

Slobodan JANKOVIĆ¹

FREEDOM, GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND LOSS OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

ABSTRACT

Globalisation is just one of terms for the process of networking and centralisation of political and economic power with the increased importance of transnational bodies and corporations. Reaching the world peace is one of the oldest arguments employed by proponents of the political globalization. The issue of freedom, as one of the central philosophical and political concepts in history is mostly missing in debates on globalisation. Author discusses various facets and usual interpretations of globalizations, explains wider context and then proceeds with opposing freedom to globalization. Leading researchers of globalisation noticed rising inequality and pointed that one of the global processes is the globalisation of poverty. Those who advocate the globalisation of political power (global governance) are opponents of the national state or simply tend to qualify it as obsolete. Author argues that personal and collective freedom may be better safeguarded in the order of national states than in the world order with global political and financial authority.

Key words: freedom, global governance, national state, globalization, global oligarchs.

The world economy is in crisis at least since 2007. Just before that, although the process of the dislocation of production and virtualization of the economy was in full swing, western hemisphere seemed to live in the best of the worlds, of course through the glance of the materially driven worldview. American will for political and military power all over the globe as total aspiration of Nichean belief

¹ Slobodan Janković, PhD, Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade. 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.

was accompanied by an attempt to reciprocate it in the cultural and economic sphere. Thus, many observers speak of 'space-time compression': "Capital now moves around the world at the press of a button, goods can be shipped over great distances at relatively low cost because of containerization and other innovations, cultural icons represented by such products as blue jeans and Coke bottles are recognizable the world over, and Stealth technology undermines the ability of territorial military power to police its air space."² But, even though all of these 'achievements' are fading away there are still proponents of political globalization.

Indeed, in times of crisis, people are ready to accept deprivation of many rights they enjoy in normal circumstances. Proponents of structural changes in society or at the world level seldom envisaged the big crisis, an emergency situation or tried to convince people of its imminence, as the most opportune moment for the attainment of their radical goals.³ One of the most diabolical of them is surely the imposition of the global governance and loss of the nation state.

Why using such an adjective? Because the processes that will be presented further in the text testify inherently authoritarian, non-democratic and oligarchic character of the elites that tends to rule the planet at the expense of freedom.

Principal obstacle for the global political authority is the sovereignty of states, even as the mere concept and the people's convictions of their independence. This was already elaborated by U.S. diplomat Richard Gardner in a 1974 article in *Foreign Affairs*.⁴ Gardner proposes erode national sovereignty "piece by piece" which "will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault."⁵

² John Agnew, "The New Global Economy: Time-Space Compression, Geopolitics, and Global Uneven Development", *Journal of World-Systems Research*, VII, 2, Fall 2001, pp. 139-140.

³ Particularly notable are examples of Climate hysteria, where prophets of the doom were and still are trying to spread fear of the global freezing in 1970s, as do they with the scare of global warming since the 1990s. Obama's advisor on climate, John P. Holdren participated in both scares. Despite the *Leipzig declaration on global climate change*, of 80 scientist who objected the findings of the *Second Assessment Report (SAR) of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)*, report was adopted and the Kyoto agreement on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions was signed (1997). Even though the Climategate and the measurement of temperature across the globe are still showing that there is no global warming, internationally binding documents and resolutions are being adopted in order to impose the global control of development. Subtle background of these events is the imposition of global institutions of control and not environmental protection.

⁴ Richard N. Gardner, "The Hard Road to World Order", *Foreign Affairs*, April 1974, Volume 52, Number 3, pp. 556-576.

⁵ *Ibid*, p. 558.

Sovereignty is derived from the ideal of freedom of people, collective identity, rights and security and thus the claim to choose freely the type of relations with other peoples. Sovereign nation protects its land and people and relate to other entities of the same nature. A state with its nationalism, patriotism and particular group identity in society along with existing universal religions are the main opponents of global governance, which tends to extrapolate this freedom and right of the peoples to the individual and to higher, global level. Global rule is of course an old idea, cherished by Nimrod, conqueror who wanted to defy God by building the tower in Babylon up to the heavens; later Alexander the Macedonian married the idea and so on. But in contemporary world, after the experience of Hitler, the idea sounds rude, so the proponents of the power over the globe made it sound democratic and environmentally friendly, something inevitable due to the process called globalisation.

Although very in vogue in 1980s and in 1990s, globalisation frenzy declined after the start of the American war on terror and the invasions of Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003). With the subsequent economic and financial crises, it lost much of its prominence in public speech and partially in academic publications. During its high time, globalisation was cheered as the economic and information led networking at the planetary level that should have made national states somehow obsolete.

However, today, globalisation is no more so popular, what remains is an agenda, or will (for power), to impose global governance with various explanations why: in order to govern the climate, in order to resolve the economic crises, in order to democratise the international relations. . . Daniele Archibuggi, David Held, Thomas G. Weiss, or political and religious figures as Barack Obama, Presidents of European Commission, Popes Benedict XVI and Frances I, Tony Blair, Gorbachev and other proponents of global control over some or most aspects of politics, are testimonies that claim the political and societal globalisation has not ended.⁶ Benedict XVI called “for a reform of the *United Nations Organization*, and likewise of *economic*

