the previous number. States are different in size, population, social structure, economic development and resources. In spite of these variations, states share one common feature. The interdependence of states, which was the significant feature of the previous period of the international community, remains predominant characteristic in the present era. However, unlike the earlier meaning of interdependence, modern interdependence has a broader meaning since it covers all areas of human activity.⁴

After the Second World War, states have increasingly sought to be grouped in order to cooperate and develop, as well as to create a new system of international relations whose institutional and normative foundations were

³ In the multitude of different definitions of interdependence, it seems that it is possible to extract one that differentiates a negative interdependence which refers to interactions that are based on the mutual withdrawal and dereliction and positive interdependence stemming from expectations for achieving the common good. The logical sequence of interdependence can be symmetrical if it takes place under the same conditions and asymmetrical that indicates inequality. For these guidelines, it would be possible to create different types of symmetrical and asymmetrical interdependence, which do not substantially rationalized by the end of all the existing economic, political and social processes. See: Yoshikazu Sakamoto, “The State of the Globe”, Mimeo of a lecture delivered at the Conference on War and Peace, University of Pennsylvania, 1976, pp. 72-83.

⁴ Karl Zemanek, “Interdependance”, in: *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, R. Bernhardt ed., Vol. II, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 1021-1023.

represented in the organizations of the United Nations. The basis of this system is the principle of equality of states.⁵ Equality is a symbol of state legitimacy, which in international relations equals political independence. The exercise of independence includes the power of the state itself to determine the scope of its jurisdiction and the modalities of its performance within and beyond the borders of its territory, without interference from other states. State independence is dependent on the practical abilities of the state to exercise territorial, personal and material jurisdiction, but also on the rules of positive international law, whose general framework and end-limits are determined by the Charter of the United Nations. Except for general rules and principles of public international law, this independence could not be limited.

However, the problem of application of the sovereign equality of states always has to be looked at in the wider context of the status and rights of other actors of international relations. Their formal equality depends largely on the complex and dynamic processes in the international community. In fact, equality as a manifestation of external sovereignty should not lead to the subordination of states to other actors of international relations, because otherwise it would be contrary to their legal status of independent and sovereign states. As the relations between the actors of the international community branch over time, the international community expands its activities and functions as well. The process of expanding the jurisdiction of the international community at the expense of sovereign states was outside the scope of the accepted rule that any limitation of sovereignty must be followed by the establishment of real legal titles. Hence, it would be logical to wonder, why the development of contemporary international relations and international law goes in the direction of limiting state sovereignty. This is most apparent in the area of decision-making that has remained largely in the state jurisdiction. The state continues to retain the right to decide whether to regulate and which area of mutual relations should be regulated by their own consent or acquiescence or whether in some concrete relationship the general principles, which stem from their common legal heritage should apply. Therefore, with the accession to international treaties governing the establishment of international organizations, states transferred their competence, or limited parts

⁵ The development of the concept of sovereignty was completed with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. The result of that development was the principle of sovereign equality among states as subjects of international law. However, this principle in the first time was accepted only among the European states of the Christian Occident. See: Marek Stanislaw Korowicz, "Some Present Aspects of Sovereignty in International Law", *Recueil des Cours Académie de Droit International*, 1961-I, vol. 102, pp. 34–62; Michael Schweitzer, "New States and International Law", in: *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, R. Bernhardt ed., Vol. III, Amsterdam, 1997, p. 582.

of their sovereign powers. By concluding numerous international treaties and international conventions of a legislative character under the auspices of international organizations, states have progressively begun to assume a range of legal duties, which in effect have an *erga omnes* character. In this connection, states often have accepted the obligations by implicit recognition of decisions of international organizations, which leads to the progressive development of so-called *soft international law*. All this has resulted in the sovereignty transformed into power, which should create conditions for fully exercising state functions in accordance with general international law. Thus, the traditional solutions with antinomian conflicting principle of the sovereignty of the state, according to the concept of the international community were superseded in coordination and complementarily between states and then, between wide ranges of international actor's - from international governmental and non-governmental organizations, various legal persons such as multinational corporations and transnational enterprises- to individual entities who articulate an emerging consensus relating to the international law.⁶ This social transformation has led to a gradual restriction of state power and reshaping the former state authority.⁷

Following the dynamics of this phenomenon, it is possible to identify a fundamental transformation of the classical concept of the international community in the concept of "the New World Order". While the concept of the international community could be described as European (*jus publicum europaeum*), hitherto the concept of "the New World Order" could be observed as a system that seeks the elimination of geographic differences and cultural

⁶ In the present stage of historical development, the consensus of members of international community creates new international law. International organizations and other international subjects, particularly the UN play an increasing role in the codification and progressive development of international law. See: Hermann Mosler, *International Society as a Legal Community*, Kluwer, 1980, pp. 191, etc.

