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INTRODUCTION

Globalization process is ultimately a power driven phenomena and reflects state-centric approaches to international politics. Its impact on world politics therefore is better analyzed by an analytical tool that is state-centric and places emphasis on power relations in international politics. This paper examines the correlation between globalization as a process and international politics on two levels. First, it focuses on what globalization process involves. Second, it looks at the impact of globalization process on international politics. This study maintains that power relations cannot be downplayed in analysis of impact of globalization on international politics. Structural realist analytical model is employed in evaluating the impact of globalization process on international politics. The paper, therefore, concludes that globalization process right from its kick off until its maturation is influenced by dominant power relations and subsequently is the expression of dominant power structure in international politics. Globalization process at the behest of world dominant power(s), therefore, contributes little to ameliorate political and economic polarization characterizing international politics.
PART I

A. GLOBALIZATION: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Globalization has been defined in many ways with each definition emphasizing one dimension of human affairs. It has been defined “as action at a distant”, “time-space compression”, “accelerating interdependence”, “a shrinking world”, etc.\(^2\) This lack of precision is due to the fact that it is difficult to denote in concrete terms what globalization really is. Some academics, therefore, have argued that globalization trends could be best described by such terms as internationalization or regionalization.\(^3\) However, a closer look at globalization process for understanding real nature of the concept is helpful. Thomas L. Friedman, New York Times Foreign Affairs Columnist, in his comparative analysis of Cold War and post-Cold War international system argues that the latter substituted the former but the latter is now substituted by globalization systems: “the integration of markets, finance, and technologies in a way that is shrinking the world from a size medium to a size small and enabling each of us to reach around the world further, faster, and cheaper than ever before”.\(^4\) According to Ulrich Beck globalization “denotes the processes through which sovereign states are criss-crossed and undermined by transnational actors with varying prospects of power, orientations, identities and networks”.\(^5\)

Moreover, terms globalization, globalism and globality are often used interchangeably. However, they are not identical. Beck distinguishes globalization from globality and globalism. Such a distinction, according to him, has implications for international relations vis-à-vis the impact of globalization on international politics. Globalism denotes dominance of world market or global economic trends in shaping national policies. States responds to global economic trends and hence economic forces and priorities guide and direct state policies. States react to dominant world market. The response is either positive/affirmative (e.g. abolition of trade barriers/reduction of tariffs) or negative (e.g. adoption of various kinds of protectionist policies). Beck’s analysis of globalism indicates that despite state’s policies being reactionary, dominant world market may not have the capacity to influence policies of dominant state(s). On the contrary strong state(s) would have the ability to influence world market.

However, globality in Beck’s view denotes the existence of a ‘world society’: “a totality of social relationship which are not integrated or determined (determinable) by national-state politics”.\(^6\) This implies greater interdependency and not integration among the peoples of diverse cultures, ideologies, religions and regions. Greater interdependency presupposes transnational activities ranging from production of consumer goods, support for human rights, struggle against environmental degradation,
wars etc. State and non-state entities across national borders collaborate on almost all issues. "Globality means that from now on nothing which happens on our planet is only a limited local event; all inventions, victories and catastrophes affect the whole world, and we must reorient and reorganize our lives and actions, our organizations and institutions, along a local-global axis". Again Beck would concur with the view that globality, like globalism, is guided by preferences of dominant state(s).

In contrast to globality, globalization process would generate complex network of various types of transnational institutions and regimes. Such a complex network of supranational entities establishes multidimensional links between peoples of diverse cultures and hence interstate borders becomes blurred. As a result some sort of cultural, social and institutional homogeneity occurs. Globalization becomes matured when such a complex of networks of social relationships have been profoundly established over extended space/area and perpetuated over long period of time. In this context, globalization is a little advanced or matured from of globality and dominant state(s) could have directed globalization process throughout its various stages. Beck's analysis suggests that one way to measure its maturity is the capability of the complex network of supranational entities to become strong enough to withstand the tide of national decisional latitude.

Globalization, according to George Modelski, is "the process by which a number of historical world societies were brought together into one global system". Unlike Beck, Modelski, however, argues that the nature and shape of the world system resulting from such a process constitutes the core of debate among writers on inter-civilizational dialogue, interdependency theorists, hegemonic theorists or scholars committed to analyze general patterns of relations among numerous units of world politics. David Held et al. throw some light on the type of world system brought about by globalization. It is noteworthy that Held's conceptualization is rather comprehensive than that of others. Held and colleagues view globalization as "a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions-assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact-generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and the exercise of power".

Above definitions have few common properties: (1) that globalization is both a process and the ultimate result of the process; (2) that they do not make reference to forces and dynamics involved in creating the globalized space; (3) they do not include answers to questions such as: are these complex linkages consensual; formed by all states through consensus or manifestations of preferences of strong states?; and (4) that they do not categorically point out that globalization underpins
realization of some higher objectives or national interest and is more of a process deliberately promoted to ensure creation of conditions conducive to attainment of national interest. Notwithstanding these, these authors believe military and economic instruments of statecraft are invariably employed to bring about globalization. Most of academic heritage on globalization is scanty and often lacks detailed discussion so that one can develop an imaginary view of global conditions brought about by globalization process. Held’s analysis, however, provides a breakthrough. Held’s analytical framework for globalization is capable of projecting an imaginary vision of world resulting from globalization process. Held’s approach is, therefore, comprehensive and provides fruitful understanding of steps and components of globalization process. Let’s elaborate.

