Globalization, Civilization and World Order

A World-constructivist Approach

Why are the three concepts of globalization, civilization and world order relevant? How are they related to each other? This chapter seeks to answer these questions. Answering the first is simple. Obviously, the current world order cannot be fully understood without taking “globalization” into consideration. The effects of Globalization reach every corner of the world in different scope and degree. Why is “civilization” important? It is important because civilization incorporate the essence of world order. Civilization as we will see later on, contains and reflects both economic, social, cultural and political aspects and dimensions of the world order. We define a great civilization as a junction between a world vision and a historical formation. The answer to the second question constitutes the main subject of this chapter. We will (1) analyze the relations between civilization and world identity; (2) explain how globalization is related to world economy; and finally (3) we will bind the three concepts (globalization, civilization and world order) together by proposing three models on world order.

Before going through our study, our theoretical approach will be outlined in brief.

There is a general consensus among scholars that globalization is first and foremost of economic character. The advanced technological progress contributes largely to the acceleration of economic globalization as well as globalization of certain sets of values; e.g. human rights. In this respect, the world system theory may be applied to explain the evolution of parochial economic systems to the rise of capitalism and the world economy. The world system theory – especially in its Braude-Wallerstein ramification – goes even further and deals with questions related to civilization, culture, democracy etc. (Braudel 1979, 1993; Wallerstein 1992, 1995). However, the primary focus remains on economy without paying much attention to the international system, to phenomena such as anarchy, polarity, international law, international ethics, and in general to questions about the identity of the world. A main part of these aspects of the problematic enter within the field of social-constructivism which focuses sufficiently on the interaction between international actors as well as on the quality of anarchy and the identity of states. However, the sphere of economy does not represent a priority for the school of social-constructivism. Therefore, a synthesis of these two approaches is assumed to make a useful theoretical explanatory tool to clarify relations between globalization and civilizations, the rise of a new standard of civilization, and also the question about the new identity of the world. These two different sets of theories will be operationalized without entering into a theoretical discussion on the selected
theories. In other words, theories are not applied here for the sake of theories; they are used with regard to explaining relations between globalization, civilization and world order.

**Civilisations and the New Identity of the World**

The axial question concerns the compatibility/non-compatibility of the current unprecedented global system with a world made up by a plurality of civilizations. In other words, can the world become economically global without having any substantial impact on civilizations? Such crucial and complex questions require profound and detailed investigation which is outside the scope of this chapter. However, two elements of this problematic must be mentioned. First, as a general rule, trade will automatically increase the intensity of cultural exchanges. Trade carries along the culture of the traders. The history of humanity stands as proof for the importance of cultural exchange through trade. Secondly, what is valid for traditional and primitive trade, is a fortiori valid for a highly sophisticated system such as capitalism. Capitalism does introduce profound structural transformations in a society. Capitalism requires division of labor, networks of distribution, banking systems, etc. Such transformations entail social and hence mental and cultural changes. A deep and constant implementation of capitalism in a society will shape the world vision of the people. When a global economic system (capitalism) functions through a system experiencing technological revolution, the mentality and attitude of the people on existential questions (life and death, conflict and co-operation, time and space, etc.) will consequently be influenced. To continue this discussion, the problematics of civilization as a phenomenon must be addressed.

There are small civilizations and great civilizations depending upon their scoop, length and depth. There are abortive civilizations (e.g. the Nestorian Christian civilization in the past, and the Soviet civilization in modern times). Cumulative civilizations are longue durée stretching over many centuries (e.g. the Roman and Islamic civilizations). Great civilizations belong to the last category. It is this kind of civilizations which will continue to shine, even a long time after their decline. New civilizations are often reconstructed versions of great and cumulative civilizations. In our days, the Western political philosophy is still inspired by ancient Greek philosophers, and its existing legal system is deeply inspired and influenced by the legacy of the Roman Empire. The Muslims, on the other hand, continue to refer to their heritage with the purpose of making and remaking their social, economic and political life.
There was a time when different great civilizations could coexist. Their coexistence was not always peaceful but often dominated by war. At that time, each civilization was unique in the sense that it had its specific set of values, applicable social and political concepts, and a specific idea of her own identity as well as of that of other civilizations. The characteristics of each civilization constituted her standard of civilization. Globalization broke the cyclical theory defended by Toynbee (1995) and Quigley (1961). Globalization is now progressively blurring characteristics among different civilizations. It is globalization which selects various characteristics of civilizations, making of them a sort of symbioses.

Civilization is often defined in vague and ambiguous terms: “The inevitable destiny of a culture” (Spengler, in Huntington, 1996: 42); “The kind of culture found in cities” (Bagby 1958: 162-3); “Civilizations are invisible, just as constitutions” (Toynbee 1995: 46); etc. In reality, such definitions say nothing tangible and workable about civilizations. Fernand Braudel provides us with a better definition when defining civilization as “both moral and material values” (Braudel 1995: 5). Immanuel Wallerstein, who is also skeptical about the various definitions of civilization, makes a distinction between “historical system” and “civilization.” Civilization in his view refers “to a contemporary claim about the past in terms of its use in the present to justify to heritage, separateness, rights” (Wallerstein 1992: 235). Despite the differences of opinion among scholars, there is at least unanimity over civilizations being broader than a single culture and larger than a group of cultures. In other words, civilization is “macro-formation” composed of “patterns,” systems, and movements that are again broken down into various schools and movements. The patterns are the arrangements that give the parts a relationship to one another and to the civilization as a whole, whereas systems have their own unity, regardless of whether they happen to form a part of a still larger system (Melko 1995: 30).

Therefore, the inclusion of “historical formation” or “material” dimension into the cultural body and memory seems indispensable, at least when the objective is a workable concept.