⁷ The state was not overcome by this process. It still continues to exist and not only parallelly with international organizations, but also as their base and the precondition of their existence, as well as the existence of international order. In this regard, it would be an acceptable position that: „As the first amongst international institutions, the state is the pillar of classical international law. International law cannot be contemplated without the state, even less can it be thought of as being against the state. The existence of international organizations does not create an exception to this, for they are, as is well known, also inter-state, even inter-governmental, bodies for the most part. It is as an international institution that the state ensures civil peace and public order within its own territory, contributing to the peace and stability of the international society and carrying out its communication and cooperation functions with other states“. See: Serge Sur, "The State between Fragmentation and Globalization," *European Journal of International Law*, 1997, Vol. 8, Issue 3, p. 422.

exclusivity. It assumes the highest political role in the world whose main objective consists in the acceptance and implementation of common rules of conduct.⁸ The concept of “the New World Order” is not a separate entity grafted artificially onto the body of international community, but an integral part of the new integrated management system which has been evolving since the Great War for reasons of conducting major international processes – from maintaining universal peace and security – to connecting national economies into a globalized system of market management by introducing new technologies and building of new legal regimes.⁹

Starting with the quest for peace, “the New World Order” in the period after the Second World War has brought forth the principles of cooperation and solidarity.¹⁰

⁸ “A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility”, Report of the High-level Panel on “Threats, Challenges and Change”, United Nations Document A/59/565, 2 December 2004; “In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights”, Report of Secretary General, United Nations Document A/59/2005, 21 March 2005, pp. 35, etc.

⁹ The concept of the legal regimes includes a group of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures around which there is a convergence expectation of actors in a particular field of international law. Thus observed, various regimes that occur in areas such as human rights law, environmental law, international economic law and the like, are not in themselves contrary to general international law, because they are, in fact, a creation of the development of different areas of the law. Their existence does not threaten the existing international legal order, because it maintains a unique system of international law, which existence does not exclude the possibility of the existence of particular legal system at the regional, transnational or supranational level. See: Anne-Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order*, Princeton University Press, 2004; Joseph Weiler, Andreas Paulus, “The Structure of Change in International Law”, *European Journal of International Law*, 1997, Vol 8, No. 4, pp. 556, etc. Steven Krasner, *International Regimes*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1983; Francis Snyder, *Economic Globalization and the Law of 21st Century*, in: Austin Sarat (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Law and Society*, New York, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2004, pp. 2, etc.

¹⁰ The principle of cooperation is an international obligation of States which was confirmed in the UN Charter. The obligation arises from the increased volume of interdependence in different spheres of social life. On the other hand, the principle of solidarity represents the obligation of States to cooperate in achieving the common good. In international relations, this obligation is primarily related to the definition of government policies that implicitly or explicitly had to take into account the common values of the international community. The principle is implemented in practice through bilateral and multilateral forms of institutional cooperation in order to social development. See: Bogdan Babović, “The Duty of States to Cooperate with One Another in Accordance with the Charter”, in: M. Šahović (ed.), *Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation*, New York, Dobbs Ferry, Oceana Publication, pp. 277-321.

As an advanced political order whose limits are determined by general goals and principles of the United Nations, the concept of “the New World Order” complies with the concept of the relative effect of state sovereignty. In concrete terms, this concept means that the order indirectly makes the division of competences between the various actors in international relations, as well as the supervision of their implementation in all aspects of international existence. Consequently, “the New World Order” is becoming increasingly pluralized because it determined objective rules of international relations, which require division of state sovereignty. This transformation led to the gradual overcoming of differences between domestic and foreign policy and elimination of the collision between national and international jurisdiction concerning the regulation of social relations. There are many reasons for the transformation of the international community that is no longer a set of closed communities with their own social policies, autarchic economies and inviolable territorial sovereignty. One of the most important reasons is the process of globalization, which will be discussed in the next section of this paper.

2) The concept of globalization and liberal ideological legacy

In the science of international relations, there are diverse views on determining the meaning of globalization.¹¹ Regardless of the opposing opinions on the meaning of the term, globalization can generally be determined in a broader and in a narrower sense.¹² In a broader sense, the meaning of globalization is based on the social phenomena related to the development of

¹¹ In order to define the notion of globalization, it is best to start from the etymology of this word. At the same time, etymology of the term mondialization which has the same meaning should be considered. Both words stem from Latin language. Globalization has its origins in the word (*le globe* (both in French and English); actually farther in the past from the Latin word *globus*, which is the term for the planet Earth. The term mondialization has its origins in French word *le monde* (*il mondo* in Italian); actually farther in the past from the Latin word *mundus*, which means world. Starting from the origin of both words, and the meaning which is given to them by almost everyone that uses them, globalization and mondialization denote the same notion, or process (but the result of the process as well) of upgrading social processes and relations from lower (by spatial coverage actually narrower) levels to the world level, actually the global level.