In Held and colleagues’ view globalization as a process builds upon functionalist theory that economic interconnectedness or interdependence spills over to social and political dimensions of relations. The above statement is intuitively supported by Held’s conviction that localization, nationalization, regionalization and internationalization are convenient steps, not barriers toward globalization. None of the above, though spatially delimited processes, could suggest genuine globalization as they are socially restricted developments and the major features of globalization cannot be observed in either one of them. Given Held’s view, globalization is therefore a process being evolved and has not yet been fully matured. Up to this point of modern history, fundamental steps short of large scale globalization are being taken. However, Held’s analytical framework, discussed below, is unique in that it could provide “the basis for both a ‘quantitative’ and a ‘qualitative’ assessment of historical patterns of globalization”.

Held and colleagues suggest a ‘bi-model’ or ‘two-level’ analytical framework for assessment of globalization process. The first level of his model provides theoretical basis for understanding when a specific historical phase can be called globalized conditions. The second level of his model provides operational basis for realization of the first model. In other words stability of the first model is contingent upon the second model as the latter facilitates full operationalization of the former. The elements of first model can bear fruits only if the elements of the second model are correctly developed and rightly placed. The four principles of Held’s first level analytical framework are: (1) the extensity of global network, (2) the intensity of global interconnectedness, (3) the velocity of global flows, and (4) the impact propensity of global interconnectedness. Held believes that this four-fold framework is a useful analytical tool to distinguish globalization from other types of processes that could imply some degree of interconnectedness. Moreover, the four elements of Held’s second level analytical framework are: (1) infrastructures, (2) institutionalization, (3) stratification, and (4) modes of interactions. It is interesting to note that ‘infrastructures’
constitute the core of Held’s second level analytical model. Therefore, one is tempted to argue that ‘infrastructures’ provides basis for Held’s bi-model analytical framework. Let’s elaborate further each element of Held’s bi-model analytical framework.

Given the centrality of infrastructures in creation of global conditions and process of globalization, the issue of ‘definer’ of the infrastructures acquires central focus. Knowledge of the definer of infrastructures is helpful for two reasons: (1) it assists analysts to know the nature of globalized space better and (2) it makes the task of searching analytical tools for analysis of impact of globalization on international politics easy. Held however does not make reference to definer of infrastructures. This, therefore, constitutes a weak link of Held’s analytical framework and it at least has one important implication: that Held’s analytical framework may explain what globalization is and what it involves, but it does not help to analyze its impact on international politics. The author of this study believes that by stressing definer of infrastructures, Held’s analytical framework will become more useful. It would allow proponents and opponents of globalization to see whether globalization is a power driven phenomena and its processes manipulated by dominant states?

Relevant in this context, therefore, is a search for analytical framework for assessing the impact of globalization on international politics. Definer of infrastructures of globalization points out the existence of power relations among all those affected by and affecting globalization process. It also denotes that globalization process proceeds in the context of a hierarchical structure with the most powerful state(s) behaving as the definer of infrastructures of globalization. Therefore, globalization becomes a project designed and promoted by dominant power(s). A convenient analytical framework that complements and assists Held’s analytical framework to explain impact of globalization of international politics is structural realist analytical model. Globalization process occurring in the context of hierarchical world structure resembles structural realist clichè: ‘power structure or polarity of the system’. Structural realist analytical model for impact of globalization is discussed in Section B of Part I. Therefore, in pages below references to definer of infrastructures of globalization is stressed in view of better understanding of nature of globalized space.

In Held’s first level model, extensity of global network means stretching of political, social and political activities across the frontiers of global network-regularized patterns of interactions between major centers of powers or hubs of economic, military and political decisions. Growing magnitude of interactions on a regular not occasional or random basis indicates the extensity of interdependence among the various centers of powers. Velocity of the flow-movement of physical materials across space-can be measured by the degree of diffusion of
ideas and spread of goods across particular space. Ultimately, such kinds of relationship between the various centers of powers would make them mutually vulnerable to any type of development occurring in a given center or hub of activity. Currents and forces that describe a specific historical phase as a global condition need to be identified. At least four types of currents and forces of global conditions indicating influences between mutually vulnerable centers of activities could be identified: (1) decisional, (2) institutional, (3) distributive and (4) structural influences.