In our view, great and cumulative civilizations are composed of two inseparable parts. The first part is made up by an explicit world vision which may be a set of cultural systems, an ideology, or a religion, which is generally the case. The second is represented by a coherent political, military, and economic system often concretized as an empire or a historical formation. I define civilization as a junction between a world vision and a historical formation. In other words, when a specific world vision is
realized through a historical formation, this fusion is called civilization. When a historical formation is brought into being without a comprehensive world vision, such a formation shapes tribes, empires, states, and other forms of political entities, but not a civilization. Similarly, when a world vision stands without a body—a “physical” shape—it is merely ideology, culture or religion. A real civilization is necessarily a generative entity; in its discourse (world vision) as well as in its historical formation/system. By way of example, the Roman civilization with her elaborated cosmopolitan vision was seconded by an imperial institution: the Islamic civilization, with the Koran as a world vision and Umma/Caliphate as a historical formation.

Each civilization possesses its own standard. The standard of Chinese civilization is different from the standard of Islamic civilization, just as the standard of European civilization is different from the standard of Indian civilization etc. Put simply, the standard of each civilization represents the identity card and the DNA of the same civilization. Furthermore, the standard of civilization is the criteria determining who is “uncivilized” and who is “civilized.” “Uncivilized” in one civilization could be considered “civilized” in another, and vice versa.

There is a direct correspondence between the real power of a civilization and the extension of its standard. When one civilization becomes stronger than another, its standard will prevail as the dominant standard. The dominant standard is often imposed on others (e.g. “capitulation,” “unequal treaties”), but it can also be “interiorized” and voluntarily accepted (conversion to a religion, adherence to democracy, etc.). Rejecting the dominant standard or opposing to it is a sanctionable offense. The sanction can take different forms: Jihad against the non-Muslims, economic sanctions against Iraq, universal condemnation of human rights conditions in China, etc. Weak civilizations produce only weak standards in terms of degree and scope of applicability and acceptance. The standard of a declined civilization cannot be revived after its fall.

Continuing our discussion on civilization, there is no historical evidence that the primary aim of civilizations is establishment of internal peace. Historically, all civilizations have been subjected to severe internal conflicts resulting in war. In fact, internal conflicts have been the main source for the decline of civilizations. In other words, a clash within a civilization has been more frequent and more damaging than a clash between civilizations. This is a general remark, valid for all civilizations including the Western civilization. In fact, the Western civilization has been one of the most war haunted civilizations. Here, we are not referring to the innumerable, bloody and horrifying external wars related to Western colonialism and imperialism. We refer to internal wars such as the Hundred Years’ War, the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648), the
Napoleonic Wars, WWI, and WWII. Similarly, the Greek civilization experienced multiple wars; e.g. the Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta, and war between the Athenians themselves. Also the powerful Roman Empire could not escape their fate of division and the rise of the Byzantine Empire as a new rival. The Islamic Empire followed the same path and was divided into many parts (Abbasids, Fatimids, Seljuqs, etc.) causing her final decline as an empire and a civilization. Now, the question is why the horrifying war history of the Western civilization did not cause the decline of Western civilization? Why did the West become paradoxically stronger, and why is her civilization still shining, not like a dying star but as a dominant and unchallenged civilization? Which characteristics of this specific civilization make it so unique? These are crucial and highly sophisticated questions requiring an extensive and multi-disciplinary investigation. Some Western scholars argue that Western civilization is actually in decline. Spengler and Huntington represent this tendency. However, if we consider the West as a whole (USA, Europe, Canada, Australia, Japan, etc.), no serious symptoms indicate a coming decline. On the contrary, the arrow is moving in the opposite direction. As any other civilization, the current Western civilization could of course also be subject to decline. However, this has not happened yet and probably never will. Essentially because what characterizes this civilization and differentiates it from all other previous civilizations resides in the fact that the Western civilization represents a unique and unprecedented example in the history of humankind by the fact that it is a democratic civilization. Since democracy is based on freedom of speech and mind and rule by the people, it possesses crucial qualities of self-discipline. Consequently, as long as the West remains fully democratic, Western civilization will be capable of avoiding decline. Thus, due to the specific nature (democracy) of the Western civilization, a fall, should it ever occur, will be completely different from the fall of all other previous civilizations. In this connection, one may distinguish between the strength of Western powers and the destiny of Western civilization. At present, Western civilization and Western powers are almost identical. A possible decline of Western powers will of course negatively influence Western civilization. However, Western civilization as a civilization would probably survive in other parts of the world; as it happened for Christianity which survived as a hegemonic religion outside its original place of birth.

