

GLOBALIZATION AS A POLICY OF HEGEMONY

REVIEW ARTICLE

UDK 316.334.2/3:339.97/98	DOI 10.7251/DEFEN2454057S	COBISS.RS-ID 141350657
---------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------

Davor Strika¹

Abstract: *The concept of globalization often implies integrative and affirmative processes of networking and linking states with the aim of creating a larger international scope of production and trade, the exchange and flow of capital, goods, people, and services. However, alongside this, globalization can also represent a political platform for achieving particular interests of certain or a small number of states, peoples, nations, and multinational corporations, leading to unequal economic and political development among states, as well as to policies of hegemony and imperialism. This paper will discuss the values and ideas of globalization, its consequences, as well as forms of its manifestation.*

Keywords: *globalization, hegemony, democracy, USA, unipolarity, multipolarity, international relations, global interdependence.*

INTRODUCTION

Globalization mostly implies processes and changes leading to extensive connections between states, people, and economies in commercial, economic, political, and various other terms. Throughout history, there have been several developmental phases of globalization, while some theorists argue that globalization never truly ceased, and that its processes are permanently present among states striving to achieve their interests and goals, and that, in the very logic of capital and trade, the ideas of mundialization and international connectivity emerge. However, the

¹ Corresponding author: PhD. candidate at the Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka, e-mail: davorstrika@yahoo.com

process of globalization, while bringing numerous positive developments for humanity, can also be abused by certain states as a tool to pursue their own, often lucrative interests. Therefore, this paper will discuss how the most dominant state of the 21st century, the USA, has utilized, directed, and dominated the processes of globalization to achieve its national and global interests, leading to the development of American hegemony. The conditions for such actions were created with the end of the Cold War in 1991 and the end of the bipolar world, as well as the creation of a new global order with a unipolar system dominated by the USA. In such circumstances, the most powerful state in the world proclaimed globalization as the goal of its foreign policy. However, this type of globalization essentially represented the Americanization of the planet through the exercise of soft power and influence, opening the door to American hegemony and influence without competition. The possibilities of serious opposition to such aspirations and policies by other states were highly limited. Such a constellation of relations often provoked dissatisfaction and discontent among certain sovereigntist groups of countries, which faced serious consequences when opposing the processes of mundialization and the creation of a new world order.

Today, in the 21st century, the world is increasingly moving towards multipolarity, a concept that existed on the eve of the World War I. In such circumstances, the USA is attempting to maintain its international position and influence by imposing its ideas, values and policies, however, it is facing the rising power and influence of the BRICS countries. Having learned from the experience of the Peloponnesian War, we can expect an American struggle or preventive action in order for it to maintain the acquired influence in international relations. Therefore, globalization nowadays still contains the idea of further expansion of American influence and interests around the world.

THE CONCEPT OF GLOBALIZATION

There are various interpretations and definitions of this concept in contemporary science, as well as approaches to its explanation and definition. Globalization is now considered from political, international, economic, social, and many other aspects. Wittkopf et al.'s suggests that "glo-

balization is the rapid integration of national economies, not only in the realm of ideas, information, and technology but simultaneously a process with a powerful impact on political, social, and cultural relations worldwide” (Wittkopf et al., 2008: 546). Hence, its impact and manifestations are of a multifaceted nature and touch all spheres of life. For the modern form of globalization, it can be said that it resulted from the development of modern technologies, not only in the 20th and 21st centuries but was additionally accelerated based on geographical discoveries and industrial revolutions centuries before. Although the process is undoubtedly influenced by industrial and technological revolutions, it is also a process that has been ongoing since ancient times and continues to this day. In modern circumstances, the rapid development and interconnection of nations and states are further influenced by the emergence and development of social networks, the expansion of capital, as well as global conflicts that have enabled the military presence and cultural influence of certain states on other continents (such as the American occupation and military presence in bases in Japan - Okinawa, Germany - Ramstein, Italy - Naples, and the like). “No other country in the world has as many military bases that the occupied countries often refuse to accept” (Ganzer, 2021: 22). Such USA military presence in countries around the world has enabled the promotion of American culture, the adoption of American values, and the imposition of American foreign policy priorities and interests. Similarly, Čenić takes Wittkopf’s point when he says that globalization is a complex concept and that it has been present in economic science since the sixties of the twentieth century: “There is no universally accepted definition of this term. The reason lies in the complexity and multidimensionality of the globalization process, which encompasses a wide range. Therefore, in addition to economy, the process of globalization is present in society, culture, politics, and in almost all segments of social life. The important fact is that globalization is a general process of interdependent variables and that it is not possible to distinguish its elements according to the subjects that cause it, nor to separate the process of globalization in one domain from the general process. Accordingly, it is certain that globalization represents much more than the economic integration of states. Globalization is a process of overcoming historically established borders, i.e.

the erosion of state borders. For modern globalization, it can be accepted that it represents the end of geography because technological inventions eliminate spatial distances” (Čenić, 2010: 148).