According to Held, the extensity, intensity, velocity and the impact propensity of networks of global interconnectedness cannot function desirably unless facilitated by some other institutions. These institutions are essential prerequisites for operationalization of the first level analytical model and hence creation of global conditions. These essential institutions constitute various aspects of Held’s second level analytical model. Therefore, according to him, infrastructures refer to all those facilities that can facilitate global networks, flows and relations. Such facilities include regulative, legal, scientific institutions and regimes, norms and procedures as well as physical facilities such as ports, highways, and no barriers for smooth transfer of goods and commodities. Infrastructures “mediate flows and connectivity... [and] influence the overall level of interaction capacity in every sector and thus the potential magnitude of global interconnectedness”.¹⁴ Crude infrastructural elements over time become patterned and regular. When interactions are regularized, institutionalization process takes off. The players behave in accordance to established rules, norms or regimes, which enhances the degree of predictability in interactions. Held argues institutionalization breed’s power. He defines power as “the capacity of social agents, agencies and institutions to maintain or transform their circumstances, social or physical; and it concerns the resources which underpin this capacity and the forces that shape and influence its exercise”.¹⁵ Power, therefore, is being exercised by the numerous components primarily states involved in the process of globalization. Obviously, some components could have more power while others less. Ironically, he argues, globalization does not eliminate such a power structure or to use Held’s words, ‘patterns of stratification’ within globalized space. Globalization can only transform the organization, distribution and exercise of power. If patterns of stratification refer to some type of rigid polarity and not mere manipulation and maneuverings among interacting components of globalized space, then transformation that globalization bring within the organization, distribution and exercise of power could not mean liquidation of powers of the major states or bloc leader in favor of less powerful sates. In this regard Held notes:

Globalization transforms the organization, distribution and exercise of power. In this respect, globalization in different epochs may be associated with distinctive patterns of global stratification. In
mapping historical form of globalization, specific attention needs to be paid to *patterns of stratification*. In this context, stratification has both a social and spatial dimension: hierarchy and unevenness respectively. Hierarchy refers to asymmetries in control of access to and enmeshment in global networks and infrastructures, while unevenness denotes the asymmetrical effects of processes of globalization on the life chances and well being of peoples, classes, ethnic groupings and the sexes. These categories provide a mechanism for identifying the distinctive relations of global domination and control in different historical periods.¹⁶

Specific type of pattern of stratification and the number of components involved in defining such a pattern of stratification will inform the nature of global space. Put differently, the nature of interactions in globalized space-hegemonic, cooperative, conflictual, and competitive—depends on the number of definer(s) of patterns of stratification. The nature of interaction or modes of interaction in turn depends on the instruments of powers-military, diplomacy, economic, ideology, etc.—available as well as the willingness by the definer of patterns of interaction to employ them.

It is noteworthy to mention that among numerous theories on globalization, interdependence school shares numerous common features with globalization. Yet one is tempted to argue that globalization process denotes deeper interconnectedness than ‘complex interdependence’ suggested by proponents of interdependence school. R. Keohane and Joseph Nye the most outspoken advocates of complex interdependence, inadvertently argue that state-centric paradigm has become inadequate. Creation of multiple-intergovernmental, trans-governmental and transnational-channels have drawn states closer to the extent that they have become actors in their own rights. Moreover, politically states have become vulnerable to distant events. National interests have become diffused with many institutions other than political elites involved in its formulation and determining it. States can no longer use military force in issue area where states have become vulnerable and would be adversely affected if a disturbance of any sort takes place. Regime transformation as well as preservation of status quo on global level has become contingent upon the nature of interaction among these multiple channels of interaction.¹⁷ One could take points with Koehane and Nye, and all the above assumptions. Complex interdependence does not suggest absence of definer of infrastructures. On the contrary, complex interdependence stresses economic globalization: transnational organizations of economic activities. Globalization process on the other hand suggests political, institutional, legal, cultural and economic homogeneity. In this context, economic globalization may be first ladder with spill over effects in the whole globalization process. And this whole process, so argue structural realists, is influenced by dominant pole(s) of international system.
Therefore, conceptual analysis of globalization as a process, discussed above, to use David Held and Anthony McGrew’s conceptualization, has three dimensions: (1) material, (2) spatio-temporal and (3) cognitive. Material aspect of globalization refers to transnational flow of capitals, trade, information, people, and values. Spatio-temporal aspect of globalization refers to a “significant shift in the spatial reach of social action and organization towards the interregional and intercontinental scale”. Geographical space or distance shrinks and no longer becomes impediment to numerous kinds of interactions. Cognitive aspect of globalization indicates that people and communities are aware about such globalizing trends. They know that all transnational activities as well as occurrences in one part of the globe have impact on the developments in their local vicinity.  

A fourth dimension of globalization-diffusion of popular culture or cultural homogeneity-could be added to David Held and Anthony McGrew three-dimensional view of globalization. Values, norms, institutions, life styles advocated by one civilization rapidly expand over the shrinking space. If one goes by these tangible and intangible elements of the scale in understanding globalization, then its ramifications for international politics and interstate relations are tremendous.

Throughout his analysis of globalization process, Friedman advances an important thesis: globalization has its benefits and downsides, but the main beneficiary of this process is the powerful rich nations of the North. Neo-realists would concur with Friedman on that Cold War and globalization systems share one common denominator: world politics is governed by existing power structure. Structural realist analytical model, discussed below, for analysis of the impact of globalization on international politics builds upon this common denominator.