⁶ Jack Ribeiro, “The ‘devil is in the detail’ of global financial regulatory reform”, 27 January 2011, Internet, <http://globalblogs.deloitte.com/deloitteperspectives/2011/01/the-devil-is-in-the-detail.html>, retrieved on 01/02/2011; Pope Francis calls for global authority in order to ‘safeguard the planet of climate change’. In ENCYCLICAL “Letter *Laudato Si*’ Of The Holy Father Francis On Care For Our Common Home” he states: “To manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis; to avoid any deterioration of the present crisis and the greater imbalances that would result; to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political authority, as my predecessor Blessed John XXIII indicated some years ago” ENCYCLICAL “Letter *Laudato Si*”, I, 175.

institutions and international finance, so that the concept of the family of nations can acquire real teeth... to find innovative ways of implementing the principle of the *responsibility to protect*... *there is urgent need of a true world political authority*... Furthermore, such an authority would need to be universally recognized and to be vested with the effective power to ensure security for all, regard for justice, and respect for rights.⁷ Pope Francis in Encyclical *Laudato si'*, repeats one of the repeating phrases of globalists "The twenty-first century, while maintaining systems of governance inherited from the past, is witnessing a weakening of the power of nation states, chiefly because the economic and financial sectors, being transnational, tends to prevail over the political."

Political and economic globalisation requires the surrender of or lessening of sovereignty, as a barrier for supranational authority and identity with potentially global political organisation. Indeed, if in the future of mankind would be one global apparatus, *responsible to protect* (and one is predicted already in the Revelation given to the Apostle John) would it materialize what would happen with the freedom? Freedom is among central ideas in the political philosophy, but it is not fashionable among the proponents of global governance. Why? There are various critics of globalisation and of the USA and West as promoters of it generally. For the purpose of this work, it is enough to expose the relation between freedom and global governance as a central argument against this project of global unification.

In order to answer the aforementioned questions we will briefly define the terms, overview current views on the global governance or the political globalisation, its impact on freedom and then proceed to provide an answer.

Sovereignty and anarchy in international relations

Proclamation of the state of emergency belongs to the highest authority in state, as the expression of sovereignty, and coincides with the temporary liquidation of the constitution or other basic laws governing society. Still, this exceptional situation is invoked in order to protect the sovereignty, the people and territory (for example from floods, or from military aggression). The sovereign right to defence and protection of land and people, customs and religion belonged to the rulers of all kinds of states in antic times, in mediaeval empires, kingdoms, emirates and tribes. However, western European philosophers and jurists started to define it only since the XVI century (Bodin). Sovereignty existed and it was part of the metaphysical system with God or some idol(s) on top and earthly prince, theocratic ruler, tribal

⁷ *LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE: CARITAS IN VERITATE*, Libreria editrice Vaticano, 2009, art. 57, 67.

chief and elders or aristocracy on the earth. Earthly chiefs were the once making political decisions, but always in the name of the higher authority and according to divine laws as the highest source of power, law and legitimacy.

Even if it is true that some states were not the sovereign during the Middle Ages, but recognized a higher authority of the Pope, or of the Emperor in the West and the Byzantine empire in the East and afterward of the Russian tsars, others were. Moreover, many of those nominally accepting the sovereignty of emperors or the Popes did so only after wars and military defeats or temporarily, as was the case with *de facto* recognition of dominant influence by some states to others in Europe after 1648. It is said that the system of sovereign nation states was established only in 1648 but historically it is only an illusion of some of the Western and central European thinkers. It existed much before, only the states were differing, but political organizations of different peoples or of powerful cities with their own government are not something made in 1600s, but rather many thousand years prior to religious war waged across the Central Europe.

The idea that sovereign states are in a system characterized by anarchy is novelty. It belongs to the modern era of secular and atheist thought. In the world governed by God (by abiding to his Laws – the Commandments) there is no anarchy in the relations between states or between state and other political organizations. Even with the jurists of the natural law in XVI, XVII and XVIII century, of which many were deists, that assumption of disorder, due to the absence of the higher authority, would be almost inconceivable since natural laws were understood to govern the world, human nature and conduct. Thomas Hobbes, who wasn't deists but a devout Anglican, thought that "the estate of nature, that is to say, of absolute liberty, such as is theirs, who neither govern, nor are governed, is an Anarchy, or hostile state; that the precepts whereby to avoid this state, are the Laws of nature; that there can be no civil government without a Sovereigne;" (De Cive, Religion, Chap. XV Of the Kingdome of God, by Nature, I). A state of anarchy here is characteristic of the enemies of God, individuals who do not represent any state since they do not govern (nor they are governed, by the Divine Laws). Therefore Hobbes could not have understood relations between states, entities with the government and the governed, as anarchical. He clearly sees the Lord as a King and a sovereign.⁸ But what prepared different

⁸ For Hobbes the category of the enemies of God is much more wider as he claims: "Those onely therefore are supposed to belong to Gods Kingdome, who acknowledge him to be the Governour of all things, and that he hath given his Commands to men, and appointed punishments for the transgressours; The rest, we must not call Subjects, but Enemies of God." De Cive, Religion, Chap. XV Of the Kingdome of God, by Nature, II).

thinking is the secularisation of the international relations that was first affirmed in the Augsburg peace with the principle *cuius regio, eius religio*. This logic meant the prevalence of the territory over the religion with dire consequences in subsequent centuries.⁹

A story about anarchy in international relations is of the modern era and of atheist elites, imbued with Darwinian theory. Krabbe, jurists of XIX century supposed the rule of law as a spiritual force over the previous rule of men, *quid atheo*, where the law would possess the power and not the people who define and proclaim it!¹⁰ This author had to understand the past as epoch without a higher source of legislation than men. Already in XIX century sources of law started to be understood as deriving from the conscience of people. Hence, the sources of law and power to impose them, in this line of thought were something limited in time and space. Only then relations between different states and their differing legal systems could be seen as characterized by anarchy – because of the absence of the higher authority. Max Weber saw only the will for power of Germany as the highest goal of the state and of German society and argued that economy and everything else is subservient to the interest of Germany to become one of the world powers.¹¹ From grabbing the power in international relations to anarchy there was only one small step left.