What can be concluded from these views is that globalization leads to overcoming historically established borders, thus undermining the fundamental principles of the Peace of Westphalia from 1648, which implied that every state had complete freedom, i.e. sovereignty to govern its affairs on its territory without consulting or being subjected to the dictates or policies of other states. In the context of international relations and foreign policy, globalization also means accelerated interconnection and co-operation among states through international institutions, which, among other things, involve the creation of the concept of international responsibility, i.e. a system of collective security. The contours of the existing collective security system emerged after World War I when the concept of the balance of power² was replaced by the concept of collective security. The newly established system involved the creation of international institutions, such as the League of Nations - an organization whose primary goal was to maintain international peace and order. After the World War II, this institution was replaced by the United Nations, which continues to exist and operate to this day.

Therefore, the concept and process discussed have a long history of evolution and action. Critics of globalization and other sovereigntists emphasize its negative characteristics and consequences. Andrew Heywood believes that globalization is the biggest threat to the nation-state and to states in general, “in general, globalization is a process in which events and decisions made in one part of the world affect people in another part. One of its manifestations is the emergence of a global economy in which it has become significantly more difficult, if not im-

2 David Hume described the balance of power as the "rule of wise politics" (Nye, 2006: 91), while Woodrow Wilson considered it the "principle of evil" (Nye, 2006: 91) because it encouraged European powers to treat other world states as "pieces of cheese to be arbitrarily taken and dealt out" (Nye, 2006: 91). Proponents of the balance of power argue that it represents and ensures political stability in Europe. On the other hand, its critics insist that this concept fueled rivalry and an arms race among European powers, ultimately leading to the outbreak of the World War I. "The balance of power has maintained short-term peace in Europe for 100 years, but it did not secure a long-lasting one, as this concept led to the Great War - the largest conflict in human history" (Nye, 2006: 91).

possible, for every country to control international capital movements. The consequences of this process for the state are dramatic” (Heywood, 2004: 194). This means that states have limited means to manage political and economic life and secure progress for themselves. “Political globalization is no less important, as it is reflected in the increasing role of international and supranational bodies, such as the United Nations, the European Union (EU), NATO, and the World Trade Organization. For example, it is clear that EU membership threatens the power of the state because an increasing number of decisions (on monetary, agricultural, fisheries policy, defense, and foreign affairs) are made by European institutions rather than member states” (Heywood, 2004: 194). Giddens is on the trail of these views when he says: “Western policy seems to be the source of poverty and underdevelopment. These beliefs are often based on facts. The critical conditions of some African countries, for example, reflect the long-term consequences of Western colonization and recent Western interventions during the Cold War. Such impacts are often equated with globalization itself. In developing countries, globalization is largely seen as the latest stage of Western exploitation of the Third World - a project by means of which wealthy countries earn at the expense of the poor” (Giddens, 2005: 13). These processes also tell us that the understanding and perception of sovereignty have been disrupted, i.e. the concept of state sovereignty that has existed until now and has been the way states function since the aforementioned Peace of Westphalia from 1648.

From a sociological perspective, Lape et al. (2005) consider that the process of globalization implies the acceptance of dominant patterns of behavior and actions of leading countries that are the drivers and protagonists of such processes and policies by less developed, less independent, and less influential states. Thus, this type of globalization is closely linked to soft power and the interests of the most powerful states in the world. The value system that is promoted and imposed disrupts traditional forms of behavior, primarily within the family and community, and leads to contentious processes that result in the erosion of the centuries-old authenticity of many nations and cultures.

POLICY OF GLOBALIZATION IN THE CONTEXT OF CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS - ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL ASPECTS