B. STRUCTURAL REALIST ANALYTICAL MODEL FOR IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION

Granted globalization process, the real question therefore is not that events, catastrophes and other distant developments have impact on and affect every single individual, group and nation. The real issue however seems to be on whose terms such occurrences manifest. Answer to this question would assist practitioners and academics alike to know that the nature of international system brought about as a result of globalization process and that globalization process is influenced by existing power relations. Given centrality of power relations to analysis of impact of globalization process, structural realist analytical model therefore has the capacity to explain its impact on international politics. Therefore, a convenient starting point for discussing structural
realist analytical model for impact of globalization on international politics would be to look at definition of international system. However, power being central to structural realism needs to be defined. Therefore, prior to analysis of structural realist analytical model, some fundamental observations concerning power are in order.

Evan Laurd defines power, as “the capacity to secure desired political results”. According to Hans J. Morgenthau, power generally means men’s (nations’) control over the minds and actions of other men (nations). Some others have defined power as one’s ability to make others do what others would not do otherwise. Above definitions of power suggest that power refers to all those capabilities possessed by a person or nation that enables the individual or nation to attain the desired objectives. Therefore, power, viewed as capabilities, exercised by a nation would take multiple forms. In other words, instruments of power become many. The conception of power, therefore, is broadened to include factors such as exercise of military force, political power, national economic strength, diplomatic expertise/skills, technological know-how, natural resources, membership of international global and regional forums and organizations and other instruments that could enable a nation to compel conformity of actions of others with its wishes. Given the notion of power above, national power is, therefore, relative and distributed unevenly; some possessing more than others. However, often considerable few nations possess more capabilities and dominate international politics. Nations controlling globalization process are, therefore, states possessing more capabilities than the rest of the members of world community.

International system is defined as “a set of well-defined and long-established ‘rules of the game’ governing states and how sates treat each other”. Some academics have substituted international system by world system or global political system. According to them world system is broad and includes “numerous more or less autonomous actors interacting in a patterned ways to influence one another”. Arguments above have two common features: (1) world system consists of numerous constituent elements and (2) interaction among them is patterned; they interact in accordance to well-defined and long-established rules of the game. The above two components of world system are closely interrelated. Globalization affects these interlocking components of and in turn is affected by the nature of the world system. Structuralism and particularly political structuralism or neo-realist alternatively known as structural realist theorem proceeds on assumption that great power(s) relations and distribution of power among them effectively influences and guides the process of globalization.
Structural realism provides deeper insight about the 'definer' of 'infrastructures' of globalization. Therefore, if structural realism proceeds on the assumption that great power relations and distribution of power among them effectively influences and guides the process of globalization, then it, from the above assumption, follows that the 'operative balance of power system' affects the 'infrastructures' of globalization in Held's second analytical model (see Section A of Part I) or 'patterned ways', 'long-established rules of the game' (in definitions of international system above). Correlation between 'operative balance of power system' and the 'infrastructures' suggests that globalization could result in neo-imperialism and hence its significance for world politics-defined as the way human beings as individuals, groups (i.e. states and non-state actors) strive to advance certain collective or otherwise values in opposition to those of others-becomes tremendously many. Let's discuss the structural realist analytical model for the impact of globalization to clarify ambiguities around the above assumptions.

Structural realism adheres to all original assumptions of traditional realism; such as state-centric international order, state as unitary rational actor and anarchic nature of the international system. However, responding to growing role emerging of interdependent world resulting from growing number of functional international institutions and regimes, original realism was modified and hence the term neorealism or structural realism is used to represent this modified version of traditional realism. Therefore, structural realism in the main is based on assumptions below: (1) the world is divided into major/super, middle/regional and small/national powers; (2) states are no longer primary actors in international affairs; (3) that the distribution of power within the international system influences the making of policies of states; (4) there exists power structure within the international system. This means that international system is composed of numerous autonomous major powers or centers of powers alternatively called polarity of the system; (5) world politics is a self-help system; a semi-organized anarchy, lacking mechanisms of controlling moral consensus and socially sanctioned code of behavior and hence stability and order within such a system depends on the nature of interactions among the major powers; (6) there exists hegemonic tendency among every single pole of the system. Hegemony is understood as attempts at establishing political, economic, military domination or leadership by a state over the whole world or part of it. Hence, hegemony could take as many from as the number of poles of the system. The numerous centers of powers, however, attempt to establish their respective hegemonic domination over the bloc of its spheres of influence. (7) Distribution of power among the numerous poles of the system can be either even or uneven (distribution of power as such is called
balance of power). When distribution is relatively even, the power structure is called either bipolar or multipolar, depending on the number of centers of powers constituting the power structure. However, if the distribution of power is hierarchical, such a distribution favors only one power. This power located at the top of the hierarchy is variously called hegemon or preponderant power. Other major powers are ascribed second class status. It then follows that this predominant power or hegemon will attempt to establish hegemonic domination. (8) States may not only pursue aggrandizement of power viewed in military terms; they may also pursue other interests. By implication means of attaining these interests are therefore many. It therefore follows that (9) some degree of governance is essential in the realm of trade and dynamic growth. Numerous supranational economic regimes and institutions that coordinate economic activities among states and regulate international economic exchanges are essential. But they would effectively be influenced by existing core economic blocs; each with its center and periphery. Power relations among the numerous centers of powers of existing power structure within the international system influences activities and roles of and regulations and rules within such a transnational network. However, the most powerful state(s) would use such supranational organizations to establish their hegemony in economic sphere as they do in political sphere of international politics. By extension, dominant power(s) play effective role in maintaining both economic as well as political international order. In other words multilayered and multidimensional system of governance could exist but in every layer, a dominant power would exert influence in decision-making processes of its domain. 22