¹² In theory of international relations, authors often make a distinction between globalism and globalization. Thus, globalism is an example of how a particular ideology is born from a general one. It is nothing but one subspecies of liberalism and that one are thereby, usually called an economic option of neoliberalism. Since the 1970s, it is pronouncedly focused on implementation of those political principles that provide profit. Hence, globalism is only neoliberalism on a mission. On the other hand, globalization is the process of intertwined

trade, technology and communication, restriction of tariff and trade barriers, as well as improving transparency and permeability of national borders, all of which has resulted in the acceleration of economic activity and the improvement of living conditions and welfare of mankind. In this sense, globalization can be described as the process of abolishing restrictions on the movement of goods and services, people and ideas. In a narrower sense, however, the meaning of globalization covers liberalization of cross-border trade cooperation, capital markets, investment and production. Despite these different approaches in the determination of the term, no one claims the conceptual definition of globalization is sufficient in itself because it overemphasizes the economic aspects of this social phenomenon, which has *per se* a much broader meaning, as it also includes other social aspects, such as political, legal, technological, scientific, cultural, religious and humanitarian aspects.¹³ Therefore, globalization can be conceived as a process or set of processes of unification of human behaviours and human lives through connecting different social activities through the dynamics of the intensified political, economic, legal and other integration at the regional, continental and planetary level.¹⁴

political, military and economic activities of a series of political, economic and military subjects led by USA. This country is the carrier of globalization and its actions (as well as actions of its followers) are aimed at directing the totality of human society towards the realization of the postulates of liberalism. See: Dragan Simeunović, "New World Order, Globalism and Globalization", in: Duško Dimitrijević (ed.), *The Old and the New World Order – between European Integration and the Historical Burden: Prospects and Challenges for Europe of 21st Century*, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, 2014, pp. 13, etc.

¹³ Among writers, there are plenty of differences regarding understandings of globalization. Hence, there are not some general definitions of globalization, and understanding its contents are conditioned by scientific approach and methodology. Given that globalization is a sociological phenomenon, it seems reasonable to cite the definition of a prominent professor in sociology from the Faculty of Law in Belgrade Miroslav Pečujlić. Professor Pečujlić states that "... globalization as an objective process is universal and permanent aspiration of mankind beginning with his first lonely group of hominids, through the archaic empire to the modern world order which is characterized by the interdependence of all wider range of societies, and the compression of time and space, with a permanent rise trans-national forces and institutions". See: Miroslav Pečujlić, *Globalizacija: dva lica sveta (Globalization: the two faces of the World)*, Gutenbergova galaksija, Beograd, 2005, p. 17.

¹⁴ The grasp and nature of globalisation is a field of passionate theoretical and ideological disputes, clashes of rival conceptions. For well-known experts in this field, globalization can be conceived as a process embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions, expressed in transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and power. It is characterized by four types of change. First, it involves a stretching

Globalisation as a process has been initiated by leading actors in international relations in the framework of a liberal conceptual heritage.¹⁵ The very idea of globalization has resulted from the idealistic concept of international relations that emerged after the end of the Great War. Namely, the essential liberal paradigm is based on the assumption that the system of international relations should be based on common sense (*recta ratio*) and international morality. The doctrine of liberalism starting from these idealistic premises sets out on the following fundamental question: how to convert the international community from primitive conditions to advanced social conditions? Liberal doctrine looks for a solution in the formation of one international system of the whole human race. This system will be able to handle conflicting interests and ideas about the future of the world. Such a system would be qualified to formulate the idea of the common interest of mankind and of each individual. Also, such a system would be competent to separate general interests through the legal relationships that condition human action and behaviour on all sides of the world.¹⁶ This idea is supported by the fact that the international system of states suffered significant expansion in the post-war period, what corresponded to its spread to new areas of social life and to new multi-level networks of interdependence.¹⁷

of social, political and economic activities across frontiers, regions and continents. Second, it is marked by the intensification, or the growing magnitude, of interconnectedness and flows of trade, investment, finance, migration, culture, etc. Third, it can be linked to a speeding up of global interactions and processes, as the development of world-wide systems of transport and communication increases the *velocity* of the diffusion of ideas, goods, information, capital and people. And, fourth, the growing extensity, intensity and velocity of global interactions can be associated with their deepening impact such that the effects of distant events can be highly significant elsewhere and specific local developments can come to have considerable global consequences. In this sense, the boundaries between domestic matters and global affairs become increasingly fluid. Globalization, in short, can be thought of as the widening, intensifying, speeding up, and growing impact of world-wide interconnectedness. See: David Held, Anthony G. McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1999.

¹⁵ Liberal conceptual heritage are linked primarily to Adam Smith and his famous metaphor of the “invisible hand” that leads individuals to the exercise of their own interest, and achieve the interests of society as a whole, although it was not their explicit intention. See: Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*. New York, Random House, 1937.

¹⁶ Philip Allott, The True Function of Law in International Community, *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 1998, Vol. 5, p. 409.

¹⁷ Robert O. Keohane, Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston, Little, Brown & Company, 1977.