In today's modern era, we are active participants and witnesses to the process of globalization and daily, increasingly intense connection of peoples and nations. The world and information are more accessible than ever. A glimpse into events in the farthest corners of our planet is shared within seconds, as long as it takes our personal smartphones to load a specific search. The available information is often subject to filtering and processing with the goal of indoctrination and ideological shaping of people, but one cannot dispute the speed of their flow, which is unprecedented in the history of mankind so far. The entire process of networking, connecting people, states, cultures, nations, as it is highlighted - is not new, nor did it emerge in the 21st or 20th century. The origins of globalization can be traced back to even Alexander the Great and his creation of Hellenistic culture based on a fusion of Greek and Near and Far Eastern cultures. Much time has passed since then and there have been several different phases of globalization, as well as several of its protagonists. Depending on the times, historical circumstances, and power relations, the protagonists of the world mundialization have shifted (Ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, the Portuguese Empire, the Spanish Empire, the French Empire, the British Empire, the USA, etc.). All of these states were the most powerful and influential at certain points in history, or within what was known as the world at the time. It is evident that all these states benefited from spreading their culture, empire, power, and influence. Each expansion implied simultaneously mixing and merging, which is one of the fundamental characteristics and features of globalization. However, it is undeniable that very often these imperial powers imposed their values and culture on peoples, often by using an open physical force - particularly on those who were subjugated, in order to secure their presence in those regions. The presence of imperial powers in occupied territories led to resource exploitation and the impoverishment of many civilizations.

Therefore, based on what has been said, it is evident that various geographic and technological discoveries accelerate and contribute to the faster processes of globalization and connecting the world and its people.

Throughout history, globalization as a process has often occurred spontaneously due to the spread and merging of different peoples and cultures, but in the modern age, it has been exploited and projected as a continuation of imperialist policies by the most powerful nations. What we will particularly focus on is the fact that by the late 20th and early 21st century, the protagonists of this process became the United States of America. Globalization in the 21st century implies an ever-greater economic interconnectedness between states. This kind of globalization has enabled the creation of a massive global capitalist market, which, in these circumstances, secures domination and benefits mostly to the economically and commercially most powerful states. Heywood believes that in today's world we can talk about the existence of three types of globalization: "a) cultural globalization, which represents a process where information produced in one part of the world enters a global flow that tends to equalize cultural differences among nations, regions, and individuals. This process is sometimes described as the process of McDonaldization; b) political globalization, which is clearly reflected in the growing importance of international organizations. They are international because they have jurisdiction not only within one state but also in the international area composed of several states; c) economic globalization, which is expressed in the idea that no national economy is isolated or self-sufficient anymore, but they are all to some extent integrated into an interdependent global economy. Globalization is linked to homogenization since cultural, social, economic, and political diversity is destroyed in a world where we all watch the same TV programs, buy the same goods, eat the same food, cheer for the same sports stars, but globalization is often accompanied by regionalization and multiculturalism" (Heywood, 2004: 268–270). Kissinger concludes that, at the beginning of the 21st century, conditions were created for the first time for a unique global economic system, and markets on all continents are in constant interaction. In such a constellation of relations, Kissinger sees the USA as the protagonist of these developments: "The USA has been driving force behind the process of globalization, but it has also reaped the greatest benefits from the process. American capital has made an astonishing array of new technologies, their distribution and application throughout the world. The successes of

the American economy have been so good that it is hard to imagine they could have been better” (Kissinger, 2003: 176).

Based on what has been discussed, it can be concluded that the progress of developing countries largely depends on the availability of private capital and investments, and the continuity of investments greatly depends on legal security, return rates, and reasonable risk. Therefore, any country that wishes to become more competitive must engage in the processes of globalization, both politically and economically, otherwise, it risks falling behind the processes guided by the world’s most developed and powerful states³. What is clear is that the global market is facing two different trends. On one hand, it opens up opportunities for unprecedented financial and economic success for many companies and nations. However, at the same time, the global market creates sensitivity to political upheavals and the danger of creating a new divide, not so much between the rich and poor but between those who are part of the globalized world and those who are not. These trends have consequences for the “undeveloped world.” With this economic system and a capitalist way of doing business, where it is almost inevitable that the big dominate the small, American and European companies dominate those in developing countries. While this solves the problem of access to capital, it simultaneously creates political tensions which, especially in times of crisis, can result in attacks on the process of mundialization: “Globalization represents a game of winners and losers. Multinational companies and industrially developed states are undoubtedly considered winners, primarily the United States of America, on the contrary, losers are developing countries where earnings are low, regulations are weak or non-existent, and production is primarily oriented toward the global market, rather than domestic products” (Heywood, 2004: 274). Based on this Heywood’s statement, it can be noted that, as the USA and other developed countries progressed, the standard in other nations significantly declined. Such a constellation of relations undoubtedly led to new injustices, dissatisfaction, and feelings of a resurgence of colonialism and imperialism.

³ According to the view of liberal pluralism, the emergence of a global economy should be welcomed, since free trade allows each country to specialize in the production of those goods and services for which it is best prepared.