Four basic yet interrelated themes are advanced through the above assumptions: (1) power structure; (2) definer(s) of rules of the game'; (3) existence of hegemonic tendency by the major states constituting the power structure and (4) existence of supranational (multipurpose or single purpose) security and functional international institutions (organizations and regimes). This last theme advanced by structural realists suggests a significant departure from traditional realist position on international politics. It is expressive of the fact that structural realists incorporated some of the elements suggested by functionalists and interdependence theorists. For instance, they took into account transnational, importance of economic factors and non-state elements in international relations. Yet, they upheld the view that the functionalist and interdependency theorists assumption were still significantly affected by the first theme-international politics affected by existing power structure. By emphasizing power structure, structural realists broadened the scope of traditional realism. Yet they maintained all developments-
political, economic, social, and military—are the by-product or net-result of such a power structure in the world politics. Put differently, structural realists believe that the nature of power structure influences definition of patterns of relations on global scale and the destiny of all nations on the planet earth is shaped by one, two or few powerful state(s).

The power structure suggests existence of numerous poles or centers of powers. However, each single center has hegemonic tendency. The regimes and institutions that are established and being shaped within international system are, therefore, the result as well as reflection of the interests of these centers of powers. Hence procedural, institutional, functional, political, legal or economic developments that occur are determined by the nature of power relations of these centers. Notwithstanding this, the number of dominant centers of power could range between one, two or more than three. If it is one the international system is unipolar. The definer of the rules of the game is one state. If centers of powers are two the international system is bipolar. They dominate international relations globally as well as within their respective spheres of influence. If centers of powers are more than three the international system is multipolar and the concert of major powers determines the rules of the game both on global level as well as bloc level.

Given structural realist perspective on international relations, typifying post-Cold War international system into either of the above categories could be risky. It would be safe to argue that the post-Cold War international system is being defined. However, some general observable trends, specifically after the incidents of September 11, 2001 and the recent unilateral preemptive military action by the United States against Iraq, dominating international politics have surfaced. The trend in post-Cold War is that United States' behavior shows symptoms of preponderant power both in military as well as economic terms. The United States sidetracked the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), despite strong opposition from other permanent members of UNSC, in removing Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq. Moreover, the United States has so far rejected any role for the world body in the post-Saddam Iraq. The United States, according to its Secretary of State Collin Powel, is even contemplating action against France for its opposition to the second Iraq War. In post-September 11 world, almost all nations are cooperating with Washington in crushing terrorism. Above all, Washington has shown the will and determination to act unilaterally as well as in concert in any situation that is perceived detrimental to the interests of the United States and world security. The United States believes that it needs to be consulted in arrangements
of any kind anywhere and mostly all transactions concluded on Washington’s terms. The reasons stated are simple: the United States is the most powerful nation on the planet earth. All these in a nutshell suggest strong hegemonic tendencies in the way the United States behave. However, this is not to suggest that the game among the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council is over.

Therefore, it is safe to conclude that a given power structure influences and guides the definition of the established rules of the game or the nature of a given international system. The definer of such rules of the game could be one state, two states or more than two states. The post-Cold War international system however leans towards unipolarity in which one power dominates definition of the rules of the game. Hence, according to structural realist analytical framework, the globalization process will be guided by the power structure. And the United States wields power in the post-Cold War international politics, the ‘infrastructures’ in Held’s second analytical model, discussed above, essential for globalization process would therefore be primarily defined or at least in the main dominated by one dominant power. Major features of international politics in such a globalized world are discussed below.

PART II

IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Analysis of the impact of globalization on international politics, viewed in terms of structural realist analytical model, may proceed on basis of one overriding assumption: state monopoly in international politics still prevails and manifestations of such a monopoly is even more observable if globalization discourse viewed in the context of existing power structure within the international system. Globalization process will further crystallize political and economic polarization. It naturally, therefore, follows that all processes-integration, interdependence, dependency and obviously globalization-take place within the major currents of workplan designed by the dominant pole(s) of that power structure. The term ‘major currents of workplan’ denotes flexibility inherent in structural realist analytical model. In this context, the model provides for development of institutions, regimes and rules in a specific area of international politics without participation of the dominant pole(s) of the power structure in so far they do not deviate from the major currents of control (i.e. do not run counter to the interests of dominant pole(s) of the system). Here, the structural realist
analytical model rebuts the functionalists, interdependence, system, or regime theorists' argument that huge amount of transnational activities are carried out neither by states nor require dominant powers participation.\textsuperscript{23}

