

GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN THE MULTIPOLAR WORLD AS REALITY OR IDEOLOGY

Mirko Tripunoski¹

American University of Europe-FON Skopje

Borce Sibinoski²

University of Tourism and Management-Skopje

Fisnik Ferati

State University of Tetovo-Tetovo

Abstract: This paper revolves around the question “Is our society really short - sighted to that extent to choose the road of self - destruction?”. The analyses conducted for the purpose of this paper are trying to check two points of view providing different answers to this question. The first optimistic view is confident that it is possible to overcome the situation considering the capacity of the societies in the Western Balkans as a result of the increase of the discrepancies of the current systems and the degree of economic activity. The second, pessimistic view interprets the situation in terms of the initial insufficiency of resources that will cause reduction of the interest and motivation for changes in the society towards technological and social development. These two opposing views, two visions for the future, pose a question that we must answer if we want to understand what our future holds. Our efforts towards the answer will teach us how to create proper responses in the economic and political systems and in what manner they will influence the institutions and the population in different countries. The following questions are of essential and sophisticated nature as they focus on the way of understanding and interpreting the fast pace, world and international relations today, which as a whole represents a basis for the future growth and development of every society. How to implement the whole procedure and how to ensure overall satisfaction? How to convince the manufacturers, consumers, society in terms of finding a proper and permanent method that will enable entrance into and participation in the global economy? How to choose and create an efficient system for change of global processes, developed on the actual data bases? How to benefit from our own steps and measures taken? How to accept and how to select a strategic global economic partner? Open mindedness, public exposure, liberalization, integration and cooperation are major reasons for the growing interdependence of countries that constitute the chain of global perspective or future and the open economy of the world, where increasing knowledge is invested, rather than raw material and labor - intensive efforts. Therefore, the focus of this paper is global economy, technological and IT globalization, global culture, globalization of countries and new global order.

Keywords: *Globalization, self-destruction, systems, geopolitical, strategic changes*

1 mirko.tripunoski@fon.edu.mk

2 sibinovskib@yahoo.com

INTRODUCTION

Globalization is a process that should be entered with knowledge and a sense of responsibility, courageously and decisively, because the global market and trade will be the only judge that will limit or encourage the growth and development of each country participating in that process. 50 years ago, Karl Deutsch founded the concept of the development of the knowledge-based economy. Among other things, it will indicate that creative learning is the ability of a system to accept new information and, based on its own choice, to introduce new changes that are needed to ensure stable and reliable development. Such a system makes development decisions, respecting the new development trends. The challenges of modern technological changes that pave the way for knowledge-based societies require the political system to respond with technological strategies and policies. Such strategies are creative knowledge, new changes, as creative evidence for the future and application of global economic challenges to world economic thought, anticipating the evolution of the development of human society, through a multitude of researches.

Peter Drucher, a famous researcher, follows knowledge, and therefore information, as a specific resource that changes the reality of living and the totality of knowledge about that reality. Any knowledge-based economy provides a range of answers to the character of knowledge as a non-exhaustive resource. Knowledge is capital, to which everyone should have access, and with that access, education will be available to every individual, starting from the criterion of knowledge, in his evolution of development. The prominent professor, Popovska Zlatka, in one of her studies distinguishes three periods of application of knowledge as a prerequisite for entering the global market through:

- Industrial Revolution - application of knowledge to tools, processes and products;
- Productivity Revolution - Applying Knowledge to the Workforce.
- Management revolution - application of knowledge to knowledge itself.

Such views open the question of a serious approach and the possible rich scenarios for the unstoppable move towards a knowledge society and economy, supported by a dynamic process of a globalized economy as a world process. Therefore, any knowledge-based economy is exactly the one that is directly based on the production, distribution and systems of knowledge and information, as a more comprehensive and broader characteristic of developed economies.

The globalization of the world economy, based on technological dynamism, is only a roadmap for the complete opening of the world to the new characteristics of the information society. The leap of time, and therefore of space with the help of telecommunication technologies through the fast and simply transmitted information in the written and electronic media, opens the vision which translated into a strategy for connecting the world in a global framework makes the process of globalization easily applicable and achievable.