Darwinian outlook presupposes the world history as a constant fight for the survival where the weak perishes. Having in mind this hypothesis of the absence of the Divine order, several authors already in XIX century and many since the 1900s started to propagate the idea of the creation of the world government (like Federalist movement with close ties to some members of the London Fabian Society) that would end the chaos, the wars and instability and bring progress, or as it became popular, ‘better and safer world’. Globalisation started to be a very popular concept that should have explained and described the inevitability of the loss of sovereignty and the rise of the global society and global governance. Therefore, the globalisation may be understood as another expression of the old tendency in human history to rule the world, to behave ‘like Gods’, but not like gods spiritually but quite materially and temporarily. This time, though, it is a

⁹ Слободан Јанковић, „Промене на Блиском истоку и у Северној Африци — Ка постсувереном светском поретку”, (Changes in the Middle East and in North Africa — Towards postsovereign world order), *National Interest N.*(Nacionalni interes), Belgrade 2/2011, vol. 11, pp. 261-315.

¹⁰ For the position of H. Krabbe and H. Kelsen see: Carl Schmitt, *Le categorie del ‘politico’*, il Mulino, Bologna 2005, pp. 45-48.

¹¹ For example in “The Nation State and Economic Policy” (*Max Weber, Political Writings*), Maks Veber, *Politički spisi*, Filip Višnjić/ Službeni glasnik, Beograd 2006, pp. 505.

direct expression and continuation of the world federalist movement and different movements and secret societies aspiring to unite the world politically.

One of the formal, political, legal and even cultural obstacles to globalization is a border. The border is essentially a divisive line. It is the line between virtue and sin, right and wrong, day and night and in the end, between them and us. This latest pair created borders between political territorial organizations. Globalisation of politics, culture and economy is paralleled with blurring borders in public morality, in what is accepted and what is not, what is correct and incorrect. Globalisation i.e. westernization establishes new borders, in science and art it is postmodern or even post post-modern, whatever it should mean.

Today, more than ever the very notion of the border as a visible (border-crossing) and essential component of the sovereignty is under attack. European countries which promote measures and actions in order to guaranty legal and controlled movement of people across their borders, are accused of racism, lack of humanism and of course of fascism. Growing voices of people across the European continent and across the USA, who oppose illegal immigration and radical change of the cultural background in their societies, are proclaimed as nationalists (in a negative tone) and as not sympathetic toward the hard situation of the Middle Eastern and African immigrants. But this process that has many characteristics of the organized, is here interesting only as a coup against borders, as reflections of sovereignty.¹² Because “(G)lobalisation and current regional reordering do affect not only the type, authority and the structure of the state government, but they challenge the post-Second World War importance and legal protection of the international borders... In the postmodern era relativity of the borders is one of the components of the globalisation and supranational integrations and governance. This is in particular peculiarity of the Western civilisation...”¹³ It is not strange then

¹³ Slobodan Janković, “Israeli borders Amid Globalisation and Regional Tensions”, op. cit., p. 125.

¹² On the importance of borders for sovereignty see: Slobodan Janković, “Borders In The Balkans: Longevity In The Postmodern Era”, u Zborniku radova Međunarodne naučne konferencije, *Srbija u savremenom geostrateškom okruženju Serbia In Contemporary Geo-Strategic Surroundings*, Slavica Đerić-Magazinović i Nevenka Jeftić-Šarčević (prir.), Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu i Ministarstvo odbrane RS, Beograd 2010, str. 165-178; Slobodan Janković, “National, Cultural and Civilisation Borders in the Balkans”, originalni, in: *On Borders: Comparative Analyses from Southeastern Europe and East Asia*, Lingua-Culture Contextual Studies in Ethnic Conflicts of the World (LICCOSEC), Vol. 17, Osaka 2011, pp. 31-44; Slobodan Janković, “Israeli borders Amid Globalisation and Regional Tensions”, originalni, in: Dimitrijević, Duško, Mitrović Dragana and Lađevac, Ivona (ed), *The Meaning of Borders and Border Issues in the Age of Globalization: Europe and Asia*, Proceedings of round table conference, Institute of International Politics and Economics 2012, pp. 123-136.

that Israeli author Adriana Kemp in 2005 noticed how part of literature on migration points to the conclusion where “underlying assumption is that escalating international migration functions as a major catalyst for the rethinking of such critical concepts as ‘citizenship,’ ‘sovereignty’ and ‘national identity.’”¹⁴ But borders represent also perimeter of security for the political community living inside them, and this security is intended as protection of freedom from oppressor.

Benvenisti, the globalist friendly author tried to purport the contemporary state as no more traditionally sovereign due to the rising influence of international private and public bodies and organisations that effectively regulate and limit the results of decision making in single states in the field of economy, agriculture, trade and even in the use of violence (through Right to protect and prevent, USA and NATO promoted principle). Thus, he claims, states are no longer able enough to provide freedom to their citizens.¹⁵ So, the very global and international institutions and entities (with the backing of the western countries he forgets to mention) essentially threaten the freedom of citizens, the fact that Benvenisti refuses to admit. Quite contrary, he advocates more globalisation and more global governance, just as the crisis of the institutional setting of the EU makes EU optimists scream for “more Europe!” With more global institutions, people will have more freedom, of course, according to Benvenisti!