Globalization combined with the expansion of Western civilization has created a specific world order. This world order is not merely limited to a mechanical stability. The new world order goes beyond stability. It requires legitimacy which is quite different from the legitimacy related to absolute and perpetual sovereignty; a legacy of the Westphalian order. The novelty is that the current changes are more substantial and more general than any time before in history. The new changes in state identities
are both horizontal and vertical. Both gemeinschaft and gesellschaft. The identity of
states such as e.g. the Czech Republic, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic
republics are quite different from before the end of the Cold War. The most important
identity transformation is unquestionably the changes in the identity of the Russian
nation. This change has had a considerable number of consequences for peace and
stability in the world. As a result, we may claim that Russian missiles today are
culturally different from the earlier Soviet missiles. However, there is some resistance
to the general change. China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq and some other states are in
different degree resisting transformation of the identity in their respective states.
However, the change in state identities has not so far affected the structure of the
international system. A system changes only if its ordering principle is changed. The
ordering principle of the system is still anarchy and the system therefore remains the
same. Has the bipolarity changed? Not in military terms. More than a decade after the
fall of the Berlin Wall, we still have a nuclear balance of power between the USA and
Russia as the successor of the USSR. If the ordering principle of the system has not
changed, and the nuclear balance of power remains unchanged as well, wherein lies
the actual change? In this respect, the structural-realism gives contradictory messages.
On the one hand, Kenneth Waltz, the front figure of structural realism, admits that
“[c]learly something has changed” (Waltz 2000: 30). On the other hand, he says that
“[the] world, however, has not been transformed; the structure of international politics
has simply been remade by the disappearance of the Soviet Union and for a time we
will live with unipolarity” [italics added] (ibid: 39). From this argumentation we may
deduct that the change at the unit level (in this case the Soviet Union) can cause
a change in the structure of the international system. Surprisingly, when admitting to
this proposition (above quotation), Waltz contradicts himself by saying that “[c]hanges
in the structure of the system are distinct from changes at the unit level” (ibid: 5). The
latter proposition is correct, thus is in clear contradiction with Waltz’ other proposition
that “the structure of international system has been remade.” The only way to solve
this contradiction is to admit to the fact that the structure of the international system
has not been changed. Despite the hegemony (and not “unipolarity”) of the USA, the
system still remains anarchical. Clearly, change does not lie in structure of the
international system. The change lies precisely in the world and the identity of
the world, and consequently the identity of the global system. It means that the identity of
the system can be subject to change whereas the structure remains unchanged.
Consequently, we still have anarchy, although not the same kind; we still have a
balance of powers, but not the same kind; and we still have states, but they no longer
have the same authority and sovereignty. Yet, it is obvious that the world before and
after the fall of the Berlin Wall is a quite different place. The balance of power between
a democratic bloc on the one side and a non-democratic bloc on the other differs from a balance of power between two democratic blocs. More specifically, the US-USSR balance of power is completely different from a possible US-EU balance of power. It is equally true that a democratic anarchy is quite different (in terms of functioning, communications, and consequences) from a mixed anarchy (democratic and non-democratic). In an anarchical system there are two ways of categorizing states. One is power-based and the other is quality-based. Most theories, realism (old and new) in particular, classify states according to their respective material (power) capabilities: super powers, great powers, medium powers, and small powers. From this point of view, nuclear weapons are nuclear weapons independently of the immaterial attributes of their possessor. Some nuclear weapons are less destructive than others. There is neither “good” nor “bad” in a Machiavellian universe, only “friends” and “enemies,” amity and enmity. Waltz is convinced that states’ interests have nothing to do with their identity. The interest of a democratic state is identical with the interest of a non-democratic state. However, he admits that “all governments have their faults, democracies no doubt fewer than others, but that is not good enough to sustain the democratic peace thesis” (Waltz 2000: 12). If it is so, why does President George W. Bush consider Russia a friend of the USA? What happened which turned the archenemy of the USA its friend? To state the reason to be Russia’s weakness would be a realistic argument. In this case, why does the President of the US not consider countries such as China, North Korea or Iran as friends of the USA? These states are even weaker in military terms than Russia. The main reason why these countries are not perceived as “friends” is to be found rather in their specific identity than in their military capabilities. Therefore, the most logical and reasonable explanation resides in fact that the change in Russia’s identity has been the real cause for the change of the US perception of Russia. This remark brings us directly to the quality-based approach. This approach operates with the identity of states as well as the identity of missiles. There are “uncivilized” ones, just as there are “democratic” and non-democratic missiles. While all civilized and democratic missiles are friends because they share the same democratic values, the uncivilized and undemocratic missiles are hostile not only to each other, but certainly also to civilized and democratic missiles. One could argue that the “uncivilized” missiles share the same value – uncivilized –, which will restrain them from going to war against other barbarians. Against this argument we may say that uncivilized “values” do not create durable “common interests” and lack a cooperative culture. For decades, the USSR and the People’s Republic of China shared the same ideology (Marxism-Leninism) and pursued the same objective: the realization of communism. Obviously, this was not sufficient to establish durable common interests between them. Furthermore, a schism actually produced “fratricide,”
antagonism and hostility between Beijing and Moscow. Since they were non-democratic, their “common cultures” were negative. And negative common cultures are insufficiently capable of establishing “uncivilized peace.”

The main reason for the lack of long-term common interests and peaceful cooperation between non-democratic states is that their “culture” is alien to the concept of voluntarily entering into contracts. While the entire underpinning of democracy is based on a liberal contract system, non-democratic constructions are arbitrary products of force, and are thus incapable of generating common interests. One could also argue that the Warsaw Pact and Comecon, created in respectively 1955 and 1949, are evidence that run counter with the argument presented here. In response to this, we emphasize the substantial difference between a military alliance on the one hand, and a collective security arrangement or security community on the other. In Alexander Wendt’s words, “alliances are temporary coalitions of self-interested states who come together for instrumental reasons in response to a specific threat. Once the threat is gone, the coalition loses its rationale and should disband” (Wendt 1994: 386). It is true that both the Warsaw Pact and NATO initially possessed the same characteristics. A significant difference between the two is that while the former was dissolved before the end of the “threat” from NATO, the latter transformed from an alliance to a community thus changing its raison d’être from working against a specific threat to working against non-specific treats. When comparing the Comecon with the EU, we arrive at the same conclusion that the auto-dissolution of Comecon was a result of its mechanical and abortive character, while the progress of the EU is due to its integrative and cumulative character.

Based on the quality criterion, John Rawls divides states (people in his terminology) according to the degree to which they have internalized “liberal culture.” He divides states into 1) reasonably liberal people; 2) decent [non-liberal] people; 3) outlaw states, and 4) societies burdened by unfavorable conditions (Rawls 1999: 4). He thinks that peace should be possible between the first and the second category of states, and obviously with the third one. Rawls does not assign much importance to nuclear weapons, but what in his model makes peace possible between categories 1 and 2 are again the “basic cultural affinities” between them (respect for basic human rights, moral duties, obeying the law, etc.). The most important requirement to obtain classification as a decent state is to be non-aggressive (ibid. 64-70). In civilizational terms, Rawls’ classification of states is based on “cultural identity” rather than material power. From this point of view, the world consists of the “civilized” or “semi-civilized” and the “uncivilized” or “savages” (Rougier 1910; Oppenheim 1912; Gong 1984). In both approaches, actor identity determines the quality of anarchy and not the
reverse. Our argument is that the change in the international arena that we are witnessing in the post Cold War period is primarily due to the transformation of the Russian identity rather than the disintegration of the USSR. The former gave rise to the latter and not vice versa. The USSR could disintegrate and yet remain the same (with a Marxist-Leninist identity). According to this hypothesis, the USSR would surely have been a weaker challenger without this tangible effect on the identity of the system. NATO could hardly have intervened in Yugoslavia and Poland, and the Czech Republic and Hungary could not as easily have become full members of NATO. The reason is that the USSR challenged not only the military power of the USA (and hence the entire West), but also and especially the very identity of the West. It was only when the USSR changed her identity by giving up the adversarial position towards Western identity, slowly moving in the direction of Western “civilization” and sharing the same intersubjectivity that the sense and meaning of Russia’s military challenge changed in consequence. In short, “Russian missiles” are culturally different from the earlier “Soviet missiles” independently of their technical performance. It is only from this angle that President George W. Bush’s statements on Russia can be correctly understood. He has repeatedly announced that “Russia is our [USA/Western] friend.” What happened to make Russia USA’s friend? Is it not precisely because of the fundamental change in Russia’s identity?