In the economic field, the liberal doctrine encourages free trade (*laissez faire* – *laissez passer*), and the construction of new supranational and global institutions. Given that this process demanded fundamental reform of the existing international institutions and changes in the political systems of the member states of the international community between the two world wars, limiting state sovereignty in conditions of increased interdependence was inevitable. The limitation of its negative content, i.e. independence *vis-à-vis* other states, and positive, consisting of exclusive competence of state power in the territory, led to a new organization of the international community in whose centre was the League of Nations. Following these changes, for the first time in the history of international relations was confirmed the need for institutional mediation of state sovereignty with the idea of the international community through the collective security system, strengthening social solidarity and inter-state cooperation (*diversum in diversis nationibus*).

After the Second World War, there was a broader organization of the international community within the framework of various international organizations in which the focus were the United Nations. At the time of the Cold War and the bipolar system of international relations, the efficiency of the functioning of international community largely depended on the United Nations, which had a role in “objective standardization” of state behaviour. Installation of state sovereignty in the legal system of the United Nations and other international organizations, inevitably led to the divisibility of state sovereignty and transfer of functional competences between state and non-state actors.

Increased efforts at democratization of international relations after the Cold War, have led to the new functional division of competences between states and international organizations.¹⁸ The justification for these processes has been found in the neoliberal concept of globalization, which explains the new forms of social integration and increasing dependence between various actors of international relations.

¹⁸ The functional division of competences encompasses the integration of theory of international relations, and its functionalist approach. Functionalism is based on the idea that certain areas of government activity can be connected on a functional basis. When this occurs, competences are transferred to the central authority which exists at a level that is above the national state. In areas which were identified as areas of integration, a level of integration continues with a new one which is a process called *spill-over*. With this process is easy explains the movement starting from the customs union, the establishment of a common or internal market, to the formation of a monetary union which leads to the ultimate goal – the establishment of a political and economic union of states. See: Ernst B. Haas, *Beyond the Nation-State, Functionalism and International Organization*, Stanford University Press, 1964; Willemien Riphagen, “Some Reflection on Functional Sovereignty”, *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, 1975, vol. VI, p. 122. etc.

However, it should be noted that the objective process of development of international relations through the process of globalization does not go towards complete social integration. The evolutionary course of the latest state transformations in Europe, Asia and Africa, just indicate that there is no complete withdrawal of state sovereignty, before an international authority. But despite that, it could point out the fact that the postulates related to liberal capitalism on the establishment of a unified management system within the framework of “the New World Order” have a decisive impact on the legitimization of limiting state power, which in itself can be an advantage, but also a challenge for the further development of international relations.¹⁹

3) Globalization and internationalization of international relations

The world society is changing dramatically and a vigorous public debate is under way about the nature and historical significance of these changes. In this constellation, the questions about the scope and consequences of globalization process have a central place in modern international relations. What is obvious is that little attention has been devoted to providing reviews about the position and role of international organizations in the process of globalization.²⁰ The main reason for this is the internationalization, which takes place simultaneously with the process of globalization and under the auspices of international organizations.²¹

Internationalization can be defined as a process that enables a state to meet its interests in areas where they themselves are unable to act independently.²²

¹⁹ Marti Koskenniemi, *From Apology to Utopia, The Structure of International Legal Argument*, Helsinki, Lakimiesliiton Kustannus, 1989, p. 21, etc.

²⁰ Tanja Miščević, „Novi teorijski pravci izučavanja međunarodnih organizacija“ (*New theoretical directions to the study of international organizations*), Godišnjak FPN, Beograd, 2007, p. 344.

²¹ In this sense, it seems quite plausible theoretical observation that: ”The characteristics of the globalization trend include the internationalizing of production, the new international division of labor, new migratory movements from South to North, the new competitive environment that accelerates these processes, and the internationalizing of the state (...), making states into agencies of the globalizing world“. See: Robert Cox, “Multilateralism and the Democratization of World Order”, paper for the International Symposium on Sources of Innovation in Multilateralism, Lausanne, May 26-28, 1994, as cited in J. A. Scholte, “The Globalization of World Politics”, in J. Baylis and S. Smith (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics, An Introduction to International Relations*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 15.

²² At the end of the 20th century in Japan prevalent view was that the Japanese economy is “small and frail”. Anxiety over this position caused terms such as internationalization to enter everyday

Basically, it is rooted in the nature of economic, technological and political progress of society. Development of internationalization is associated with the development of production, science and technology, transport and telecommunications, and with the increased significance of the international division of labour. It means the environment in which states influence each other, willingly or unwillingly, spontaneously or deliberately, desirably or undesirably. Depending on the nature of spheres of interest and mechanisms of their actions, these impacts may concern not only economic but some much wider area, it can result in the establishment of international administration. Such international administration may be exercised by one or more states or by an international organization on behalf of the international community.²³ On the other hand, globalization frees alternative centres of influence, which generally personify different international actors. For example, through international organizations states institutionalizes a process of co-ordination amongst governments, intergovernmental and transnational public and private entities designed to realize common purposes or collective goods through making or implementing global or transnational rules, and managing international problems. By eliminating the time and space factors in international relations, globalization is changing social relations in the international community. The concept of the international community in this way has been transformed into the new concept of world society, which assumes the new legal system based on a global basis.²⁴ In economic field, globalization has been accompanied by a significant internationalization of political authority associated with a corresponding globalization of political activity. Therefore, these two processes – internationalization and globalization can be viewed as consecutive phases in the development of the international system of governance.