Freedom and globalised oligarchs

Freedom

Coming back to Benvenisti and his claim that globalization of political authority will bring more freedom, we have to put forward simple questions and judgments based on arguments presented above.

If current trends of micro-regionalisation and transfer of decision-making to local authorities is justified by claim for more democracy, as bringing the voice closer to the constituent party – the people, how comes the transfer of authority to global or macro-regional level brings more democracy and, even more important, more freedom? What power will single persons and communities have over global government if they are not able to cope with devolution of powers from electorate to lobbies, like in the USA? The EU is a good example of

¹⁴ Adriana Kemp, “Citizenship, Ethnicity and Globalization”, *Geopolitics*, 10:188–191, 2005, p. 189.

¹⁵ Eyal Benvenisti, “The Future of Sovereignty: The Nation State in the Global Governance Space”, Global Trust Working paper 01/2015, p. 5.

democracy deficit, where referenda are possible and tend to repeat only until they do not bring answer for 'more Europe'. There are no referenda still for 'less Europe', although, for example, in Great Britain there is great public pressure for that.

Rising poverty was always connected with lesser freedoms. Growing inequalities in nominally liberal democracies, (which promote) globalisation, are a clear example that we are headed toward political systems that may be labeled as democratic, but will have one superior caste and vastity of poor people, economically and thus politically dependent and subjugated by the superclass.

Namely, apart from different side effects of the global government as the product of the political and economical globalization, dissenters of the political regime would lose the opportunity to emigrate and be protected as asylum seekers.

Freedom is one of the central concepts in the history of political philosophy, and surely one of the core ideals and ideas in history. Yet, here we will treat the freedom of action of individuals and its restraints in the system of only one, global state, or only in the order with global governance. How would that affect the free will and freedom of action of single persons?

Free will, one of the basic assumptions of Christianity and freedom of people are aligned concepts, although freedom of people from foreign oppression and occupation are present in all cultures and in different epochs. The concept of freedom that was present as ideal in political history is virtually losing its place in political discourse, and since the Second World War and the creation of the UN is being ever more replaced with the concepts of human rights, democratisation and security. Human rights today are more and more applied to guarantee the rights of the so called "new minorities" like LGBT persons and of ethnic and religious minorities in different countries at the expense of freedoms (of speech, of thought, of religion) of the majority. Western liberal democratic regimes arrived at the point where the Pericles's words in Thucydides interpretation need to be evaluated again. Namely, what Pericles said about democracy, as Italian philologist Luciano Canfora, clearly demonstrated was that the concepts of democracy (rule of the majority) and freedom (equal rights) are somehow opposed (Canfora says antithetical).¹⁶ But the current state of affairs in western nominal liberal democracies needs paraphrasing Pericles, where the rule of majority and democracy are becoming antithetical.

Except for the freedom and the rights of minorities, majority is being deprived of freedom of movement, speech (political critique for example) because of security concerns. Parallel process to the loss of freedom is the loss of sovereignty

¹⁶ Luciano Canfora, *La democrazia: Storia di un'ideologia*, Laterza 2010.

on the national level. States are becoming less and less sovereign, also in order to integrate in larger political unit (like suprastate organisation – EU) or officially to achieve the criteria for joining some international organization (like WTO). The desired outcome of the current process of the loss of sovereignty or degradation of the state at the local and international level is the appearance of the global governance and therefore of the sort of the global state. Freedom there is only in the intermediary stage, as the freedom of market and freedom of movement of goods and increasingly of labour (masked as migration).¹⁷

Global institutions, transnational corporations preach of free trade, “expanding markets, the need for ‘competitive advantage’, ‘efficiency’, cost-effectiveness’, ‘maximizing benefits and minimizing costs’, ‘niche markets’, ‘profitability’ and ‘the bottom line.’” But their alter-ego, masked in various transnational NGO’s and local organizations following the same agenda – when they preach about minority rights, protection of rainforests, or generally of environment – never advocate the right of workers, of middle class, of the majority of people. They do not question the policies of their political and financial sponsors who minimize wages and destruct the environment, while they write about and advocate ‘human rights’. Freedom, except for the freedom of trade and freedom to be morally perverse is not on the agenda of many of the concerned citizens.

It is true that liberal democracy tends to provide freedom from (in order to protect individual from coercion of the state) and from outer aggression. Nevertheless, freedom is also freedom to and freedom for. In religious and transcendental meaning to choose freedom, by one own will, is good. It is freedom for the possibility to choose the right, freedom for the betterment of oneself and of community. Freedom to is freedom to practice its own religion and follow group’s customs and traditions, including the freedom of speech which is increasingly colliding with the so called anti-discrimination. It is also freedom of association. The current situation is characterized by the dictate of the world oligarchs (those super rich) asking freedom of the market and not freedom of people. Actually in the name of the freedom of markets, humans may lose freedom. In the name of the non-discrimination, freedoms are eliminated. Right to live is increasingly limited with the right to die, from abortion to euthanasia. All this limits to freedom are being increasingly elevated in the most globalized countries. Right of association is threatened by extremist labeling of what was yesterday mainstream or traditional political culture. In the name of the better, safer and more equal globalised world, new labels and new limits are being imposed.