GLOBAL ECONOMY

Economic globalization in a broad sense implies the connection of national economies into a single world economy, whereby the connection of the national

economy is realized through the world market. All flows of international movement of capital, international transfer of technologies and demographic movements are realized on the world market. The bearers of such a movement are the states or national economies. On the other hand, the globalization of the economy in a narrower sense, according to the understanding of economists, is carried out, first of all, in the cross-border actions of enterprises through the movement of goods, services, knowledge, movement of capital in the form of foreign direct investments, while more and more moving finance, technologies or property. In such a microeconomic process, the bearers are the enterprises.

The emergence and development of the global economy was influenced by numerous factors and processes, which had an uneven, unequal and contradictory character. However, within the framework of economic globalization as a process of connecting different parts of the world into a single and integrated economy, which functions according to new economic rules, imposed by the accelerated development of technology and knowledge, it is still possible to single out those factors that refer to increase in world production, the growth of some Asian countries, the development of the world market, the strengthening of transnational corporations, the growth of foreign trade. All this affects the creation of a new economy, which is a global economy. Of course, global economy, as an inevitable phenomenon of economic globalization, it cannot evenly and uniformly cover all countries of the world, because they are not at the same level of development. In conditions of creation of new mechanisms of trade action, new economic, commercial and financial institutions, new roles of states or transnational companies in economic life, for many underdeveloped states globalization can mean colonization or assimilation.

By the middle of the 20th century, a period of European dominance ended and the world entered the “era of world globalization”. The central events of such globalization were the formation of the European Economic Community (today’s EU), the rise of Japan as an industrial power and the confrontations between the rich and the poor. However, the key features of the global economy that today has a new face took place in the period from 1870 to 1920. First, the development of transportation and communications that spatially connect different parts of the planet, second, the rapid growth of trade, and third, the enormous flow of capital (John, 1920)

However, the scale of today’s international economy is not unprecedented compared to the past 150 years, and in some ways the old economy surpassed today’s degrees of economic integration. Economic history seems to be quickly forgotten. Compared to 1993, the US spent the same amount of its income on imports as it did in 1890, making international trade not that different from 100 years ago. Keynes describes the old global economy in a very illustrative way (Rakas, 2002).

In conditions of global connection of states, peoples and nations, the concept of “new economy” as a new economic activity has replaced the old economy. Namely, the new economy is based on highly sophisticated technology, knowledge and innovation, new forms of connection and association of transnational corporations, while the activities take place on the world market. As a modern analytical category, the “new economy” is characterized by intellectual capital, modern information technology and communication technology as basic factors of economic development, in terms of new market institutions and new roles of states in economic life. This concept of the “new economy” is also confirmed by Keynes (Колодко, 2016)

The emergence and development of the “new economy” which follows globalism, leads to a number of problems that affect the connection of all its characteristics. They refer to the abolition of state control, privatization, rapid changes in production programs, convergence of multiple technologies, breaking through competition, standards that develop in market competition and are based on decisions of governments, the abolition of all distances between producers and the users. A phenomenon that follows these trends is the emergence of new types of organizations. A new organization that will speed up so-called two-way knowledge transfers, influence the integration of knowledge flows, respect the diversity of cultures and develop language skills. That is why the question arises whether the new economy will become a global economy.

TECHNOLOGICAL - INFORMATIONAL GLOBALIZATION

Advances in technology and informatics affect most segments of commerce, society and governance in most regions of the world. The changes that technology and informatics bring to various aspects of life are often collectively called the “technological - information revolution”³. Most of these changes may prove beneficial over time, while some have already done so. A wide range of national and international political, economic and sociological issues are raised by these changes, both now and in the future.

Understanding the various impacts that advanced technology has and the nature of future changes, in various societies around the world and the issues raised by these changes are very important, but at the same time quite difficult. All this is important, because the technological - information revolution will change the world in the 21st century just as the steam engine, the railway and the telephone changed the world in the 19th century, just as electricity, the internal combustion engine, the automobile and the airplane, the telephone, the radio and television changed the world in the 20th century (Anton, Silberglitt and Schneider 2001). On the other hand, it is difficult, because while the technological advances that enable and drive the information revolution are more or less identical around the world, a number of factors - sociological and cultural, political and governmental, commercial and financial - shape each society's approach to them. Technological changes. These factors influence each other in various ways and are subject to numerous variations in countries around the world, leading to various national or regional manifestations of the technological - informational revolution.