**How Can Structural Realists Explain this Change?**

At present, there are no tangible signs indicating China’s possible return to Maoism, Vietnam’s to the Hồ Chí Minh era, or Iran’s to the Khomeini era. On the contrary, numerous indicators show that these countries intend to pursue policies of reform. We have an ongoing process towards global convergence which also affects inter-state relations. This convergence is not tactical, nor is it a contextual convergence of merely materialist interests between states. Convergence is too broad a concept and cannot be reduced to temporary “alliances” (e.g. the alliance between Nazi Germany and stalinist USSR in 1939). Convergence is a product of change in the orientation of states. We are not saying that it is complete, nor that it is perfect, but the trend towards convergence is unprecedentedly great. Contemporary state orientation moves roughly in the direction of capitalism and liberalism. This tendency is more immediately noticeable in the “center” of the world system (the West) as well as in countries such as Russia, China, Vietnam, and Iran. These countries have yet to “internalize” the norms associated with the Global Standard of Civilization, but they are at the stage of pre-internalization or “norm cascade” (Finnemore et al. 1998: 887-911). This factual observation does not necessarily imply that all these countries share the same ideas and values and have similar approaches to human rights, democracy, and liberalism.
On the other hand, it is undeniable that, in a historical sense, the gap between different world visions is now as narrow as it has ever been. Two pillars of the current mega civilization remain unchallenged, and also adherence to liberalism and capitalism (in various ramifications) is on the increase. In other words, globalization has considerably reduced the differences between various world visions. Not yet complete convergence or complete divergence.

**Globalisation and World Economy**

Contemporary globalization is a result of a long cumulative complex and multidimensional process which can be traced back to the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries. In fact, “[c]apitalist development is a process that was put together gradually over a period of some five centuries, beginning in Western Europe from the fourteenth century, before it became, in nineteenth, a coherent expansive force on a world scale. The expansive force at the mid-nineteenth century point was in its competitive phase. From the late nineteenth century, capitalist development entered a new, monopolistic phase. Each of these phases was associated with new modes of social relations of production” (Cox 1987: 51).

During the past six centuries, the world has completely changed in every thinkable and unthinkable way. It is a profound and immense change. Within the social and political fields, the axial question is to establish which elements among the most general ones have been constant during the entire period from the fifteenth to the twenty-first century. If we ignore a number of elements, two will be identified as being the most constant. By “constant,” we do not mean that elements have not been subject to evolution. On the contrary, they have been submitted to challenge (by communism and fascism/nazism/fundamentalism). However, the elements maintain their strong position – which is almost hegemonic – causing substantial changes in all aspects of human social life. These constant elements which emerged in Europe (the epicenter of a new civilization which became Western before becoming global) are: 1) a specific and unique economic system referred to as Capitalism; and 2) a specific set of ideas about social and political engineering which – in contemporary discourse – is referred to as liberalism. We argue that the world today and globalization in particular is best understood by taking these two elements into consideration.

It is a fact that capitalism is the absolute dominant economic system, as it is a fact that despite great lack of perfection, the world has never been as democratic as today. Furthermore, the respect for human rights has never been as weighty even though horrifying violations of human rights still take place. Following the Freedom House Survey (2000-2001), at the end of year 2000, there were 86 free countries (2,465.2 billion people; 40.69 percent of the world population) in which a broad range of political
rights was respected. There were 59 partly free countries (1,442.2 billion people; 23.80 percent of the world population) in which there was a mixed record of more limited political rights and civil liberties. There were 47 countries rated not free (2,151.1 billion people representing 35.51 percent of the world population) where basic political rights and civil liberties were non-existent. In sum, the survey shows that in the year 2000, there was significant progress towards freedom in 25 countries and significant setbacks for freedom in 18 countries. Moreover, 40.69 percent of the world population living in freedom is the highest score in the history of the Freedom House Survey which was founded in 1941. This brings us to ask ourselves whether this state of affairs is purely a matter of coincidence, or whether there is any logical and historic connection between globalization on the one side and capitalism-liberalism on the other.

Fernand Braudel, the architect of the world system theory, makes a distinction between two concepts: world economy (économie mondiale) and world-economy (économie-monde). The former is simply what we call international economy or “universal market.” The latter – more important in his view as a historian – is equivalent to the German weltwirtschaft and is applied to an economy of a portion of the world standing by itself as a tout économique. “A world-economy is defined by a triple reality: 1) it is limited to a given geographic area; 2) it is related to a political pole or center (e.g. New York) or even to multiple centers (London, New York, Tokyo, Paris, etc.); and 3) it is also composed by a center and different peripheral zones” (Braudel 1985: 85-86). Immanuel Wallerstein, the most prominent among Braudel’s disciples, argues that a world system is a multicultural network of exchange of necessities which include food, raw material, bullion, and protection. In his view, there are two types of world systems: world empires and world economies which shape and control production and distribution (Wallerstein 1974: 63).