¹⁷ On the movement of labour see in: Vladimir Grečić and Slobodan Janković, “Managing Population Movements: The Challenge for Diplomacy in Southeast Europe”, *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Winter/Spring 2010, Vol. XI, N. I, pp. 127-143.

Since the definition of better and safer world does not depend on some universal teaching like the faith in God, but on the will and mind of a narrow minority of the most influential and wealthiest persons, the space for the political decision-making in the electoral process is shrinking. United States public and private entities make many strategies or analyses of future global trends. Planning in business or in ordinary life is in some measure normal and regular, but planning to shape the global processes ends with the imposition of the will in order to make 'predictable' environment which translates in domination of western elites and not in effective care for the ambient and wellbeing of peoples. Thus, many politicians, and they are always globalists, speak of the climate change, although caused mainly by human action and many research studies point out that it is only minimally affected by the human activity. On the other hand, the real problem of pollution, produced by consumerism is not the prime issue on the agenda of the same persons concerned for ecology.

Globalised oligarchs

Globalisation was and still is a synonym for Americanization or as other authors put it, Westernization. Radical changes of the Western European culture, of media outlook and university reforms in majority of European countries (idiot producing system of Bologna) are all influenced by the cultural revolution in the USA and standards established and dominant in that country. Therefore, we may argue that West is being Americanized or Westernized, but more importantly, we have to stress that globalization is a process.

There are different definitions of the globalisation. Some of them highlight economic, technological, socio-cultural or political aspects, while the other comprises all the aspects mentioned. Many definitions or claims about globalisation may be erratic and misleading even when they come from the famous scholars. Example is the following line of sentences by Robert O. Keohane: "Globalization in the contemporary world means that transnational relationships are both extensive and intensive (Held et al., 1999). States and other organizations exert effects over great distances; people's lives can be fundamentally changed, or ended, as a result of decisions made only days or moments earlier, thousands of miles away. In other words, interdependence is high."¹⁸ But states and other organizations were exerting effects over great distances in the past, too. Just the

¹⁸ Robert O. Keohane, "Global Governance and Democratic Accountability", Durham, Chapter prepared for a volume to be edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi from the Miliband Lectures, *London School of Economics*, Spring 2002.

study of the system of alliances of the Eastern Roman empire with the central Asian tribes, or influence of German hanseatic companies on the colonization of contemporary Venezuela in 1500s shows how this dimension of the globalisation is not new at all. But the statement that “people’s lives can be fundamentally changed, or ended, as a result of decisions made only days or moments earlier, thousands of miles away” is at least too simplistic. Because, indeed some lives may be ended because somebody gave orders from the Pentagon, Kremlin or from Jerusalem, but the emphasis is on *some* and not just on (all) people’s lives. Defeat of Avarian tribes in Mongolia, made them move toward West and eventually invade the central European plain of Pannonia, which brought significant political changes in Europe, weakened the East Roman empire, and established new force that lasted for more than two centuries. Different is the velocity of the events. Instead of years, now we may speak of months. The main distinction is velocity. If certain actions on the stock market in Shanghai or in Frankfurt may have influence on some people’s lives, but principally quality of life or material situation, then it surely does not change the life of billion poor people in India, or Norwegians and Danish, or the people across Latin America and in Madagascar. These and similar statements are flawed and easily contradicted, but they have some weight because of the person or authority that pronounce them.

Mary Kaldor defined it as “intensification of global interconnectedness – political, economic, military and cultural.”¹⁹ Martin Khore says: “Globalization is what we in the Third World have for several centuries called colonization”. Martin Albrow has another definition: “Globalization refers to all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society, global society”.²⁰ Milan Brdar sees globalisation as elimination of territorial and cultural boundaries in the framework of the future world that leads toward integration or unification of the world, the peoples, the ideas and economies.²¹ Here we will embrace the definition of Brdar.

The change of tone in the past fifteen years regarding globalisation did not affect the fact that political globalisation as a tendency in the western countries to transfer the power at the international level continued while global inequality jumped both geographically and inside all societies. Ascend of different power

¹⁹ Mary Kaldor, *New & Old Wars – organized violence in a global era*, Polity Press, Cambridge (UK) 2001, p.3.

²⁰ Sheila L. Croucher, *Globalization and Belonging, The Politics of Identity in a Changing World*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Oxford 2004, pp. 10,19.

²¹ M. Brdar, “Globalizacija i desuverenizacija: problem regionalizacije Srbije u aktuelnom geopolitičkom kontekstu”, *Sociološki preglad*, vol. XXXVI, No. 1-2 Beograd January – June 2001, p. 58.

centers or poles in international relations in the past years, highlighted the will of Western financial and political elite to impose their policies using international organisations, economic pressure and if necessary military intervention around the world much faster. The old powers are opposed to the reform of the UN, IMF and other intergovernmental organisations. They vouch for economic liberalization at the expense of the rights and material standard of the peoples in order to maintain their predominance on the planet and save the project of the global governance.

The same cosmopolitan elites who waffle about the need for the international democratization, global institutions and similar institutions and mechanisms are in fact those who benefitted materially the most of the globalisation. Back in 2002, Paul Krugman wrote: “We are now living in a new Gilded Age, as extravagant as the original. Mansions have made a comeback. Back in 1999 this magazine profiled Thierry Despont, the “eminence of excess,” an architect who specializes in designing houses for the super rich. His creations typically range from 20,000 to 60,000 square feet; houses at the upper end of his range are not much smaller than the White House. Needless to say, the armies of servants are back, too. So are the yachts. Still, even J.P. Morgan did not have a Gulfstream...