The effects of the technological - information revolution have been combined with those of globalization - rapid advances in cross-border integration in many economic areas and ongoing human activities and the elimination of regulatory barriers to the movement of capital, goods, services and persons have been facilitated by the advances in transport and communication systems. Globalization and the technological - informational revolution are closely related. Indeed, advances in technology and informatics are fundamental enablers of the globalization that is shaping the world in which this revolution is taking place. In most cases it is difficult, and

3 This is not the first revolution that people have experienced. The discovery of the type of movement of newspapers, in the 15th century in Europe and earlier in China, is one thing, and the discovery of writing several millennia earlier is another. There were other inventions classified as revolutions (the invention of the telephone and the telegraph). See: Dewar, J.A., “The Information Age and the Printing Press: Looking Backward to see Ahead”, Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA: 1998, pp. 1-10.

in some cases impossible, to separate the effects of globalization from the effects of the technological - informational revolution.

There is a heated debate in the world about the general remarks of the information-technological revolution and globalization especially when considering their sociological dimension at the planetary level. For the prophets of technology, for the true believers in the magic of the market, everything will be fine, as long as ingenuity and competition are set free. All that is needed are a few regulatory provisions, for the prevention of corruption and the removal of bureaucratic disturbances on the way to hyper-modernity. For those around the world who are not ecstatic about surfing the Internet, but who are affected by layoffs, lack of social services, crime, poverty and the disruption of life, globalization is nothing more than a warmed-up version of traditional capitalist ideology. According to them (Castells, 1999).

The world in 2022 will be revolutionized by the growing effect of multidisciplinary technology across all dimensions of life: social, economic, political and personal. Biotechnology will make it possible to identify, understand, manipulate, improve and control living organisms. The revolution in technological - information availability and utility will continue to profoundly affect the world. Modern materials, agile industry and nanotechnology will change the way of production if the barriers to their development are resolved in time.

The results can be astonishing. Effects may include significant improvements in the quality of life, high levels of industrial transformation, continued globalization, re-mixing of wealth, cultural integration or invasion with the potential to increase tension and conflict, shifts in power from nation-states to non-governmental organizations and individuals, mixed environmental effects, improvement in lifestyle followed by prosperity and reduction of tensions.

The actual realization of these opportunities will depend on numerous factors, including local acceptance of technological change, levels of technological and infrastructure investment, market drivers and constraints, and technological breakthroughs and advances. As these factors vary differently in globalization, both the implementation and the effects of the technological - information revolution will vary, especially in developed countries. However, the overall revolution and trends will continue throughout most of the developed world. The rapid pace of the technological - informational revolution makes prediction more difficult, but the revolution seems globally significant and quite probable (Hundley, 2000).

The downside of this revolution is the claim that technology is replacing humans with machines in almost all industries of the global economy. Around the world more than eight million workers are unemployed, and as an argument is given the initial adjustment to strong market forces that lead the global economy in another direction, promising a successful global economy and material wealth⁴.

This pattern is repeated in the widely industrialized world. Even developing countries are facing technological unemployment as multinational companies develop cutting edge high technologies, laying off millions of workers who cannot compete with automated production. In all three key employment sectors - the economy, manufacturing and services - labor is rapidly being replaced by machines, promis-

⁴ However, many people are skeptical. In the US, Fortune magazine found that corporations cut over two million jobs a year. Rifkin Jeremy, "The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era", G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York 1995.

ing that by the middle of the 21st century all production will be automated (Rifkin, 2003).

GLOBAL CULTURE

What is the connection between the process of globalization and the complex human condition that we call “culture”? Increased connectivity is, in some ways, an obvious aspect of our lives. It is something we can recognize in everyday routine practices: using communication technologies - mobile phones, computers, internet - building the environment we live in, food we eat, earn a living, the way we have fun - cinema, television etc. It is increasingly evident that we live in a globally connected world. But what does this mean for culture? Are we bound together in a single global cosmopolitan culture? Is it universal or imperial?