“Globalization is the reality of our time” (Bacevich, 2002: 38), as Bill Clinton once said, while Bacevich, at the beginning of the 21st century, emphasized that “globalization⁴ cannot be stopped, just as integration cannot. Simply put, the world is changing too rapidly, laptops, computers, CDs, satellites, the internet have greatly accelerated the world, made it more accessible, and sped up the flow of information more than ever before” (Bacevich, 2002: 38). Madeleine Albright mentioned: “A lot of energy in the State Department is spent on encouraging foreign governments to act in the interest of the common good. Although globalization was initially a political phenomenon, a phenomenon and process, it was not just that. It represented a social, cultural phenomenon and was connected to the concept of power. Globalization established the rules for nations and states that would dominate in the 21st century” (Bacevich, 2002: 52). When Bill Clinton, in the presence of Chinese President Jiang Zemin, in the White House in 1997, said that China was on the wrong side of history, he sent a message that America, along with its allies, was on the winning side of history and that America determined the processes in the world (Bacevich, 2002: 32). This sufficiently speaks about the American political and foreign policy self-confidence of that time, as well as the fact that Albright called the processes of globalization “the processes of common good-interest.” Therefore, all of the above meant that the USA is leading the processes of globalization, and that those who do not participate in them will be excluded from important international processes. It meant that globalization represented American state policy, a concept of development, and the orientation of American foreign policy embraced and accepted as an operational ideological platform to pursue its interests. Globalization aligned with the principles of soft power, and in the 1990s, the USA, as the sole remaining superpower after the dissolution of the USSR and the end of the Cold War, decided to adopt and promote it

4 "For me, one of the paradoxes of the globalization of the new world is that in the economic sense globalization represents a very efficient decision-making process due to the speed with which multinational/global companies from all parts of the world communicate. If you go to any company in the USA, you will see different groups of Chinese, Indians, Africans, Pakistanis and Americans, all working together, cooperating, overcoming differences in language and culture, while the company responds very effectively to the problems and challenges it faces. However, when we talk about governments, we find rigid structures, based on models from the 19th century and even earlier. A rigid system that does not allow many options for cooperation on different issues" (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 271).

to realize its aspirations and foreign policy orientations, proclaiming it as values to strive for. In this way, the USA claimed international hegemony and influence. The unipolar world created at the beginning of the 90s of the 20th century made it possible for them.

Madeleine Albright often emphasized that Americans should be “the authors of history” (Bacevich, 2002: 33). This is also supported by Clinton’s statement in which he says: “There is no point whatsoever in talking about domestic politics or domestic economy, capital has become global. Products are global, services are global. Most importantly, information is global and has become the king of the global economy” (Bacevich, 2002: 95).

GLOBALIZATION AS A POLICY OF HEGEMONY

The conclusions we have reached so far are clear, American entrepreneurship had to and was morally obliged to operate on a global level, or else it would stagnate and fail. The markets they needed for exporting their products were global in nature and volume. This was the logic behind the Marshall Plan for the reconstruction of Europe after the World War II. Through this plan, USA essentially financed the recovery and rise of markets to which they would later export their products. In Clinton’s opinion, the approach to an open global market became a characteristic of modern society and economy: “Open and competitive trade will enrich us as a nation and a society” (Bacevich, 2002: 96), he believed. It is clearly evident that the American economy still operates in a globalist manner. What is indicative in such circumstances is that the USA must continue with interventionism, both in foreign policy and in economic and financial flows, in order to maintain its position and influence in a globalized world. Interestingly, George H. W. Bush⁵ was never a strong

5 After coming to power, Bush did what every American president before him did - he used force to protect American interests. The first example was Panama, where President Manuel Noriega threatened to cancel obedience to the American government and thus reduce the influence of the USA in this extremely important country for America (Panama Canal). Bacevich talks about how Noriega involved the state in relations with drug lords and how such a policy resulted in a distance from the USA. Soon, in the morning hours of December 20, 1989, the USA launched a brief attack on the Panamanian Defense Forces involving 26,000 USA troops. The epilogue of the action was the appointment of Guljeramo Endar as president of Panama, the man who won the elections in May of that year, which Noriega cancelled (Bacevich, 2002: 69).

proponent of globalization, unlike Clinton. However, after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, his statements are well known, in which he stated that technology had overcome tyranny in many countries and that the information age could become an era of liberation (Bacevich, 2002: 73). Bush also spoke about the interconnectedness of world economies, emphasizing that a decrease in the growth and volume of trade slows down a country's economy on a local level as well. He often emphasized that America can only grow in the coming centuries if it can compete globally in every part of the world. Therefore, in his opinion, America must take advantage of the opportunity to open new markets.