Over the past 30 years, most people have seen only modest salary increases: the average annual salary in America, expressed in 1998 dollars (that is, adjusted for inflation), rose from \$32,522 in 1970 to \$35,864 in 1999. That is about a 10 percent increase over 29 years — progress, but not much. Over the same period, however, according to Fortune magazine, the average real annual compensation of the top 100 C.E.O’s went from \$1.3 million — 39 times the pay of an average worker — to \$37.5 million, more than 1,000 times the pay of ordinary workers...”²²

The main reason why top salaries significantly grew, and here we do not speak about the immense wealth of less than 100 people who twelve years after the Krugman’s article in the New York Times are possessing the same amount of wealth as the 3.5 billion of people (!), is not the competition or some other excuse but, what Krugman noticed as “a social change in corporate culture”.²³ This change is evident also in the general change of societal values and in politics on marriage, family policies, and spread of the culture of death across the westernized societies. The change is actually about the evolution that started with the secularization of power and of the international relations in XVI century that

²² Paul Krugman, “For Richer”, *NY Times*, October 20, 2002, Internet, <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/magazine/20INEQUALITY.html>, accessed on 25/04/2014.

²³ *Ibidem*.

today produced 'dead souls' in westernized political and economic elites. The reference to the dead souls is from the article by Samuel Huntington. He noticed alienation of the upper class or as he puts, the American elite, from American homeland, and their denationalization.²⁴ The same could be observed in Serbia, in Sweden or in Greece. Most of the ruling political and financial elites in westernized societies are acquiring individuality, ergo egoism as a lifestyle and call themselves the cosmopolite, or the citizens of the world, while there is the way of no limits, in moral values. Among holders of American passport, Huntington distinguishes three types of transnational ideas and people: a) Universalist – American nationalism and exceptionalism taken to the extreme. America merged with the world; b) “the economic approach focuses on economic globalization as a transcendent force breaking down national boundaries, merging national economies into a single global whole, and rapidly eroding the authority and functions of national governments”²⁵, c) moralist are those who decry nationalism and patriotism “as evil forces and argues that international law, institutions, regimes and norms are morally superior to those of individual nations. Commitment to humanity must supersede commitment to nation.”²⁶ These transnational elites are comprised of political, financial, journalists and intellectual figures.

Neil Smith observed in 2006 that globalisation is a class project (elitist): “Spearheaded by one branch of the US ruling class, and not at all popular with others, US elites are driving an attempt to complete a project of global economic and political power that has not only long dominated its sense of its own destiny, but also coincides with its material interests around the globe. Peaking in two prior moments, that longstanding ambition has been revived since the 1980s under the rubric of “globalization.” It is a project that combines the domination and suppression of real or potential rivals abroad with the necessity of heightened social control at home (Fox-Piven, 2004; Harvey, 2003). Its proposed “endgame” is the victory of a global power which, for all the fact that it is surely centered in Washington and New York, really is a global project spanning elites the world over, not just in Europe and Japan, but in the capitals of some of the world’s poorest countries as well. Globalization in its present guise is a class project as much as a national one.”²⁷ Truly, it may be even termed as a class project at least by its results.

²⁴ Samuel p. Huntington, “Dead Souls: The Denationalization of the American Elite”, *The National Interest*, Spring 2004, pp. 4-7.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Samuel p. Huntington, “Dead Souls: The Denationalization of the American Elite”, op., cit, p. 7.

²⁷ Neil Smith, “The endgame of globalization”, *Political Geography* 25 (2006) 1–14, p. 3.

Why? It is because income inequality is growing everywhere, even among the most developed nations. “The richest 10 per cent of the population in the OECD now earn 9.6 times the income of the poorest 10 per cent, up from 7:1 in the 1980s and 9:1 in the 2000s, according to a new OECD report.” (Report from 2015).²⁸ And if we read that “Oxfam made headlines at Davos last year with a study showing that the 85 richest people on the planet have the same wealth as the poorest 50% (3.5 billion people). The charity said that this year the comparison was now even starker, with just 80 people owning the same amount of wealth as more than 3.5 billion people, down from 388 in 2010.”²⁹ This distressing inequality might be compared only to the situation in the Pharaohs Egypt.

In August 2015 Lawrence Wilkerson, a retired United States Army colonel and former chief of staff to United States Secretary of State Colin Powell, stated on the local Latvian radio that his country is not run by the representatives of the people and for the people, but by 400 wealthiest individuals. According to his words, these oligarchs are the one making decisions behind the curtain, and they are merely 0,001 percent of the population.³⁰ The year prior to that statement, he gave a lengthy interview for the small independent internet TV, *Realnews*, when he spoke about the oligarchs who control the decision-making and about the process in which political decision-making is going on in government. Still, none of the famous and big media outlets in the USA or in Western Europe published or reported of what he said.³¹ This understanding of the politics in the USA is not new, but it appeared also as the result of the research published in peer reviewed Journal in the United States in 2014. Findings corroborated “already diffused notion that United States are no more democracy and that the decisions and the policy are guided almost entirely by

²⁸ “Improving job quality and reducing gender gaps are essential to tackling growing inequality”, *OECD* 21/05/2015, Internet, <http://www.oecd.org/newsroom/reducing-gender-gaps-and-poor-job-quality-essential-to-tackle-growing-inequality.htm>, accessed on 05/09/2015.