Culture shows a great tendency of globalization and is closely related to modernization and westernization. This is especially evident in the field of religion. For many centuries, the world’s great universalist religions offered adherents a set of values and allegiances that stood above the state. Today these religions are threatened or overshadowed by modernization and the growth of capital. But the emergence of the liberal-democratic state and the capitalist economic system brought liberalizing values from the state.

A globalized culture is more chaotic than ordered—it is integrated and connected, but not unified or centralized. Absolute globalization would involve the creation of a general but superdifferentiated field of values and possibilities of taste and style available to everyone without limitation. In a globalized cultural regime, Islam would not be confined to separate territorially based communities in the Middle East, Africa and Asia, but would be universally available across the planet. Closely related to this is the emergence of fundamentalism and nationalism, the former associated with religion, the latter with ethnicity. Modernization and post-modernization leading to ever-increasing globalization raise fundamentalism to a high level against those who want to be imposed by those on whom something is imposed.

A globalized culture allows for a constant flow of ideas, information, values, and tastes mediated through mobile intermediaries, symbolic signs, and electronic simulations. Through modern technical - technological achievements, the development of electronic media, satellite technology, the information that spreads at a high speed and in all parts of the country is available to every person. There are more and more media and news agencies that can be followed throughout the day, showing us the daily happenings, while forming our public opinion through their informational influence.

Many countries today find themselves in the vortex of ideological-cultural war and are under pressure from the products of cultures and spiritual creativity of a smaller group of countries (“Coca Colonization” of the world), which would represent, instead of cultural universalism, cultural imperialism or “terrible ... mono culture, a kind of totalitarianism of culture” (Tomlinson J. (1999). These fears are not unfounded. Take any index, from clothing to food, from music to film, and from television to architecture, and there is no ignoring the fact that certain styles, brands, tastes, and practices can be found virtually anywhere in the world. But what does this distribution of uniform cultural goods signify, than the power of some capitalist firms to command wide markets for their products throughout the world? If we as-

sume that the global presence of these goods signals a convergence towards a single capitalist culture, we are likely using a poor concept of culture - one that reduces culture to material goods only. If culture is the production and experience of meaning through symbolization, the thesis of global cultural convergence must include the idea that people's interaction with these goods deeply penetrates the ways in which the cultural world is constructed.

The problem with the cultural imperialism argument is that it only assumes such penetration: it makes a leap of inference from the simple presence of cultural goods to the attribution of deep cultural or ideological effects. The reason why it should be treated with skepticism is that it "ignores the hermeneutic appropriation that is an essential part of the circulation of symbolic forms" (Thompson, 1995). Culture simply does not transfer in this non-linear way. If a critical understanding of cultural globalization seems beset by a tendency to assume a utopian or dystrophic scenario, then perhaps the cultural process should be approached not through a macro-global perspective, but rather the opposite way, by understanding the effects of globalization as they are felt within in certain localities (Tomlinson, 1999)

GLOBALIZATION OF THE STATE

The state, just like the economy and culture, is influenced by globalization and political activities are increasingly focused through social issues. As steps that undermine the nation-state and its eventual displacement from world governance, Held states:

- Growing economic and cultural ties reduce the power and efficiency of governments at the nation-state level; they can no longer control the flow of ideas and goods at their borders, so the instruments of internal politics become ineffective.
- State power is shrinking as transnational processes grow in scale and number.
- Therefore many traditional areas of state responsibility must be coordinated on an international or intergovernmental basis.
- States are thus obliged to surrender sovereignty within larger political units (EU, ASEAN), multinational agreements (NATO, OPEC) or international organizations (UN, WTO, GATT, IMF).
- Because of that, a system of global governance is emerging with the development of its own policy and administrative systems that continue to reduce state power (Held, 1991).

It is not absolutely necessary to show that the state is weakening in order to support the position of political globalization. The very emergence of the state is a product of globalization processes. The institutionalization of the state took place within a system of international relations in the 19th century. Nations can only survive and function within that system if they have a centralized and unified system of government that can manage their affairs and their security (McGrew, 1992).