Moreover, flexibility also denotes that the model permits multi-level or multi-layer as well as multi-dimensional dominance or exercise of power. In other words multilayered system of governance-local, national, regional and global-is influenced by the operative power structure. A state can be a dominant global power or regionally influential bloc leader. It can also be economically, politically or militarily dominant. The whole world or a region could be sphere of influence of a state and that it can exert its influence because it is economically, militarily or political influential. Here, the model suggests that all interconnectedness and interdependences denoting globalizing tendencies resulting from functional integration are carried out under the tutelage of powers that are dominant globally or regionally. Thus, power is pervasive and penetrates all levels of globalization process and the existing power structure greatly influences all layers of Held’s bi-model globalization process. Held’s first level four-layer model consists of (1) the extensity of global network, (2) the intensity of global interconnectedness, (3) the velocity of global flows, and (4) the impact propensity of global interconnectedness. Held’s second-level four layer model of globalization process consists of (1) infrastructures, (2) institutionalization, (3) stratification, and (4) modes of interactions.

Let’s recapitulate the main thrust of Held’s thesis, discussed in Section A of Part I of this paper, to show that globalization process is indeed the end result of prevalent power structure within international system. In Held’s view, the globalization process kicks off with putting in place what he termed ‘infrastructures’: all those facilities that can facilitate global networks, flows and relations such as regulative, legal, scientific institutions and regimes, norms and procedures. Operationalization of all other steps as well as creations of globalized conditions are contingent upon infrastructures. Crude infrastructural elements over time become patterned and regular. When interactions are regularized, institutionalization process takes off. The players behave in accordance to established rules, norms or regimes, which enhances the degree of predictability in interactions. Institutionalization, Held argues, breeds power. He defines power as “the capacity of social agents, agencies and institutions to maintain or transform their circumstances, social or physical; and it concerns the resources which underpin this capacity and the forces that shape and influence its exercise. Power, therefore, is being exercised by the numerous components primarily states involved in the process of globalization. Obviously, some components could have more power while others less. Ironically, he argues, globalization
does not eliminate such a power structure or to use Held’s words, ‘patterns of stratification’ within global space. Globalization can only transform the organization, distribution and exercise of power. Patterns of stratification refers to some type of rigid polarity and not mere manipulation and maneuverings among interacting components of globalized space, then transformation that globalization brings within the organization, distribution and excise of power could not mean liquidation of powers of the major or block leader in favor of less powerful states. In other words, the type of power structure advocated by structural realist analytical model may not disappear. This implies that definer of infrastructures is not collectivity of all members of the global space-small, major and bloc leader or transnational—but either one preponderant power or two superpowers or few major powers.

Therefore, the structural realist analytical framework suggests that despite cultural heterogeneity, religious pluralism and distinctive historical backgrounds of peoples in globalized space, the infrastructures upon which globalization is erected is characterized by homogeneity. All institutions, regimes, norms, values, rules and procedures everywhere throughout the globalized space are the same and uniform. However, infrastructural uniformity as such has not been the result of intercultural or inter-civilizational dialogue. The argument that infrastructures are expressions of preferences of dominant pole(s) of the international system is congruent with Michael Mann’s view. Mann argues that all global institutions, rules and regulatory regimes are West Northern dominated. It is Northern citizens and not commodity that rules multilayer of interactions. Therefore, consequences of globalization process for international politics become tremendously many. However, prior to further discussion of impact of globalization process on international politics, it is worthy to note that structural realist model also provides for often small scale systemic disturbances between small powers and major powers, regional powers and major powers and among major powers. Disturbances as such are inevitable due to simple fact that policies of the major powers dominating international affairs and guiding globalization process would adversely affect the core values of other nations, which, obviously, provides strong impetus for development of effective nationalism (discussed later).

Globalization has transformed essential edifice of international system created in Westphalia in 1648. The Westphalian model recognizes no form of—physical, political, cultural, etc.—outside penetration into political domains of other states. According to the Westphalian model, states must respect the principles of (1) sovereign and sovereign equality and (2) territorial integrity in their relations. The former denotes
overarching role of the governing elites in management of citizens’ affairs of a given territorial entity. Management of peoples’ daily lives has become to be the sole prerogative of the government in that territory. Moreover, territorial occupation of some part or the whole of states amounts to violation of sacred human values. By 1990s this Westphalian Model of nation-states has become truly global in the sense that colonialism has almost come to an end.

While Westphalian order has become truly global, yet new dynamics have emerged to diminish national sovereignty both in form and character. This is not to suggest, as Susan Strange argues that states and variation in their power status have become irrelevant. The emphasis is to investigate the nature and to what degree dominant pole(s) of power structure within international system have managed to control decision-making processes in other nations. Diminution of exercise of sovereignty, therefore, must not be understood in the sense that states would fade as predominant actors in international politics. States will be predominant actors, but constrained by rules of game of realpolitik. Strong center-periphery relationship would characterize relations and exchanges among them. The Westphalian model was invoked as an attempt to put an end at once and for all times to patterns of imperialist quests by strong powers. The globalization process revives such an attempt by dominant pole(s) in contemporary international system, however, in its modified form: neo-imperialism/neo-colonialism. Globalization has unleashed forces that recognizes no limits and penetrates every corner of public and societal institutions. State could maintain its discrete geographical identity, but it has to make concessions in its exercise of sovereignty.