The reason why Braudel attaches more importance to world-economy is the particular evolution of European world-economy which as a single regional system is the only one that expanded and incorporated all parts of the world. None of the other world systems became global despite the fact that they shared some structural similarities with the European system. “Many of them had core-periphery hierarchies in which core regions, usually those areas with the biggest cities and the strongest states, dominated and exploited adjacent peripheral regions” (Boswell and Chase-Dunn 2000: 19-20). Along this line, we may ask why Europe stands as a unique system which became global? World system theorists explain it by the fact that, only in Europe, capitalism became the dominant mode of accumulation, and this fundamentally altered the nature of the international system.
Consequently, as the vehicle of structural transformation in Europe, capitalism in this context is a longue durée phenomenon par excellence, and the vehicle is defined as “historical capitalism” quite different from all previous historical social systems. What distinguishes historical capitalism is that “in this historical system, capital came to be used (invested) in a very special way. It came to be used with the primary objective or intent of self-expansion” (Wallerstein 1995: 13-14). Another difference resides in the non-availability of one or more elements of the process: the accumulated stock in money, the labor to be utilized by the producer, the network of distributors, the consumers. More specifically, in the pre-capitalist formation:

One or more elements were missing because, in previous historical social systems, one or more of these elements was not “commodified” or was insufficiently “commodified.” What this means is that the process was not considered one that could or should be transacted through a “market.” Historical capitalism involved therefore the widespread commodification of processes – not merely exchange processes, but production processes – that had previously been conducted other than via a “market” (Wallerstein 1995: 15).

To Marx, capitalism is a system of commodity production. “In the capitalist system producers do not simply produce for their own needs, or for needs of individuals with whom they are in personal contact; capitalism involves a nation-wide, and often an international, exchange market” (Giddens 1971/1990: 46). In Marx’s own words, “capitalism withdraws from the spheres with low rates of profit and invades others which yield a higher profit” (quoted by Giddens 1971/1990: 51).

Following the path of expansion of capitalism, the treaties of Westphalia (in 1648) and subsequently the rise of nation states are interpreted by world system theorists as a necessary, even inevitable consequence of historical capitalism in expansion. It is explained by the fact that the capitalist world system from being among many worlds is becoming the historical social system of the entire world needed to construct “territorial organizations capable of regulating social and economic life and of monopolizing means of coercion and violence” (Arrighi 1997: 5-6). On the other hand, the concentration of capital in the core zone created a fiscal base as well as a political motivation for establishing relatively strong state-machineries, the many capacities of which ensured that the state machineries of peripheral zones became or remained comparatively weaker (Wallerstein 1995: 32). In short, national states are a differentiated form of capitalist power. It must be stressed that the capitalist system based on the Westphalian national state, which led to the world economy is distinct from global economy. While the former was predominantly about movements in trade, investments, and payments crossing national frontiers regulated by states and by
international organizations created by states, the latter, in contrast, “was the sphere in which production and finance were being organized in cross-border networks that could very largely escape national and international regulatory powers” (Cox 1996: 22). In other words, the Westphalian world economy was based on territoriality, while the “global economy” is at work in a de-territorialized universe (Hassner 1993: 53). The distinction between the two stages of evolution of capitalism is crucial to grasp the real sense of globalization. Globalization is not about intensification of the classic international economy since the global market is not the sum of national markets. The whole is more than the sum of its parts. Globalization is about the expansion of the world economy which became a reality during the nineteenth century. In its elementary form, globalization is what Lenin called imperialism which emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general (Lenin 1946: 366-385). Lenin was far from being the only thinker who was preoccupied by the idea of the expansion of capitalism. Before and after him, a range of specialists, thinkers and theorists focused their study (some of them their entire life) on this topic. To give an idea of the importance Marxist authors attached to capitalism, nothing is perhaps more revealing than the title of Marx’s own axial work: Das Kapital and not Das Beruf! In a sense, one could argue that Marxism (and with it communism) was not an alternative to capitalism; actually it was a reaction to it. As a matter of fact, this reaction is apparent already in their Manifesto calling and preaching for the “unification of proletarians” against the “unified front of capitalists.” Marx himself and Marxist theorists of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century did in general correctly predict the development and expansionist tendencies of capitalism. What they failed to predict was the extraordinary capacity of capitalism to overcome its contradictions...so far. Rudolf Hilferding is among the authors (i.e. Bukharin, Luxembourg) who in his major work Finance Capital (1910), explained the new mechanism of expansion of capitalist economy and its evolution from international economy to world economy. To Hilferding:

Finance capital marks the unification of capital. The previously distinct spheres of industrial capital, commercial capital and bank capital are henceforth under the control of high finance, in which the magnates of industry and the banks are closely associated. This association, which is founded on the suppression of competition between capitalists by great monopolistic combines, has, of course, the effect of changing the relations between the capitalist class and the state (Finance Capital: 40 in Brewer 1980: 85-6)

The further expansion of capitalism during the twentieth century confirmed Hilferding’s prediction. Capitalism continued its way towards more expansion, it
became a world economy by ignoring national borders and by making the states the agents of globalization from which they (at least states in the high developed capitalist economy) drew substantial benefice. The empirical work is also beginning to “confirm the expectation that highly mobile capital may place limits on the ability of governments to choose not only an autonomous monetary policy but an expansionary fiscal policy as well” (Simmons 1999: 64).

It is in the same spirit that Robert W. Cox retraces the evolution of capitalism. He writes,

“[t]he monopoly phase of capitalist development begins with the long depression of 1873-96. Its salient characteristics have been (1) the concentration of capital into large corporate units; (2) the growth of a dual structure of economy in the industrialized countries....(3) increased importance of the role of banking consortia....(4) increased concern of states...for ensuring the conditions in which production and capital accumulation can continue without distributions...(5) an international division of labor brought about by capital in the most industrialized countries...” (Cox 1987: 69).