There is intense debate about the nature and fate of the nation-state in the current era of globalization. There are different sets of widely divergent views. It is assumed that:

- trend towards the end of the nation-state;
- erosion - weakening of the state;

- forced withdrawal of state welfare, not the state as such;
- adaptation - mutation of the state - nation to neoliberal globalization;
- imperialism by the developed capitalist states towards the rest;
- neither the weakening nor the end of the state - nation; and
- The state is both a victim and a creator of globalization.

Globalization of the state began after the Second World War. The state could no longer guarantee security, trade and financial markets were institutionalized, there was a disregard for borders by drugs and crime, natural issues of AIDS and ecology, chemical and nuclear weapons. Through international alliances, the state created more danger than security by dividing the world into hostile camps.

The global order in relation to globalization consists of all global phenomena: economy, technology, culture and state. Hence, globalization not only works, but is necessary if we aspire to expand prosperity and freedom across the planet. If one analyzes the debacle of the collective experiments of the 20th century - nationalism, communism, fascism - and their profound negative effects on the wealth and freedom of nations, one will conclude that the collapse of central planning was not caused by fanatical liberal thinkers; it was a logical result of the inherent contradictions of the collective model, especially its inability to build a viable economic system and increase personal income, and its failure to promote democracy. The connection between the segments of globalization (economy - technology - culture - state) creates a basis for all liberal democratic systems; their underpinnings are ethical and practical, which in a way implies a global system. The survival of such a complex and complex system of social organization requires a strong state, but which will limit its functions to three areas: first, the provision of public goods, second internationalization of the outside, which can be understood as providing remedies for market failure, and thirdly to help people, for a number of reasons, who suffer harm from the market or are more vulnerable.

NEW GLOBAL ORDER

The political aspect of globalization rests on attempts to perceive the future development of societies, search for certain specificities of certain periods and ways to connect and unify humanity. At the same time, it is pointed out that these are paths of democratic dialogue and solidarity cooperation or that they are paths on which the will of strong and powerful states would be imposed. In that sense, the dominance of the USA and its desire to rule the world is mentioned. After all, both understandings start from the fact that the modern global world needs to be arranged by creating a new world order, only they differ in how and in what way this should be done. According to one understanding, the globalized world should be organized according to democratic procedures, with respect and preservation of the national and cultural identity of each participant and with respect for equality in expressing one's own interests. According to another understanding, the globalized world should be arranged by creating a new world order in which the most economically developed and politically most powerful states would decide, headed by the most economically developed and politically most powerful state.

The lawyers of American power will say "of course". But America's inconsistency in understanding the imperial role will undermine its ability to meet this task. In

particular, although the US has the will to support a military force with a global outlook, it does so only in the name of national security. Moreover, because the US clearly wants to avoid running something like an overseas empire, it has decided not to develop something like an imperial civil service to help create and maintain domestic order in distant and dangerous places (Wolf, 2004).

Moralists do not understand that democracy and various other elements of Western culture, such as human rights, are not universal, but a product of Western specific historical and religious development. Seeking to impose or promote democracy in states that have not yet developed civil character among their citizens, or seeking to impose Western values and ideals on cultures that for millennia have defined rights differently, is likely to be fruitless and lead to a clash of cultures, and in the process to change the productive global order with economic conflict (Deepak, 2004).

The solution to this equation is honest: shut down all the ineffective multinational organizations that are supposed to uphold international order (WB, IMF, UN), recognizing that an imperial power that upholds security and order is the only real basis for increased global prosperity, and yes let the US do the work. To address this, it is necessary to divide it into three parts. First, is the claim that the imperial order is essential to growth; second is the claim that the United States is best placed to play the role of imperial protector; third is the claim that missions such as spreading democracy, protecting human rights and protecting the environment against global warming are dangerous distractions that can undermine economic growth⁵

The problem of imperial order is more like a “paradox of power” at the national level. Any state government strong enough to enforce order and security for its citizens is equally strong, if it chooses, to oppress them. The paradox is resolved at the national level through representative institutions and a legal system that allows the people to block or reject an overly predatory state, and that protects individuals and minorities from restrictions on their economic and political rights by the majority.