Current international system of governance provides an opportunity for improvement and upgrade of existing social processes that are taking place on a global level. Internationalization and globalization are only segments of this new system of governance, which is a historical phase of development of the international community or what is known in contemporary international

language. See: Takenaka Heizo, Chida Ryokichi, “*Domestic Adjustments to Globalization*”; Charles E. Morrison, Hadi Soesastro (eds), Japan center for International Exchange, 1998, pp. 76–102.

²³ Rudger Wolfrum, “Internationalization”, in: *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, R. Bernhardt ed., Vol. II, Amsterdam, 1995, pp. 1395-1398.

²⁴ Frank J. Garcia, “Globalization and the Theory of International Law”, *International Legal Theory*, 2005, No. 11, pp. 9, etc.

relations as “the New World Order”. However, this phase would be impossible without previous phases, upon which it simply builds, and they altogether constitute a single unique social process. At this point, it would be reasonable to ask yourself, what is it that makes this unique social process actual right now? The answer lies in the key factors of the social development that are associated with intensive progress in the economic, political, technological, scientific and cultural spheres of social life. Actually, it confirmed that the processes of internationalization and globalization go hand in hand with the establishment of numerous international organizations and institutions that contribute to the creation of integrated systems management at the global, transnational and supranational level. In these processes of special importance are universal organizations such as the United Nations (UN), and various financial, economic and trade organizations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB) and the World Trade Organization (WTO). An important role is played also by supranational organizations such as the European Union, the African Union, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), inter-state or inter-governmental forums for co-operation such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the Nordic Council, the Benelux Economic Union and regional agreements such as the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). The common feature of all these international actors is that they can contribute to these processes and allow further liberalization, integration and legitimization of state policies in the wider international space.²⁵

4) The impact of globalization on the asymmetric development of international relations

Complex social phenomena like globalization can only be explained by multicausal method. It is the only reason around which everyone who is involved in the debate on globalization can agree. Everything else is very controversial. As can be concluded from the previous analysis, globalization depends on the ideological approach to this phenomenon. Due to the fact that the ideological orientation determines the content and meaning of globalization, the explanation of its impact on the development of international relations will depend on this

²⁵ In 2000, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) identified four basic field of globalization of state policies: trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people and the dissemination of knowledge. See: “Globalization: Threats or Opportunity.” *International Monetary Fund Publication*, 12 April 2000.

course. In this context, on one side the important place is occupied by supporters of globalization (i.e. the hyperglobalists).²⁶ On the other side are proponents who resist this process from ideological and practical reasons (i.e. the sceptics). In mediation, the two opposing approaches have positioned commentators who are seeking rational justification for this social phenomenon, also keeping a sufficient distance for its challenge (i.e. the transformationalists).²⁷

What is quite unique to anyone involved in the rationalization of the process of globalization is that, it has an evolutionary character that is not easily predictable, taking into account the current historical experience.²⁸ Thus, while some commentators in the globalization see the emanation of the iron historical necessity, for the others it is but a myth, a degree of mutual connection of states under the level that existed prior to the First World War. If the globalization is for some an objective and spontaneous planetary process, for the others, it is entirely a project of western domination, of the global Americanization. While for one strand it represents the global integration, for the other it causes inevitable fragmentation, ever-wider gap between worlds and the clash of civilizations.²⁹ If

²⁶ The famous scientist Fukuyama in his explications of social changes indicated “the end of history.” The great historical rivals, fascism and Nazism disappeared with scenes, market democracy and become a social universal formula that has conquered all areas of the world. Instead of a multi-polar created a uniform, a unipolar world. Dramatic battles, wars and conflicts are part of the past. The world has come to the end of history, to the harmonious order. See: Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, London, Hamish Hamilton, 1992.

²⁷ David Held, Anthony G. McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1999.

²⁸ “Globalization, however, does not gain the form of a constant evolutionary line. On the contrary, in its tempestuous and dramatically history periods of expansion and contraction interchange, rises and brutal falls – caused by the unstoppable forces of the industrial revolution and colonial expansion, it lives its never presaged soar which begins during the fifth decade of 19th century to the First World War. Two great world wars and Cold War will bring, however, brutal fall and ebb. The fall of communism and the triumph of the West will sign the period of its brain storming acceleration, the era of turbo globalization. But, the track of the world remains opened and uncertain – it can move from environmental or nuclear cataclysm, over the new division of the world into giant regional blocks, to the single democratic and Orwellian “New World Order.” See: Miroslav Pečujlić, “Two Aspects of Globalization”, op. cit., p. 11.