The above discussion shows that capitalism evolved from European world-economy to global economy. A global economy is “an economy with the capacity to work as a unit in real time on planetary scale” [italics added] (Castells 1996: 92). In this definition, all three elements of globalization are present in a unified form. “Unit” means a comprehensive system with its internal logic and its own dynamics. “Time” is real and synchronic. “Space” is planetary and no longer limited to national, regional or even cultural borders. In such a system, capital is managed around the clock in globally integrated financial markets working in real time. The labor markets are not yet global; thus the arrow goes in direction of globality. In a world becoming more and more mobile, the labor follows production and services which in turn follow cheaper wages and favorable taxation. Of course, it does not imply that protectionism is history or that every company sell worldwide. It merely implies that trades, productions and transactions in the core (the USA, the European Union and Japan) of the system are becoming predominantly global, giving birth to what Susan Strange called a non-territorial “business civilization” (Strange 1990). In her view, the key aspect of globalization involves neither trade nor investment: It is the adoption of common practices and standards (Strange 1996). In many respects, the rise of a global economy drastically transformed the face of the global world. It stimulated the homogenization and standardization of products which in turn produced a “global life style.” It also established a framework and a guideline for good conduct in international trade (6.6 trillion US dollars in 1997). The general and multilateral rules on trade are now
considerably reinforced by the World Trade Organization (WTO). Among these rules are: reciprocity, non-discrimination, decreasing tariffs (not increasing), consulting and dispute resolution etc. The third and perhaps most significant consequence of global economy is the time-conditioned gap between finance and production. Money is fungible and extremely mobile. New technologies allow billion dollars-worth of transactions to take place in seconds in the electronic circuit around the globe. Capital flows become global and are operating in synchronic dimensions. The development of production takes place in a diachronic dimension. As a result of this gap, global finance has come to dominate production (Cox, see chapter X: XX; Castells 1996: 93). Consequently, changes in the mobility of capital will inevitably influence the development of the nation state, by the fact that while capital flows globally, the nation state is fixed. In this situation, “the different states compete to attract and immobilize the flow of capital. The relation of particular national states to global capital is mediated through the competitive process of attraction-and-immobilization” (Holloway 1996: 130). The problem with global finance is that it is not bound to any global regulatory institution. Disconnected from economic realities, global finance is left to the uncontrolled financial market mechanism, which only takes care of individual interests; causes turbulence (e.g. financial crisis in Asia and Latin America in 1998) and misery for millions of people. The laissez-faire orientation of the market has taken refuge in the lame conviction that, in due course, the invisible hand associated with economic growth would overcome economic hardship, a view completely lacking in empirical support (Falk 1999: 423). George Soros (who is an “insider” of the global finance and a beneficiary of the lack of regulations in this domain) thinks that the present international economic system is highly unstable, and that it has within it the makings of another catastrophe like 1929. Furthermore, in his new book, he criticizes the current situation in the financial market, because “instead of acting like a pendulum, financial markets have recently acted more like wrecking balls knocking over one economy after another” (Soros 1998: xvi). Other commentators such as Paul Hirst, who are skeptical about the ungovernability of financial markets, admits however to the urgency and necessity of its regulation by “extending public governance at both national and international levels, with the aim of combining growth with fairness within and between nations” (Hirst 1997: 425). The lack of rules and principles for a sector on which the future of humanity may depend justifies the necessity of common civilization. A common civilization, universally accepted is not yet established. However, strong indicators attest the emergence of at least a common standard of civilization.
Globalisation, Civilisation and World Order

“World Order” is a human phenomenon. Human phenomena are social constructed. Social constructed phenomena are best understood when are been studied in broader scope than what they are in reality. Describing a phenomenon provides little information about its identity, its spirit, its essence, its history and its possible transformation in the future. To reach such a stage, we need to go beyond description. We need to put the target phenomenon into a broader perspective and take sufficient distance from the phenomenon itself. We need also to look to some deep structures in what the phenomenon (in this case the “world order”) is rooted. It requires reaching general principles and durable regular movements that are determining the shape of the world order. Such démarche is indispensable, because simply the world order cannot be explained by world order itself.

To begin this process, there is a need to have a workable definition of world order. Hedley Bull defines “world order” to mean “those patterns or dispositions of human activity that sustain the elementary or primary goals of social life among mankind as a whole” (Bull 1977: 20). Furthermore, Bull makes a correct distinction between “world order” on one side and “international system” on the other. In his view, the former is broader than the latter. He argues that “international order [system] is order among states; but states are simply groupings of men [and women] and men may be grouped in such a way that they do not form states at all” (ibid). Elaborating further his argument, Bull means that “[w]orld order is wider than international order because to give an account of it we have to deal not only with order among states but also with order on a domestic or municipal scale, provided within particular states, and with order within the wider world political system of which the states system is only part” (ibid: 22). We have to say that Hedley Bull’s great contribution to understanding the “world order” remains at an analytical level. Explaining the causes of different world orders through history did not constitute Bull’s first priority. Simplifying Bull’s statements, the “world order” and order in international society exist because it is necessary (ibid: pp.4-5 and chapter 3). What Bull has not done, we find in Robert W. Cox’ works, in his seminal Production, Power, and World Order in particular. Cox tried to demonstrate that the variations in “world order” are caused by reciprocal relations between production and forms of states. Relations that are both related to the rise and development of capitalism. He means that “[i]n focusing on the transformation in forms of state that bring about changes in production relations, we are led to discover the relationship between changes in forms of state and changes in the structures of world order” (Cox 1987: 108). And on the other hand, “[i]n examining changes in world order, the alternation between hegemonic and non hegemonic
structures is of particular significance. The hegemonies of the Pax Britannica and the Pax Americana both constituted interstate systems that gave free rein to the expansion of the world economy” (ibid). Opposite to this, “[i]n the intervening non hegemonic and more turbulent structure, the interstate system reasserted itself so as to subordinate and control world-economy influences” (ibid). Following this schema, Cox retraced three successive structure of world order: 1) the coming of the liberal international economy; 2) the era of rival imperialism; and finally 3) the neoliberal world order. From an international political economy angle, other scholars come to the conclusion that capitalism went trough four periods: 1) the mercantile phase; 2) the colonial period; 3) the neo-colonial period; and finally 4) post-imperialism (Hoogvelt 1997: 17).