²⁹ Larry Elliott, economics editor, and Ed Pilkington, “New Oxfam report says half of global wealth held by the 1%”, *The Guardian*, 19 January 2015, Internet, <http://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/jan/19/global-wealth-oxfam-inequality-davos-economic-summit-switzerland>, accessed on 25/01/2015.

³⁰ “US Run by 0.001% of American Population – Powell’s Former Chief of Staff”, *Sputnik News*, 29.08.2015, Internet, <http://sputniknews.com/us/20150829/1026327916.html#ixzz3l01ZAsMg>, accessed on 02/09/2015.

³¹ “Who Makes US Foreign Policy? - Lawrence Wilkerson on Reality Asserts Itself (1/3)”, *The Real News.com*, October 3, 14, Internet, http://therealnews.com/t2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=11839, accessed on 03/09/2015.

the interests and the will of the big lobbies and not according to the will of the majority or for the common good.”³²

We live in an age of the globalization of the capital, globalization of the economic and thus political influence, in an age of the erosion of the national sovereignty of democracy (Colin Crouch)³³ in the age of the rising international dominance of the transnational corporate class.³⁴

Hence, the USA and the west in general, as Colin Crouch, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, Alexander Zinoviev and many others previously exposed, is not anymore home of democracy, but rather oligarchical network with residual features of democracy where the people only have the illusion of influencing domestic and foreign policy. These ‘dead souls’ and their companions from academy or media are obviously not acting in order to keep the national interest and sovereignty. Therefore, they truly may be termed as global oligarchs, due to their tendency to shape and influence the globe according to their personal wishes and not for public good. Having an absence of national identity, globalisation of greed is masked in superficial cosmopolitanism and the will for the global power necessities global institutions of power and control and transformation of different societies and states in the one single global society, as announced by Alexandr Zinoviev and dreamed by Peter Drucker.³⁵

However, what is more dangerous is that even the freedom to oppose and criticize particular solutions like laws and policies is increasingly illegal. For

³² “When a majority of citizens disagrees with economic elites and/or with organised interests, they generally lose. Moreover, because of the strong status quo bias built into the US political system, even when fairly large majorities of Americans favour policy change, they generally do not get it... Multivariate analysis indicates that economic elites and organised groups representing business interests have substantial independent impacts on US government policy, while average citizens and mass-based interest groups have little or no independent influence.”, in: Martin Gilens and Benjamin I. Page, “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens”, *Perspectives on Politics*, 12, (2014), pp 564-581. Taken from Slobodan Janković, “Transformation of the Middle East after the Arab Spring”, in: (Ed) Taro Tsukimura, Ivona Ladevac, *Major International Issues in the 21st Century from a Perspective of Japan and Europe*, Global Resource Management Program, Doshisha University, Japan Institute of International Politics And Economics, Makedonska 25, Belgrade, Belgrade, 2015, (178), p. 140.

³³ Colin Crouch, *Post-Democracy*, Polity 2004, pp. 144.

³⁴ By Peter Phillips and Brady Osborne, “Financial Core of the Transnational Corporate Class”, *Project Censored*, September 9, 2013, Internet, <http://www.projectcensored.org/financial-core-of-the-transnational-corporate-class/>, retrieved on 08/11/2014.

³⁵ See more in Slobodan Jankovic, “Changes in the Middle East and in North Africa — Towards postsovereign world order”, op. cit., p. 276.

example, the informed, value oriented or purely scientific critique of the promotion of some of the LGBT rights and actions, and of gender theory can be sanctioned with the excuse of using 'discriminatory speech'. For some journalist or whistleblower to reveal state secret with the effect of protecting public interest in media (like exposing the lies of politicians regarding the Weapons of mass destructions in Iraq) is being subject to legal prosecution. Critical voices are simply covered by dumb silence in the controlled media.

Conclusion

Globalisation is today in the grey zone of no man's land, in dusk and it is directed toward totalitarian change of notions and understandings. In order to achieve it, old notions of sovereignty, national border and national state need to be dismantled. Freedom should remain the phrase, maybe with the meaning it has in the Orwell bestseller – 1984.

Although it is not as modern as it used to be in 1990s, political globalisation is being proposed again and again by some of the leading political figures of western society and by many in academia. Political and economic globalisation obviously appraises small circle of 'dead souls' that unlike Nikolai Gogol's dead souls are buying living souls and making them live in globally deprived cast of the 90 percent. These globalised oligarchs, who are on top of the transnational class, are accumulating unprecedented amounts of wealth and of political power. The result is the travesty of democracy, and perversion of the meaning of freedom in what used to be liberal democracies. In a way, it is indeed a class project.

Globalisation of governance requires less freedom of people in order to achieve effective and reasonably controllable administration over the world. It advocates freedom, not of men, but of goods, services, of financial transactions.

It is freedom from the control of the power and not freedom from the abuse of power. Globalisation of governance is obviously a process of the perversion and corruption of the basic notions of traditional and even of modern men, in order to prepare future governed citizens (if and when it happens) to accept informal slavery as the brave new world.

Literature

Agnew, John, "The New Global Economy: Time-Space Compression, Geopolitics, and Global Uneven Development", *Journal of World-Systems Research*, VII, 2, Fall 2001, pp. 133-154.