However, there are those who believe that globalization and the insistence on it have made the USA vulnerable, that is, that in the course of the globalization process, the USA clashed with states that did not recognize or accept this kind of process and policies because they were concerned about preserving their own identity (Bacevich, 2002: 123). As such, the policy of globalization turned America, as Bacevich defines it, into an "American Empire" that emerged as the dominant state after the collapse of communism, the end of the Cold War, and what Fukuyama defined as the "End of History." Globalization served the USA for promoting its interests, which often clashed with the interests of other sovereign states, leading to the imposition of American ideas and visions. Such an approach results in a policy of hegemony. Nenad Kecmanović (2005)⁶ states that the USA, primarily in the Balkans in the 1990s, after the end of the Cold War when it remained the sole superpower in a unipolar world, implemented a policy of hegemony, which created a democratic empire from them. The USA interventions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, later in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, all speak to the idea that the policy of globalization, which in this case implies the expansion of American interests, way of life, political system, democracy, and goals, often presumed military confrontation with dissenting states, which is a condition for the emergence of hegemony. Naomi Klein, in her paper "The Shock Doctrine," (2008) talks about how

6 A parallel is created between that America and Rome during the transition from republic to empire, when the Roman Empire still nominally existed as a republic, but in all its aspects existed and functioned as an empire.

the IMF and the World Bank, which are under the greatest influence of the USA, insist that countries in transition (most often former communist countries) quickly privatize, liberalize markets, reduce public spending and more to make a faster transition to a capitalist way of functioning. This kind of policy and transition approach often led to the impoverishment of a large number of former communist countries. Such impoverishment further resulted in significant political and security crises and challenges. If we examine which country has the most capital in these institutions, it is clear how international organizations are controlled to serve the interests of individual countries. "It appears that it was not necessary to use weapons and the army to achieve massive exploitation - all that was needed were shrewd bankers, compliant and sometimes bribable local officials, and an international financial regime whose flagships were the IMF and the World Bank, acting like debt-collection agency for creditors" (Stiglitz, 2018: 403-404). Mander and Goldsmith also speak about how the USA used these institutions as instruments for implementing its interests and policies when they say: "If a Third World country managed to develop a modest economy, the World Bank and the IMF, in alliance with the U.S. government and multinational corporations, would set out to systematically destroy it" (Mander & Goldsmith, 2003: 266).

Therefore, American interventionism in foreign policy, as well as political and armed confrontations with dissenting states, speaks to how the policy of globalization has been replaced or equated with the policy of USA hegemony. Đurović also discusses the trend of American hegemony and its roots, as well as aspirations when he says: "The guiding idea of the first settlers in America about the right to conquer by divine will and grace has been replaced by the idea of assimilation, then Americanization, to transform this idea today into an idea of hegemony over the entire world" (Mićović, 2001: 46). So, in much of the world, sovereign states have equated the processes of globalization with the processes of American hegemony. The aforementioned USA interventions against other sovereign states support this thesis. The question remains how will the processes of globalization unfold in a world where American supremacy and hegemony are being questioned.

"The most significant political debate about globalization concerns

its impact on the economy. Proponents of globalization, including the USA itself, believe it is a key factor underlying the trend towards democratization and, in its most optimistic version, as Fukuyama discussed, will lead to the end of history. However, critics of globalization say it disrupts democratization in two ways. Firstly, it leads to the concentration of economic, and thus political power, in the hands of multinational corporations. These are economic organizations that produce in multiple countries and now dominate multiple markets. What gives them an advantage over national governments and allows them to evade democratic control is the ability to shift capital and production to another location in the world. Developing countries are particularly vulnerable to such occurrences” (Heywood, 2004: 276–277). However, the fact is that we no longer live in a unipolar world formed after the end of the bipolar world - the Cold War and the collapse of the USSR. The 21st century world is increasingly moving towards a multipolar world that existed before the World War I, in which there were several great powers competing for decisive international influence.

GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE AND THE MULTIPOLAR WORLD OF THE 21ST CENTURY

“The quest for a wise foreign policy must begin with an understanding that globalization, in its essence, implies global interdependence” (Brzezinski, 2004: 8).