The above definitions contribute to a better understanding of the concept of “world order.” We find that while Bull’s approach to “world order” is strong in the description and analysis of this concept; it is equally weak because of the lacking explanation of the dynamism of world order. How has the world order changed? What are the relations between world order and world economy? Cox does not give any definition for “world order.” Thus, he proceeds to a deep analysis of the dynamism underlying the transformation of the world order. In this connection, what we are proposing is: 1) considering economic factors (i.e. capitalism) as the primary cause for the shape and evolution of the world order; 2) considering “civilization” as the common place for both economic formation and cultural-political identity. It is with these two remarks in mind that we mean that “globalization” and “civilization” together are determining the shape and transformation of the contemporary world order. What could then be a new definition of “world order.” Do we have a better definition than the one of Hedley Bull? We tried and tried again to find a better and more comprehensive definition. One outcome of our search is this: the “world order” is an arrangement of the most general structures that shape general paths of actors’ identity and behavior. Comparing this definition to Bull’s, we must admit the great superiority of Bull’s definition. Especially, because Bull’s definition “is not definitionally limited to political and economic considerations; it allows normative ways in which individual and collective actors can incorporate into themselves the cognitive and behavioral dispositions associated with particular world orders” (Alker et al. 2001: 8).

Therefore, we consider Bull’s definition as valid and workable faute de mieux. In this connection, our contribution will be to go beyond Bull’s definition to find out what underlies the “world order.” How is the “world order” shaped? How can it be that under some world orders, international norms and ethics become more relevant and
more visible, while under others, international law and ethics become considerably marginalized?

When looking at the evolutionary process of world economy from the birth of capitalism until our days, we may trace the progressive trends between the evolution of world economy on the one side and a set of common norms and rules on the other. In general, this evolution has gone through three phases or models which will be presented in the following.

**Model 1: European World-Economy and Westphalian Order**

Model 1 exemplifies the rise of the European world-economy and the phasing out of a multiple world-economy where different regional and autonomous economies could coexist: a Chinese, a Japanese, an Arab-Islamic, and a European world-economy as examples. Under this type of world configuration, multiple civilizations could also live side by side. What happened during the long sixteenth century was that only one of these world-economies emerged as a system with extraordinary capacity of expansion: the European world-economy. Because of its highly dynamic nature, the European system extended to multiple spheres internally (in Europe) as well as externally (colonialism and imperialism). Here, only two elements of European origin directly related to our current study are mentioned. The first is called the Westphalian model based on state sovereignty, and the second is the absolute autonomy of politics. On the first, there is a vast literature (Krasner 2000; Sørensen 1999 among others). Thus, our focus is on the second element – the autonomy of politics – since sovereignty, despite its importance, does not represent a crucial element in the present study. Autonomy of politics is rooted in Aristotelian and more precisely in Machiavellian traditions. It is astonishing, however, that the reformulation of autonomy of politics by Machiavelli happened during the Renaissance; coinciding with the birth of capitalism in Europe. According to the world system theory, capitalism needed a well-defined political sphere which did not exist at the time. Emergence of the Westphalian system and consequently the sovereignty of state was in this perspective an economic exigency. It means that politics were not separated from the economic system but rather from religion and later on from the feudal system. In other words, multiple chains of loyalty gave place to a single political one. In this way, all essential aspects of capitalism (banking, communications networks, investment, distribution, etc.) could be assured by administration of a responsible and sovereign nation state. It is a fact that until the Treaty of Westphalia, questions related to ethical and/or legal principles were incorporated into religion: (the Church/the Canon). The right and wrong, the just and unjust (war) as well as principles of legitimacy, contracts, conquests, relations with non-Christians etc., were decided upon and justified by the ecclesiastic institutions.
During this period, the international society as Hedley Bull noticed “was identified as European rather than Christian in its values or culture. Reference to Christianity or to divine law as cementing the society of states declined and disappeared, as did religious oaths in treaties” (Bull 1977: 33). The secularizing movement was accelerated by the French revolution of 1789. Even the salvation that, up to that time, was an exclusive religious (Christian) property, became public property (salut public).

When the European system went through a secular process, Europeans were faced with a new task of devising a new set of ethical and law principles; predominantly non-religious. The result was the formulation of a standard of civilization. The standard of civilization was European, and it was first and foremost directed to regulating inter-European relations. Thus, the standard was exclusive and discriminatory. With the intensification of international trade, military and political expansion of Europe, the European standard of civilization (ESC) became progressively the international criterion for “civilized” international behavior. As a result, the absolute exclusive character of ESC was scaled down. Japanese, Persians, Chinese adhered to the ESC, at least partially. However, the ESC conserved its discriminatory character segregating human beings in terms of slave and master, man and woman, and race. It was not until the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 that the rights of human beings as human being were officially recognized. Under model 1, the identity of the world was in general terms asymmetric: Europe on the one side (subsequently together with North America) and the rest of the world on the other. This configuration changed with the outbreak of WWI and WWII. The following model is consecrated to a brief review of the transitory period.

**Model 2: Competing Global World-Economies and World Empires**

Model 1 continued to dominate the international system submitted to modifications and improvement (Hague conventions 1899 and 1909, League of Nations, etc.). The European world-economy transformed to capitalism and was increasingly challenged by the rise of Soviet socialism. Thus, the challenge was limited. Geographically, the Soviet regime was limited merely to Russia. Politically, it was also of a limited scope. It was only after WWII that the Soviet world-economy expanded to comprise the political and military spheres, hence becoming an alternative to the world order dominated by Western powers. The Western world order embraced three related components: economic, cultural and political. The Western economic system included the developed market economies of North America, Western Europe, and Japan. “These states were [and still are] wealthy, highly developed and capitalistic. They had [and still have]
their major international economic interactions with each other and were involved with each other in a dense system of mutual economic interaction” (Spero 1981: 12).