²⁹ Proponents of the sceptical position considered that global system has witnessed a return to old style geo-politics and neo-imperialism, through which the most powerful states and social forces have consolidated their global dominance and hegemony. See: Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1996.

the winners in globalizations find exclusively the progress of civilizations and new benefits for the mankind, for the losers it is but a destructive force.³⁰

What distinguishes the present era from the past, argue the supporters of globalization, is the existence of a single global economy transcending and integrating the world's major economic regions. Free movement of goods, capital, labour, and the integration of markets, combined with rapid technological developments have led to unexpected possibilities for social development and potential eradication of global problems such as poverty and unemployment, pandemic and environmental degradation, as well as the enormous gap between North and South – rich and poor nations. The positive effects of this process can be observed through increased productivity and living standards across the world, then through an increase in the volume of trade at the global level, as well as through intensification of investment relations, incredible scientific and technological progress and the overall opening of the economy, accelerated communication and internationalization of ideas and information. When we consider these effects of globalization, it is logical to ask, why there exists resistance to this process? There are two key reasons which indicate why there exists the irreconcilable disagreement between supporters of globalization and its opponents.

The first reason against globalization is the fact that many view, as its essential component, the engagement of large capital from developed countries in the exploitation of cheap labour in underdeveloped countries; whereas in those poor parts dirty technologies are being exported and environmental standards are disrespected. In general, the sceptics or opponents of the process of globalization find that its results were not what had been anticipated at the time when it launched free trade. The international institutions that were involved in this process had not taken into account the interests of poorer nations and developing countries. Moreover, globalization, in this anti-globalizing opinion has utterly ignored the interests and rights of the working class.³¹

The second reason for the opposition to globalization is that many consider as its essential component the disappearance of local, national or regional specificities,

³⁰ Miroslav Pečujlić, “Two Aspects of Globalization”, in Ivana Pantelić, Vlado Pavićević, Vladimir Petrović, Goran Milovanović (eds.), *Aspects of Globalization*, Belgrade, Beogradska otvorena škola, 2003, Internet: <http://www.bos.rs/materijali/aspekti.pdf>, 1.4.2014, p. 9.

³¹ Opponents of globalization are gathered around the anti-globalization movement whose goal is global justice. The anti-global movement is very broad, including church groups, national liberation factions, left-wing parties, environmentalists, peasant unionists, anti-racism groups, libertarian socialists, and others. Most are reformist (arguing for a more humane form of capitalism) and a strong minority is revolutionary (arguing for a more humane system than capitalism).

and the cultural, evaluative and so-called civilizational uniformization in accordance with models of developed countries, which could lead the identity loss of certain national, ethnically and other traditional oriented social groups.³²

Both reasons against globalization are only partially correct and acceptable.

The fact is that developed parts of the world, especially their large capital, show more of the abilities and readiness to use new conditions which are created by the scientific, technical and technological progress, wider possibilities of communication and the possibilities and needs of the functioning of the economy and other segments of human activity in the wide, global space (as is the global economical functioning, which supposes the usage of raw materials and labour from the global space and the placement of goods on the global market). This is normal and expected since the rich parts of the world and large capital naturally have greater possibilities for the uses of the results of social progress, to which they alone are the most often initiators and financiers, often with the monopoly on the plan of their usage. However, that does not mean that the social progress which enables communication and functioning on the global level does not bring with it means and possibilities of benefit to all mankind, including those that are contemporary poorer. Richer sectors of the international community have before many centuries been the first to pull benefit from the industrialization, which establishment have they alone initiated, but finally whole mankind enjoyed great benefits from it (despite the fact that even today, the rich have more benefit from it than the poor). Class divisions and exploitation existed and still exist in even narrower, national or other frameworks, so it is only logical that they exist on the global plane. With the spread of economical processes to the global level, these class divisions and exploitation are translated to the same global level. As it was led and as it is led in the lower, spatially narrower levels, fight for social justice should be led in the global level, with the aim of elimination of social injustice and exploitation on the global level, not only in narrower frames. But fighting against globalization as such, against the upgrade of social processes and relations on the global level is absurd (since that fight is futile, condemned to failure since it is a fight against a social pattern) and harmful (since it is a fight against a process which is basically positive, the same as progress as such is something positive and beneficial under the notions of a civilized man). Fight against globalization, and

³² The rise of globalization has fostered a rise of localization. One manifestation of this is the concern about the loss of local identity. As the world becomes a global village, each culture absorbs elements from other cultures so that its own individuality disappears. There is a loss of cultural diversity. See: Keith Suter, *Global Order and Global Disorder*, Praeger, Westport Connecticut, London, 2003, p. 142.

not against class differences and exploitation, which exists on a global level, leaves little room for the exercise of universal workers' rights. Today's geographically defined class divisions, which are usually called divisions between the rich North and the poor South, will be overcome one day since the capital does not know or accept national or regional qualification, and since with the flow of capital to the regions with cheaper raw materials and labour will come gradual levelling in development. Until the social justice is established on a global level, the international community will continue to exist in an asymmetric order of international relations.