We have had the opportunity to observe and conclude so far that globalization represents a process of international connection between peoples and countries that occurs continuously based on various aspects, with varying intensity during different phases of history. We also discussed how globalization was proclaimed as a goal of American foreign policy to achieve American imperialistic interests. However, it is necessary to mention how and in what ways it has influenced the creation of a system of global interdependence. Although globalization was adopted by the USA after the end of the Cold War as state policy and a means of achieving American dominance in the world, marking the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, when American culture and soft

power were unparalleled, the processes of globalization, which led to an increasing economic interconnection between states, simultaneously created a system of international interdependence due to the rise of other countries, their economic, industrial, and military strengthening. Their economic rise led to the creation of a greater number of respectable powers, thus the disappearance of the unipolar world and the creation of a multipolar environment based on economic, financial, but also political global interdependence. However, Bacevich discusses five ideas that stood out in Bush's administration and were also present in the Clinton's administration: "The identification of interdependence as a dominant reality in international politics; dedication to global openness - globalization; commitment to free trade and investments; belief in the need for American hegemony in the world; rejection of isolationism in American foreign policy" (Bacevich, 2002: 72). Therefore, based on these ideas/goals, we see that the absolute imperative of American foreign policy is "continuous economic growth" (Bacevich, 2002: 79) and maintaining the status of a world hegemon without allowing the rise of a new challenger. The wealth and appeal of American soft power at the end of the 20th century may have been the greatest the world has ever seen, which, during the period of American triumphalism after the Cold War victory, made the USA the driver of the globalization process. American soft power and the process of mundialization were natural partners. In this way, globalization became equivalent to Americanization – as a stage and a political-ideological platform for the easier realization of American state interests and the interests of big capital: "It is considered that globalization, in principle, serves the interests of the USA and other Western countries and is more or less identical to Americanization" (Giddens, 2005: 14). Nevertheless, circumstances changed in just a few decades. What was once considered the "American peace" or a world that would be shaped according to the model and visions of centuries-old American influence began to lose its foundations faster than expected: "While some count aircraft carriers and so clearly put the USA in first place, it should be said that the USA was that, but that the unipolar, hegemonic world is the past, although many still do not understand it" (Elzner, 2021: 75).

The policy of globalization was a logical sequence of events for the USA, if we know its history. Emerging as a nation of freedom, a fusion of different nations, it had no problem spreading its multicultural identity and values to other nations and states. However, the problem laid in the fact that many states and societies were not ready to accept such processes and characteristics, while some categorically rejected such ideas with open contempt. Meanwhile, as a consequence of hegemony and mundialization, many extremist and radical movements emerged, resulting in the rise of terrorism.

One of the most significant debates regarding the impact of globalization concerns its effect on democracy. “Globalization can be said to undermine democracy in two influential ways. Firstly, it leads to the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of multinational corporations. Secondly, democracy is endangered by the fact that the speed of the economy significantly surpasses the speed of political globalization. While economic activity pays less and less attention to national borders, politics still largely operates within them, and international organizations are too weak to control global capitalism” (Giddens, 2005: 16). In this way, globalization, under the influence of big capital, erodes one of its most significant ideological exports - democracy, and puts it at the service and in favor of big capital.

Based on the above, it can be concluded that the globalization process intensified significantly after the end of the Cold War. The victory in the Cold War opened the opportunity for the USA to dominate over other states in a unipolar system. The USA imposed its values on the world, implementing and pursuing its own interests in the process. The American president during that period was George H. W. Bush, who wanted to work towards greater openness because he believed that this kind of policy was of paramount interest and importance for the USA: “I see a world of open borders, open and free trade, and, most importantly, a world of open minds” (Bacevich, 2002: 73). These views led to the creation of NAFTA - the North American Free Trade Agreement (USA, Canada, and Mexico). Moreover, Bush played a significant role in establishing the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation. Bush believed that the benefits of free trade and globalization were not just economic but also political, as it implied con-

necting states and their collective action in solving many problems. However, the question arises whether it was really possible to create a common, large global market that would be of equal and equitable benefit to all and what its implications would be. Past experiences tell us that such an idea is still very challenging to achieve, and in some segments, almost impossible. Kissinger believes that the “greatest change in the nature of contemporary international relations is the consequence of the general acceptance of a concept that certain universal principles can be enforced, whether it is about the United Nations or in some extreme cases, such as Kosovo” (Kissinger, 2003: 195).

When we talk about global interdependence, it is primarily about the relations of interdependence and coexistence between the USA and China. Many believe that the biggest challenge in the 21st century will be finding a way to integrate China (which is economically, militarily, and politically rising) into the international community, stabilize it, and make it act proactively. Moreover, there is no doubt that China will become bigger, stronger, and more influential, and an increasingly dynamic actor in the international system, which could ultimately threaten the international position and dominance of the USA. Brzezinski says that the integration of China into the international system will be more challenging than the integration of other smaller states because it will require changes and a reevaluation of American dominance in it (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 113).⁷

However, „the fact is that global capital gravity and concentration are shifting to the Far East, and with that, the era of six centuries of Western dominance is coming to its end. Nonetheless, if we consider the ratio of intellect, economy, development, infrastructure, military resources, and technology, the North America and Europe together can still maintain global leadership, at least for a few more decades, if not more. Namely, China faces problems of an aging population, poverty, and resource scarcity, while India may face a large number of internal ethnic issues in the future, especially if there is a political awakening and self-awareness among its people (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 219).