Yet the notion of territorial integrity is waning through establishment of networks-functional and non-functional-at the behest of dominant center(s) of power. State sovereignty therefore has become a commodity shared by citizens and outsiders and the outsiders are basically the most powerful nation(s). State has lost monopoly over regulating the affairs of its citizens. States are no longer able to legislate for essential aspects of life at will. Ian Clark rightly pointed out that state is no longer barrier between domestic and international dynamics and the Great Divide-that international represents a field of political and economic forces distinct from the domestic-has been eroded by globalization. State represented by its governing elite therefore has been reduced to something resembling ‘coordinating points’ between powerful pole(s) of international system and its domestic citizens. It has rather become a medium through which the two come into contact. However, in the process, according to structural model, domestic forces operate at the mercy of powerful international forces. States policies have become vulnerable and susceptible to rapid changes and developments beyond
its borders. It is not surprising to argue that globalization resulted in restructuring the world political map; a new restructured political map of the world will indeed reflect preferences of those pole(s) dominating process of globalization. Even in democracies, popularly elected political elites are pressured to share their power or decide under duress of some distant forces, despite being detrimental to the interests and welfare of their people. On the contrary, some states, particularly small nations, have virtually no ability to raise their concerns about the tide of distant impact on their welfare. Such views, even if raised, would fall on deaf ears as the tides of globalization are so strong to be defended or reversed.

The growth of international and transnational organizations and collectivities, from the UN and its specialized agencies to international pressure groups and social movements, has altered the from and dynamics of both state and civil society. The state has become a fragmented policy making arena, permeated by transnational networks (governmental and non governmental) as well as by domestic agencies and forces. Likewise, the extensive penetration of civil society by transnational forces has altered its from and dynamics. [And according to Structural realism, discussed earlier, the dominant power structure within the international system influences the transnational networks].

According to structural realist model, the operative balance of power (leaning towards unipolarity) in the post-Cold War era provides potential strength behind waivers of globalization. Hence, one dominant state tends to assume that it possesses legitimate right to penetrate at all levels of decision processes in national, societal and global levels. All public policies and societal choices therefore reflect the attitudes and interests of the dominant center of power. This is not only true about the small and regional powers. This is often true about the powers above the regional but not strong enough to challenge the lone dominant power. Thus, according to structural model, globalization process gave birth to neocolonialism; a new from of old colonialism. Held and McGrew note:

Decolonization clearly did not create a world of equally free states. The influence of Western commerce, trade and political organization outlived direct rule. Powerful national economic interests have often been able to sustain hegemonic positions over former colonial territories through the replacement of ‘a visible presence of rule’ with the invisible government of corporations, banks, and international organizations (the IMF and the World
Bank, for example). Furthermore, interlaced with this have been the sedimented interests and machinations of the major powers, jostling with each other for advantage, if not hegemonic status.28

Globalization process, according to structural realist analytical model, also projects crystallization of economic inequalities. Structural realist model suggests that presuming economic inequalities as such can be eradicated or even moderated through coordinated international intervention or any other mechanism is a categorical mistake. For inequality is inscribed in the very structure of world order and a global hierarchy of power is essentially based on national capabilities. In this context, globalization process leads to “a new mode of Western imperialism”29 or neo-imperialism. This undermines or is dismissive of the view that there are growing patterns of interdependence between North and South. On the contrary, it confirms the proposition that there is emerging pattern of dependency; South becoming more dependent on North. To dislike of most advocates of integration approach and specifically neo-functionalists, formation of network of functional and economic transnational institutions hardly ameliorate negative effects of economic globalization. Contemporary trends on global scale confirm patterns of financial and economic activities predominantly remain captive of interests of dominant pole(s). “In effect, the governance of the world economy still remains reliant, especially in times of crisis, on the willingness of the most powerful state(s) to police the system-as the East Asian crash of 1997-8 demonstrated so dramatically. However, even in more stable times, it is the preferences and interests of the most economically powerful states, in practice the G7 governments, that take precedence”.30 Regimes and institutions governing linkages between separate national economies are manipulated by dominant states. Who decides on issues such as transition of economies of member of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) from industrial to post-industrial economic activities, global division of labor of economic activities and restructuring of patterns of economic relations on global scale? These are obviously reflection of preferences of powerful economies. The growing gap between North and South will widen. South will become more dependent on North. In globalized world, in which might trumps right, chances of growing conflicts among members of the world community become predictable. The clash between competing national interests is, therefore, resolved ultimately through exercise of power.