- Benvenisti, Eyal, "The Future of Sovereignty: The Nation State in the Global Governance Space", Global Trust Working paper 01/2015;
- Brdar, M, "Globalizacija I desuverenizacija: problem regionalizacije Srbije u aktuelnom geopolitičkom kontekstu", *Sociološki pregled*, vol. XXXVI, No. 1-2 Beograd January – June 2001;
- Canfora, Luciano, *La democrazia: Storia di un'ideologia*, Laterza 2010;
- Crouch, Colin, *Post-Democracy*, Polity 2004, pp. 144;
- Croucher, Sheila L, *Globalization and Belonging, The Politics of Identity in a Changing World*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Oxford 2004;
- Elliott, Larry economics editor, and Ed Pilkington, "New Oxfam report says half of global wealth held by the 1%", *The Guardian*, 19 January 2015, Internet, <http://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/jan/19/global-wealth-oxfam-inequality-davos-economic-summit-switzerland>, accessed on 25/01/2015;
- Litterae Encyclicae: Laudato Si'*, Libreria editrice Vaticano, I, 175;
- Litterae Encyclicae: CARITAS IN VERITATE*, Libreria editrice Vaticano, 2009, art. 57, 67;
- Gardner, Richard N, "The Hard Road to World Order", *Foreign Affairs*, April 1974, Volume 52, Number 3;
- Gilens, Martin, and Page, Benjamin I, "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens", *Perspectives on Politics*, 12, (2014), pp 564-581;
- Grečić, Vladimir, and Janković, Slobodan, "Managing Population Movements: The Challenge for Diplomacy in Southeast Europe", *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Winter/Spring 2010, Vol. XI, N. I, pp. 127-143;
- Hobbes, Thomas, *De Cive*, Religion, Chap. XV Of the Kingdome of God, by Nature, II;
- Huntington, Samuel P, "Dead Souls: The Denationalization of the American Elite", *The National Interest*, Spring 2004;
- "Improving job quality and reducing gender gaps are essential to tackling growing inequality", *OECD* 21/05/2015, Internet, <http://www.oecd.org/newsroom/reducing-gender-gaps-and-poor-job-quality-essential-to-tackle-growing-inequality.htm>, accessed on 05/09/2015;
- (Janković, Slobodan,) Јанковић, Слободан, „Промене на Блиском истоку и у Северној Африци — Ка постсувереном светском поретку”, (Changes in

- the Middle East and in North Africa — Towards postsovereign world order), *National Interest N.*(Nacionalni interes), Belgrade 2/2011, vol. 11, pp. 261-315.
- Janković, Slobodan, “Borders In The Balkans: Longevity In The Postmodern Era”, Collection of papers *Serbia In Contemporary Geo-Strategic Surroundings*, Slavica Đerić-Magazinović and Nevenka Jeftić-Šarčević (eds.), Institute of International Politics and Economics, Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Serbia, Belgrade 2010, pp. 165-178;
- Janković, Slobodan, “National, Cultural and Civilisation Borders in the Balkans”, in: *On Borders: Comparative Analyses from Southeastern Europe and East Asia*, Lingua-Culture Contextual Studies in Ethnic Conflicts of the World (LICCOSEC), Vol. 17, Osaka 2011, pp. 31-44;
- Janković, Slobodan, “Israeli borders Amid Globalisation and Regional Tensions”, originalni, in: Dimitrijević, Duško, Mitrović Dragana and Lađevac, Ivona (eds), *The Meaning of Borders and Border Issues in the Age of Globalization: Europe and Asia*, Proceedings of round table conference, Institute of International Politics and Economics 2012, pp. 123-136;
- Janković, Slobodan, “Transformation of the Middle East after the Arab Spring”, in: (Ed) Taro Tsukimura, Ivona Lađevac, *Major International Issues in the 21st Century from a Perspective of Japan and Europe*, Global Resource Management Program, Doshisha University, Japan Institute of International Politics And Economics, Makedonska 25, Belgrade, Belgrade, 2015, pp. 178.
- Kaldor, Mary, *New & Old Wars – organized violence in a global era*, Polity Press, Cambridge (UK) 2001;
- Kemp, Adriana, “Citizenship, Ethnicity and Globalization”, *Geopolitics*, 10:188–191, 2005;
- Keohane, Robert O, “Global Governance and Democratic Accountability”, Durham, Chapter prepared for a volume to be edited by David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi from the Miliband Lectures, *London School of Economics*, Spring 2002;
- Krugman, Paul, “For Richer”, *NY Times*, October 20, 2002, Internet, <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/10/20/magazine/20INEQUALITY.html>, accessed on 25/04/2014;
- Phillips, Peter, and Osborne, Brady, “Financial Core of the Transnational Corporate Class”, *Project Censored*, September 9, 2013, Internet, <http://www.projectcensored.org/financial-core-of-the-transnational-corporate-class/>, retrieved on 08/11/2014;

- Ribeiro, Jack, "The 'devil is in the detail' of global financial regulatory reform", 27 January 2011, Internet, <http://globalblogs.deloitte.com/deloitteperspectives/2011/01/the-devil-is-in-the-detail.html>, retrieved on 01/02/2011;
- Schmitt, Carl, *Le categorie del 'politico'*, il Mulino, Bologna 2005;
- Smith, Neil, "The endgame of globalization", *Political Geography* 25 (2006) 1–14,
- Veber, Maks *Politički spisi*, Filip Višnjić/ Službeni glasnik, Beograd 2006, pp. 505, (*Weber, Max, Political Writings*);
- Who Makes US Foreign Policy? - Lawrence Wilkerson on Reality Asserts Itself (1/3)", *The Real News.com*, October 3, 14, Internet, http://therealnews.com/t2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=11839, accessed on 03/09/2015.