⁷ At the same time emphasizing that the USA must not behave patronizingly towards China and its leadership, because it is about people and country with a rich and influential culture (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 120).

Nevertheless, constant economic growth and, thus, political and military strengthening of new powers point to the imminent demise of the previous dominance and hegemony of the USA, which was possible and achievable through the existence of a unipolar world. Such a scenario broadly opens the door to the creation of a new multipolar world with a large number of regional powers and areas of interest.

Ignatius offers a different perspective on understanding the relation between the USA and China, as well as Japan. Namely, he takes the point that, at this moment, the USA is spending more than it produces, and the continuation of the economic decline in the USA, alongside the simultaneous economic growth of China, could pose a serious problem for America's international position in the future, as well as the outlook of the world as we know it: "Chinese and Japanese cover the USA trade deficit and accumulate a significant portion of their debt. This makes the USA very vulnerable, especially if the Chinese, in some case, decide on a more serious and fundamental conflict with the USA" (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 147). However, being familiar with the interdependence between the USA and China, manifested through over a billion dollars of Chinese bonds in the USA, it is difficult to expect harmful actions by China against the USA, as it would simultaneously mean acting against its own interests. Essentially, this relation makes them partners, "they depend on each other" (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 148). It is important not to forget Brzezinski's views, where he emphasizes the following: "Today's allies of the USA are: Europe (which is also a competitor) and several Far Eastern countries (Japan, South Korea) and several smaller states" (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 150). Therefore, based on this claim, it is easy to conclude that, in his opinion, all other states are open competition to the USA.

It is crucial to closely monitor and assess the position of India and its future relations with the USA. "India was of no help to the West during the Cold War, and they were of no help during the Afghanistan War either. Their sole goal is to limit the influence, power, and presence of Pakistan in the region (which often leads Pakistanis to some hasty actions that fur-

ther burden relations with India)” (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 144)⁸.

It is evident that new powers, especially China and Russia, are on the rise, threatening to diminish and restrict the power and influence of the USA in Asia and the international system, which could gradually create a new multipolar world.

For almost two decades after the end of the Cold War, the USA has had complete dominance in international relations, shaping the world to its own standards. In such a unipolar world, other states and nations accepted the values and goals of the USA as universal, while the process of globalization imposed trends and policies that corresponded to their interests. However, much faster than expected, due to various political and economic reasons, the position and influence of China, Russia, India, Brazil, and other possible challengers to American policy have grown. Although the USA influence has gotten weaker in certain matters (Libya, Syria), most American international relations theorists believe that the USA is still where it was decades ago: “We are not a declining power. We are still full of energy and optimism, but maintaining leadership is the key. In the 20th century, Europe represented a crisis area - a source of international instability, and that is what we had to focus on. Today, Asia represents a place of challenge, i.e. a place of further American competence or decline. However, our strength lies in our diversity. Our culture is a culture of diversity. We have influences from people of different cultures, different ethnic groups, and we have always managed to assimilate them. Differences and perceptions of them are less common among us than in Europe, but recently there has been a rise in xenophobia in the USA, especially towards immigrants and the Latino community, which should be foreign to the American people” (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 155–156). On the other hand, Elzner states: “The rise of China to the number one position in many respects poses a systemic challenge to the West, historically the second serious challenge after the USSR” (Elzner, 2021: 85).

8 Brzezinski believes that India has huge social differences, but they are still more successful in democratic standards compared to China, but also that they significantly lag behind China in developing the urban sector and the transport system. The second biggest problem of India is the illiteracy of the population, in which India is much worse than China, especially among women, where the percentage is around 50%. (Brzezinski & Scowcroft, 2008: 146)

CONCLUSION

This paper discussed globalization, its manifestations, and the consequences it brings. We have presented various forms of globalization, delved into its causes, and examined the processes involved. We have also had the opportunity to show how globalization, as a process, was politically exploited by the politically and economically most powerful countries at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century. It served as a means to implement American foreign policy. “Globalization restructures, profoundly, our ways of life. It is led by the West, bears a strong stamp of American political and economic power, and has very uneven consequences” (Giddens, 2005: 27).