As for cultural and civilizational unification, it should be said that a part of it was caused by the very use of modern technical achievements, and not through imposed foreign models. These changes are even more visible in more developed parts of the world, in which the possibilities for the use of modern techniques are larger and the technique itself is much more available than in lesser-developed parts. The fact that the most important scientific, technical and technological achievements in the last few centuries were discovered firstly in western countries does not mean that they are the inherent feature of the western civilization, which in turn, imposes it to others. On the contrary, all the civilized nations tend to achieve technological advances. Just in some historical periods some of the nations or groups of nations, those that have achieved in given period the higher level of progress, more easily grasp new scientific, technical and technological achievements and innovations than the others. In addition, the fact that those are the achievements everyone tends to, since they are a feature of progress as a tendency of all civilized nations, leads to easier acceptance of those achievements in other parts of the world, as soon as the conditions are created. In some earlier historical periods, important scientific, technical and technological achievements were firstly discovered in some other parts of the world, not in West, and they were later accepted worldwide, but this spread is not considered an imposition or a manifestation of cultural imperialism.³³ Simply, progress is the feature of the civilized man, and the geographical epicentres of the spread of progress have migrated, throughout the history of mankind, from some regions to others. However, the fact that in the conditions of global communications functioning, and the economic globalization, exist a tendency of imposing values, perceptions and life habits characteristically for western world and its people to those parts of the world and its nations who those values, perceptions and life habits through

³³ Opponents of globalization often as evidence of cultural imperialism state limiting cultural diversity through Westernization and Americanization, which lead to assimilation and hybridization of cultures.

the nature of things do not share and do not accept, should not be denied and neglected. That imposition should naturally require the suppression and elimination of values, perceptions and life habits of these other non-western nations that are the loss of the elements of their identity. That would be deadly for not only these nations, but for the whole mankind, since the depletion and elimination of cultural and civilizational diversity would mean cultural and civilizational impoverishment of the whole mankind, even those nations whose culture and civilization would not be endangered but imposed to others.³⁴ This is why is it necessary to stand against this imposition of foreign and elimination of own civilizational elements, i.e., elements of identity, that is against generally cultural and civilizational uniformization and impoverishment of mankind, and not only against very globalizations which should not necessarily bring this impoverishment. What is more, the enlarged possibilities of communication and their spread to global level open possibilities for the increased cultural and civilizational exchange, mutual acknowledgment and permeation, i.e., promotion and advance of cultural and civilizational achievements of rich and poor, large and small alike, and generally the upgrade of cultural and civilizational diversity (while this level of cultural and civilizational achievements is not necessarily in correlation and proportion with the level of economic development and the numbers of the nation whom it belongs to, so the cultural heritage of some poorer and smaller nations is far greater and richer than the heritage of some larger and richer nations).

Both phenomena, the use of globalization with the aim of global exploitation and strangle of diversity by imposition of own cultural and civilization models, have their ideological foundation. This ideological foundation called "globalism" expresses regressive term of the fight for world domination.³⁵ Thus, with both phenomena the catch is about the following notions, which are the result of the abuse of globalization (one can say), and not the part of its essence. Therefore, they must be prevented and mitigated, and their ideologization disputed, but the fight against globalization as such is futile, absurd and even harmful.

³⁴ The opponents of globalization emphasize negative side of this process that contributes imposition of the cultural values, developed countries to the less developed countries. In law this challenge often takes the form of a critique of international human rights as an imposition of Western norms on "local" culture. See: Paul Schiff Berman, "From International Law to Law and Globalization", *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*, 2005, No. 43, p. 553.

³⁵ Mihailo Marković, „Globalizacija i globalizam“ (*Globalization and globalism*), *Filozofeme*, Srpski filozofski forum, Novi Sad, 2007.

4) Instead of conclusion

Wider discussions were marked by the creation of a new system of international relations-the “New World Order” after the Second World War, whose integral part is the process of globalization. From the previous discussion, it can be concluded that globalization is in itself neither good nor bad. Its application has direct effects on the international relations. It should not be detrimental to economic development, if it’s based on the principles of international law, which is constantly updated and improved to allow establishing an international order which will guarantee stable peace and security in the world as well as the realization of the political, economic and social objectives of the international community established in the system of the United Nations.³⁶ No one can deny that thanks to scientific and technological revolution, economic development and reform of the political and legal system, the process of globalization accelerated and improved social processes and relations of states, international organizations and other actors of international relations at the global and regional level. At present, the process of globalization raises fundamental philosophical questions related to the determination of its social nature and historical form. It remains so still uncertain whether process is leading to the gradual disseminating the economic benefits of globalization and poverty, the war of civilizations or their mutual enrichment, global democracy or authoritarian world state, ecological balance and unstoppable destruction of the environment.