The negative impact of globalization viewed in terms of penetration by dominant power in the domestic affairs of others is two-fold: (1) effective local nationalism and (2) effective global resistance. On the
domestic front, anti globalization forces will feel closer. Nationalism links the state to forces against outside domination: “it describes both the complex cultural and psychological allegiance of individuals to particular national identities and communities, and the project of establishing a state in which a given nation [and not outsiders] is dominant”. At this level ideological, cultural, linguistic cleavages are mended, criss-crossed or even compromised. New sense of national identity stressing link between indigenous culture, geographical identity and political independence or freedom is forging. Such tendencies would result in negative reactions to even benevolent Western values such as democracy, improved standards of living, progress, development, no corruption, etc. However, in economic terms national economies will lean toward adoption of mercantilist (also known economic nationalism) policies. But, success of protectionist policies depends on the nature of interactions among predominant economic powers. There is a growing trend that poles of global power structure enjoying political, military and economic preponderance have better chances of prevailing in economic regime formation on global level. Mercantilist forces ultimately will surrender. They will become dependent. Economic problems will lead to political instability and may provide impetus for growth of local nationalism.

On global level nationalism manifests itself in the form of global movement resisting the hegemonic behavior of the sole superpower. A further repercussion of this negative globalization would be that the forces of local nationalism and those of global resistance would eventually be forced to collectively repulse the tides of globalization on terms acceptable to dominant pole(s). Possibly, cold-war like scenario in which the forces of local nationalism would be extensively used to weaken the dominant pole(s) of the system so that an order that squarely accommodates interests of the forces of global resistance is put in place. Cooperation between local and global forces of resistance, according to structural realist analytical model, will be based on the notion of national interests; subduing ideological, cultural or even religious differences. Globalization process viewed in terms of structural realist analytical model at this stage possesses yet another devastating challenge: derailment or de-crystallization of liberal or representative democracy in the Third World as well as threaten the unity of Western democratic world. If national interests, for instance, interlock France and the United States or Germany and Great Britain, into non-cooperation, then globalization process will certainly threaten the unity of Western democratic world. Moreover, democratization and development of viable civil society the world over would rather become a legitimizing means used by dominant pole(s) of the system. Fragile political leadership without grass root support will win no respect of the masses. Local
nationalist forces may claim greater respect to ideals of democracy but not democratization of their lands and institutions on terms of the dominant pole(s) of the system. Even resistance as such will be justified on democratic grounds. The prospect of culturally diverse and religiously pluralistic order diminishes. Formulation of rules of the game through democratic processes on the global level would seize to inform inter-cultural and inter-civilianizational dialogues.

CONCLUSION

Globalization process unraveled challenges and opportunities. However, two challenges caused by globalization are outstanding. Globalization process has affected both the (1) field of international politics as an academic subject and (2) nationalism. Researches contemplating solutions to the problems above may consider suggestions below. It is often argued that the field of international politics requires fundamental reorientation and reinvention. Globalization have eroded the “Great Divide: that international represents a field of political and economic forces distinct from the domestic....”32 Hence, traditional theoretical framework cannot explain the complex and expanding political, economic and cultural interdependences and interconnectedness generated in human affairs. The scientific community has yet to evolve a paradigm reflecting global or globalizing tendencies in human affairs. Much of the generalization and hypothesis building have certainly contributed to redefine the role of world politics and its status in relations to other dimensions of human life, one still observes stunning lack of conceptual clarity and theoretical frame of references that could provide adequate explanations about world events and occurrences.33 The above discussion however suggests that central to theoretical reorientation and reinvention would be the role of power structure within the international system. Unless the role of operative balance of power stressed, theories would fail to provide adequate explanation of impacts new developments such as globalization process would impinge on international politics.

One alternative to diffuse forces of resistance and salvage the world from political and economic polarization is genuine crystallization of liberal democracy both on national as well as global scales. Democratization policy must guide every steps of globalization process. If democratization does not preceed globalization and if the latter aims to create a more balanced world order, then the two processes should progress symmetrically on national and international fronts. However, central to effective democratization process are: (1) socio-cultural identity based on respect for cultural, religious, ethnic and linguistic pluralism, (2) democratization
of decision-making processes and the willingness by powerful states to respect and accept the views of the less powerful states, (3) all decisions and activities must reflect collective interest and not the interests of powerful few, and (4) common structure of rights and duties in which every individual and state is treated with equality and justice. Without genuine democratization, globalization process will always remain effective tool of neo-imperialism. Parallel procession of globalization and democratization processes, though difficult, may not be a project that cannot be realized. However, it has become an open challenge to dominant pole(s) of the world order to maintain the balance between national interests and forces of democratization.

END NOTES

1 It is hard to trace the exact date of origin of globalization process. Though the term globalization process began to be used a decade after World War II, some academics have traced its origin to 19th and early 20th century intellectuals such as Saint-Simon (sociologist) and MacKinder’s (geopolitical theorist) caliber. However, this study maintains its origin primarily to era of expanding political and economic interdependence that have been main feature of international politics since 1950s.


3 For details see, ibid., pp. 4-5.


6 Ibid., p. 101.

7 Ibid., p. 102.

8 George Modelski, “Globalization” in David Held & Anthony MacGrew, op. cit, p. 49.
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