The policy of globalization was used and promoted as an American value orientation and foreign policy dogma after the end of the Cold War in 1991, when the containment policy, directed against the USSR in a bipolar world, was replaced by the policy of globalization in a unipolar world. In reality, we have observed that the policy of globalization essentially represented the spread of American ideology and goals under the influence of both soft and, quite often, hard power. It was, in essence, the promotion of the American vision of the world under the guise of a unified vision. Such a policy, as well as the sanctioning of dissenting nations – other sovereign states, created from American globalization policy - a policy of hegemony that involved the spread of American interests, even at the cost of armed conflicts and interventions worldwide, which often eventually happened. Thus, the globalization, i.e. this kind of American policy and advocacy gained many and fierce opponents around the world, which, to a large extent, influenced the emergence and development of the global terrorist threat in the 21st century.

For that reason, it is necessary to emphasize that traditional issues and challenges of power and geopolitics continue to be present in the modern world. For the first time in history, the entire world is politically active, and this is the result of the French Revolution, whose ideas and values spread throughout Europe and Asia in the late 19th and throughout the 20th century. Ideas have become global. The greatest problems in human history have been wars and struggles for survival but also exter-

mination: the Armenian Genocide, the Holocaust, and many other examples. However, despite these past experiences, intolerances are nowadays being created at the global level as well, intolerance towards differences, and significant disparities and inequalities in the standard of living among people. These divisions create xenophobia, racism, migrations, climate change, and more. Therefore, the question arises in what way will this kind of segregation manifest itself, and in which direction could international order and relations move in the future. “Inequalities between rich and poor continue to grow, and the primary responsibility lies with globalization” (Giddens, 2005: 14). It is necessary to remember, as a warning and reminder, that a period of great divisions, inequality, and injustice preceded all major world conflicts and wars.

However, what is also a fact that we have discussed is the change in power relations in the 21st century compared to the end of the last century, when the USA was an unrivaled political, military, and economic power. That being the case, the question arises: how will globalization policy manifest itself in the future, and will we witness the creation of a new multipolar international system in which multiple powers will play a crucial role, or will international circumstances and history create a new superpower that will become a new protagonist in the processes of globalization?! “Globalization has been poorly managed. The negative outcomes were not inevitable; they resulted from policies. The rules governing globalization are partly to blame; they are unjust to developing countries and allowed capital flows that were destabilizing. But even with such rules in place, developed countries should have prevented what happened, rather than having so many developing countries, as well as developed ones, end up as losers from globalization. Globalization, if properly managed, could have been beneficial to all” (Giddens, 2005: 15).

REFERENCES

1. Bacevich, A. (2002). *American Empire - The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy*. Harvard University Press.
2. Brzezinski, Z. (2004). *Američki izbor - Globalna dominacija ili globalno vodstvo*. CID.
3. Brzezinski, Z., & Scowcroft, B. (2008). *America and the World - Conversations on the Future of American Foreign Policy*. Basic Books,
4. Wittkopf, E., Jones, C., & Kegley, C. (2008). *American Foreign Policy - Pattern and Process*. Thomson Higher Education.
5. Ganzer, D. (2021). *Imperija SAD - Beskrupulozna svetska sila*. Laguna.
6. Giddens, A. (2005). *Odbjegli svijet - kako globalizacija oblikuje naše živote*. Diskrepancija.
7. Elzner, V. (2021). *Kineski vijek - rađanje nove svjetske velesile*. Laguna.
8. Kecmanović, N. (2005). *Dometi Demokratije*. Čigoja.
9. Kissinger, H. (2003). *Treba li Amerika vanjsku politiku - prema diplomatiji za 21. vijek*. Centar za međunarodne studije.
10. Klajn, N. (2008). *Doktrina šoka - uspon kapitalizma katastrofe*. Posebna izdanja.
11. Lape, F., Kolins, Dž., & Roset, P. (2005). *Dvanaest mitova o gladi u svetu*. Clio.
12. Mander, Dž., Goldsmit, E. (2003). *Globalizacija - argumenti protiv*. Clio.
13. Mićović, V. (2001). *Globalizacija i novi svetski poredak*. Čigoja štampa.
14. Nye, J. (2006). *Kako razumeti međunarodne sukobe*. Stubovi kulture.
15. Fukujama, F. (1997). *Kraj istorije i posljednji čovjek*. CID.
16. Heywood, E. (2004). *Politika*. Klio.

17. Čenić, G. (2010). *Međunarodni ekonomski odnosi*. Grafomark.
18. Štiglic, Dž. (2018). *Globalizacija i njene protivrečnosti - antiglobalizacija u Trampovoj eri*. Miba Books.

Paper received: 18. 01. 2024

Paper accepted: 11. 7. 2024