When faced with an imperial hegemony, no matter how committed it may be to the principles of free trade and equal protection, other states have no mechanism for personal protection against the day the imperial power becomes misguided or selfish leading to tyranny or oppression. Therefore, the presence of an imperial hegemony determined to maintain its predominance creates counter pressure from other states seeking an exit. German militarization and naval armaments in the years before World War I were a direct response to fears that British naval power could easily be used to wear down Germany and preserve global trade.

Because of that, and because of the need for a world system, the world in the 21st century is marked by a broad consensus around three ideas: peace as the optimal condition of international relations and the true goal of foreign policy; democracy as the best form of government; and the free market as the only satisfactory way of organizing economic affairs (Mandelbaum, 2004).

These three ideas are not firmly rooted and practiced in every part of the world. Decisive opposition to these ideas still exists, as the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 well illustrated. Even when there is no explicit opposition, some countries do not have a true democratic government or a successful market economy, such as Russia and China, which abandoned orthodox communism but did not fully and unreservedly embrace peace, democracy, and the free market.

⁵ Ibid

Not the whole world is peaceful, but the most powerful countries in the world approve and practice these three ideas. What is equally important for their supremacy, there are no alternative ideas that could represent a convincing basis for the organization of political and economic life. Peace, democracy and the free market is what surpasses everything else, which is impossible to ignore and which has no serious rival.

The dominance of the mentioned ideas is the result of world history in the modern age, a period that began politically with the French Revolution, and economically with the industrial revolution. In the first two centuries of that era, the 19th and 20th centuries, a battle was fought between these ideas and alternative methods of social organization. The 19th century contrasted these ideas, according to which war was a normal thing, while power was concentrated in the hands of the monarchs who inherited it, and economic activity stagnated. The forces of tradition lost their influence in the 19th century and were swept away by the events of the 20th century, the First World War, but in their place came communism and fascism as opponents of peace, democracy and the free market. Although different in many respects, both ideologies glorified war, imposing repressive authority and establishing broad control over economic life. Fascism was defeated in the Second World War, while communism in the Cold War, so that democracy was left without a significant rival for the first time (Mandelbaum, 2006).

A first similarity between democratic communities and democratic states is that, in both cases, there is broad agreement on fundamental principles. This is not to say that disagreement is unknown. On the contrary, sharp and bitter disputes are quite common among democracies. After all, democracy does not offer a formula for perfect and eternal consent, because it is primarily a way of expressing, mediating and resolving disputes. In stable democracies, disagreement is about secondary, not fundamental, principles. A second reason why a broad commitment to peace, democracy, and the free market makes the international community (or at least part of it) similar to the sovereign states that are its constituent parts is that disputes within the community, however bitter they may be, do not lead to a larger-scale conflict (war). (Ibid, p.40)

CONCLUSION

The word globalization is known to everyone who is involved in the global media and is rapidly rising as a favorite “mantra” of political leaders around the world. It becomes clear that it is one of those modern neologisms that are frequently invoked but rarely defined with ideological implications. It refers to the major transformations in the global system that have emerged in the previous fifty years.

Although most agree that we live in a world transformed by globalization, what that term means is becoming less clear and often remains conveniently undefined. A complete exploration of what globalization means should not be a central project, but some understanding of the basic features of the “new world order” is relevant. The smallest definition of globalization emphasizes integration into the international economy. Somewhat broader definitions refer to the idea of economic changes where “the chain of causality starts from the spatial reorganization of production in international trade and the integration of financial markets” towards demographic, political and cultural changes.

There are two particularly important understandings underpinning contemporary globalization. First is the notion that the basic dimension of the current global economy is the increase in temporal-spatial narrowing in which the real speed of exchange is multiple. But equally critical, especially if we turn to questions of politics and political responsibility, is the extent to which most images of globalization are deeply infused with ideology. Emerging from the capitalist crust of states and promoted by Western conservative theorists, large corporations, individuals and foundations.