References

- Allott Philip, *The True Function of Law in International Community*, Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies, 1998, Vol. 5, p. 409.
- “A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility”, Report of the High-level Panel on ‘Threats, Challenges and Change’, United Nations Document A/59/565, 2 December 2004.
- Babović Bogdan, “The Duty of States to Cooperate with One Another in Accordance with the Charter”, in: M. Šahović (ed.), *Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation*, New York, Dobbs Ferry, Oceana Publication, pp. 277-321.
- Berman Paul Schiff, “From International Law to Law and Globalization”, *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*, 2005, No. 43, p. 553.

³⁶ “United Nations Millennium Declaration”, General Assembly Resolution 55/2, 2000.

- Fukuyama Francis, *The End of History and the Last Man*, London, Hamish Hamilton, 1992.
- Garcia Frank J, "Globalization and the Theory of International Law", *International Legal Theory*, 2005, No. 11, p. 9.
- "Globalization: Threats or Opportunity." International Monetary Fund Publication, 12 April 2000.
- Haas Ernst B, *Beyond the Nation-State, Functionalism and International Organization*, Stanford University Press, 1964.
- Heizo Takenaka, Ryokichi Chida, "Domestic Adjustments to Globalization"; Charles E. Morrison, Hadi Soesastro (eds), *Japan center for International Exchange*, 1998, pp. 76–102.
- Held David, G. McGrew Anthony, Goldblatt David and Perraton Jonathan, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- Huntington Samuel P., *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- "In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights", Report of Secretary General, United Nations Document A/59/2005, 21 March 2005.
- Keohane Robert O, Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston, Little, Brown & Company, 1977.
- Korowicz Marek Stanislaw, "Some Present Aspects of Sovereignty in International Law", *Recueil des Cours Académie de Droit International*, 1961-I, vol. 102, pp. 34–62.
- Koskenniemi Marti, *From Apology to Utopia, The Structure of International Legal Argument*, Helsinki, Lakimiesliiton Kustannus, 1989.
- Krasner Stiven, *International Regimes*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Marković Mihailo, „Globalizacija i globalizam“ (Globalization and globalism), *Filozofeme*, Srpski filozofski forum, Novi Sad, 2007.
- Miščević Tanja, „Novi teorijski pravci izučavanja međunarodnih organizacija“ (New theoretical directions to the study of international organizations), *Godišnjak FPN*, Beograd, 2007.
- Mosler Hermann, *International Society as a Legal Community*, Kluwer, 1980
- Pečujlić Miroslav, *Globalizacija: dva lika sveta (Globalization: the two faces of the World)*, Gutembergova galaksija, Beograd, 2005.

- Pečujlić Miroslav, "Two Aspects of Globalization", in Ivana Pantelić, Vlado Pavićević, Vladimir Petrović, Goran Milovanović (eds.), *Aspects of Globalization*, Belgrade, Beogradska otvorena škola, 2003, Internet: <http://www.bos.rs/materijali/aspekti.pdf>, 1.4.2014.
- Riphagen Willemien, "Some Reflection on Functional Sovereignty", *Netherlands Yearbook of International Law*, 1975, vol. VI, p. 122.
- Sakamoto Yoshikazu, "The State of the Globe", Mimeo of a lecture delivered at the Conference on War and Peace, University of Pennsylvania, 1976.
- Scholte J. A., "The Globalization of World Politics", in J. Baylis and S. Smith (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics, An Introduction to International Relations*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Schweitzer Michael, "New States and International Law", in: *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, R. Bernhardt ed., Vol. III, Amsterdam, 1997.
- Simeunović Dragan, "New World Order, Globalism and Globalization", in: Duško Dimitrijević (ed.), *The Old and the New World Order – between European Integration and the Historical Burden: Prospects and Challenges for Europe of 21st Century*, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade, 2014.
- Slaughter Anne-Marie, *A New World Order*, Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Smith Adam, *The Wealth of Nations*. New York, Random House, 1937.
- Snyder Francis, *Economic Globalization and the Law of 21st Century*, in: Austin Sarat (ed), *The Blackwell Companion to Law and Society*, New York, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, 2004.
- Sur Serge, "The State between Fragmentation and Globalization", *European Journal of International Law*, 1997, Vol. 8, Issue 3, p. 422.
- Suter Keith, *Global Order and Global Disorder*, Praeger, Westport Connecticut, London, 2003.
- "United Nations Millennium Declaration", General Assembly Resolution 55/2, 2000.
- Weiler Joseph, Paulus Andreas, "The Structure of Change in International Law", *European Journal of International Law*, 1997, Vol 8, No. 4, pp. 556.
- Wolfrum Rudger, "Internationalization", in: *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, R. Bernhardt ed., Vol. II, Amsterdam, 1995.
- Zemanek Karl, "Interdependance", in: *Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, R. Bernhardt ed., Vol. II, Amsterdam, 1995.