The value of economic liberalism closes economic markets as a positive sum game. Advocates of this game believe that it is necessary to align states and policies to the demands of capital accumulation. At the same time as this ideological wind gathered strength and swept the world, a fundamental global economic restructuring fundamentally altered the international division of labor. The end of the 20th century witnessed dramatic changes in the location of world production. The rapid expansion of international corporate production facilities in formerly non-industrial countries called for the reduction of tariff barriers. Meanwhile, new financial instruments and technologies led to a revolutionary explosion of financial capital through international agreements and stable currencies, overseen by multilateral agencies such as the World Bank or supranational institutions such as the WTO. Such changes—led by corporate and political elites, as well as by growing public awareness—provide the economic impetus for a consensus about globalization and its implications, leading to an initial convergence of policies around the world in the early 21st century.

Such policies have domestic and international significance. Internally, these include disengagement of the government from managing the domestic economy, deregulation, privatization of state-owned enterprises, and cuts to social welfare programs. Externally, they demand the reduction of tariff barriers, the opening of capital markets and the liberalization of restrictions on foreign investment combined with new incentives to attract them. Overall, they include a general increased confidence in market mechanisms and the private sector to increase competitiveness. Hence, fundamental principles make globalization (meaning world markets and transnational actors) stronger than the state. This promotes a widespread trend of privatization and anti-statehood. Instead of, the international market for goods and capital is seen as a supplier not only of healthy economies, but also of good governance and satisfied citizens. To be sure, various dislocations will emerge and there will be clear winners and losers, but in the end, the neoliberal process triumphs.

According to the neoliberal worldview, the primary task of the state should be to get out of the way so that the most efficient private entrepreneurs can maximize social welfare by investing resources to increase productivity. Economic development is often seen as necessary to increase social changes such as literacy and individualism, leading to the rise of a new middle class and greater democracy.

LITERATURE

1. Keynes M. J. (1920). *The Economic Consequence of the Peace*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Howe.
2. Rakas. S. (2002). *Globalizacija i poslovni moral*. Zbornik radova sa simpozijuma. Prilog unapređenju teorije i prakse planiranja i implementacije, IAUS, str. 252.
3. Колодко В. Г. (2016). *Глобализацијата и перспективите за развој...*, цит. дело, стр. 32-33.
4. Tapscott D. (1995) "*The Digital Economy, Promise and Peril in the Age of Networked Intelligence*", New York, p. 72.
5. Parhald C. K., (1988). "*Managing Discontinlties: The Emerging Challenge*", Research - Technology Management, p. 16.
6. Anton, P. S., Silbergliitt, R., and Schneider, J. (2001). *The Global Technology Revolution: Bio/Nano/Materials Trends and Their Synergies with Information Technology by 2015*", Santa Monica: Calif.: RAND, p. 2;
7. Castells M. (1999). *Information Technology, Globalization and Social Development*. United Nations Research Institute for Social DevelopmentI (UNRISD) Discussion Paper No.114, p. 9.
8. Hundley R.O. (2000). *The Global Course of the Information Revolution: Political, Economic, and Social Consequences*. Santa Monica: Calif.: RAND, p. 212.
9. Rifkin J. (2003). *New Technology and the End of Labor Force*, in Mander Jerry, Goldsmith Edward, "*The Case Against the Global Economy and for a turn Toward the Local*", San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, pp. 125-126.
10. Series 2006–2007, Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies Ningbo and Institute of Comparative Cultural Studies, 24 November 2006, p. 2. Walters Malcolm, "*Globalization*"..., op. cit, pp. 201-205.
11. Tomlinson J. (1999). *Internationalism, Globalization and Cultural Imperialism*, pp. 125-130.
12. Thompson J. (1995). *The Media and Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
13. Held D. (1991). *Democracy and the Global System*, in Held D., (ed.), "*Political Theory Today*", Cambridge Polity Press, pp. 197-235.
14. McGrew A. (1992). *Conceptualizing Global Politics*, in McGrew A., Lewis P., (eds.), "*Modernity and its Futures*", Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 1-29.
15. Wolf M. (2004). *Why Globalization Works*, New Haven: Yale University Press
16. Deepak L. (2004). "*In Praise of Empires: Globalization and Order*", New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
17. Mandelbaum M. (2004) *The Ideas that Conquered the World: Peace, Democracy and Free Markets in the 21st Century*", New York: Public Affairs Part 1.
18. Mendelbaum M. (2006), *The case of Goliath - How America Act's as the World's Government in the Twenty-first Century*", Beograd: Filip Visnjic, pp. 37-38.