To improve the management tools to control the increasing economic interaction, financial arrangements were set up through the Bretton Woods system. This system was in reality an up-to-date version of the former European world-economy. It was rooted in economic liberalism and supplanted by Keynesianism. IMF and the World Bank (apart from IBRD and the late GATT) constituted the institutional pillars of the whole system. Culturally, liberalism and consequently the primacy of individual rights constituted the cultural identity of the Western system. Politically, the Western system was basically a world empire governing the Western hemisphere and large parts of Asia, Africa and South America. The system was protected by nuclear weapons and a network of regional alliances (such as CENTO and SEATO). The Western world empire and the Western world-economy reflected each other in an interactive movement.

This system was challenged by the competing socialist system led by the USSR, and was seconded by China. For the sake of convenience, we may call it the Eastern system. Equivalent to the Western system, the Eastern had economic, cultural, as well as political elements. The Eastern economic system was a planned economy; a derivative version of the European world economy. Socialist states established their own economic international institutions in which the COMECON played a central role. Culturally, the Eastern system elaborated a highly developed doctrine based on primacy of community and the absolute submission of the individual to the rule of community. Politically, just as its Western rival, the Eastern system succeeded in creating a world empire armed with nuclear weapon.

Under model 2, the identity of the world is best described as a schizophrenic symmetry. Two independent holistic systems stand face to face. In a world like this, each part has its own set of norms and ethics used as instruments for the destabilization of the other. There were two concurrent standards of civilization: Western (“imperialist” according to the socialist vocabulary), and Eastern (“evil empire” according to the Western vocabulary). During the transitory period, relations between international ethics and international politics were paradoxically drawn together as compared to the previous period; however, not in general or in global terms. The criterion of Western standards was primarily security-bonded. States which were against communism were considered members of the “free world.” Non-communist states which were not necessarily anti-communist (India, Egypt, Indonesia, etc.) were considered more or less civilized. Consequently, the repetitive instrumental use of ethical principles prevented the establishment of a procedure in this field which is a necessary condition for socialization between actors. Without socialization, the
ethical dimensions of international relations are almost isolated from the international political arena. During this period, the world witnessed improvement in the international legal system, and in particular in technical and commercial domains such as the Law of the Sea and regulation of trade.

In short, when describing the main trends of this period in only one word, primacy of security seems to be a qualified choice since all other elements in the economic, cultural and political spheres were dependent variables of security. The end of the Cold War put an end to this period inaugurating a new era (model 3).

**Model 3: The Rise of a Global World Order and World Civilization**

The fall of the Soviet Empire was not simply the fall of an empire as history has witnessed with other mighty empires. It was also the end of a civilization which possessed all the necessary elements of a great civilization: a powerful and sophisticated ideology (Marxism) constituting a complete world vision; a well-defined project for a historical formation (communism); an immense and rich geographic territory; and an empire to which a number of countries in Eastern Europe and elsewhere were subjugated. Nuclear deterrents protected the entire system. What is a point of interest for us is why this civilization declined? Among many explanations (sociological, economic, military, historical, etc.), a revised world system theory could offer a qualified explanation. The Soviet civilization failed because it emerged and lived at the wrong time. While the European world economy seconded by its standard of civilization was able to transform and expand to the outside world; the Soviet world economy was quite unable to do so. The system’s “no go” nature and dogmatic character prevented renovation and innovation. At the same time, the capitalist system once again demonstrated an extraordinary capacity to create new favorable environments for further expansion. David Harvey, a Marxist geographer, gives a good example of the flexibility of capitalism. He argues that the radical fall in transportation and communications costs was related to reorganization of the nature of capitalist accumulation since around 1968-1969. These changes have had important consequences for the culture of capitalism. Harvey focuses on the contrast between Fordist mass production and “flexible specialization” for the global market. He claims that “flexible accumulation” is much more revolutionary than was Fordism (quoted in Boswell and Chase-Dunn 2000: 159, Hoogvelt 1997: chapter 5). A similar argumentation is found in Brooks and Wohlfarth’s well-documented article. They see Soviet’s decline as a consequence of the changing structure of global production resulting in a change in the perception of the Soviet elite and ultimately in the transformation of Soviet identity. The shifts in the globalization of production in the
late 1970s and 1980s became particularly evident in three ways: “1) the upswing in the number and importance of inter-firm alliances; 2) the increased geographic dispersion of production; and 3) the growing opportunity cost of being isolated from foreign direct investment” (Brooks and Wohlforth 2000/01: 34). The fact is that the Soviet Union and its allies were completely isolated from this trend. This gap between the Western accelerating globalization of production on the one hand and Soviet’s critical backwardness on the other could only be filled by ideas. The problem was that the Soviet ideas at that time were not appropriate to find new remedies for the economic crisis. Hence, “Gorbachev became increasingly disposed to undertake a radical shift toward retrenchment” (ibid: 50). A process that resulted in the fall of the Soviet Union.

The fall of the Soviet Empire and Civilization resulted in an increasing globalization of the world order. The current world order is interpreted differently. Samuel Huntington argues that “[i]n the post-Cold War world, for the first time in history, global politics has become multipolar and multicivilizational” (Huntington 1996: 21). As a consequence of the rise of the new world “the most pervasive, important and dangerous conflicts will not be between social classes, rich and poor, or other economically defined groups, but between peoples belonging to different cultural entities” (ibid: 28). Kenneth Waltz is still insisting that the traditional balance of power will be re-established (after the Cold War) and that business will continue as usual. “Realist theory,” he emphasizes, “predicts that balances disrupted will one day be restored...One does, however, observe balancing tendencies already taking place” (Waltz 2000: 27). Richard Falk believes that the world is going trough a “Grotian moment” and the “dynamics of globalization has reted its normative case for acceptance on the promises of liberal economics and the benefits claimed for sustained economic growth on a quasi-global scale” (Falk 1998: 24). Our approach is closer to Falk than to Huntington and Waltz. We argue that the “Grotian moment” is a reality. Reality in the sense that it happened as a rupture in human history as a consequence of the end of the Cold War; a phenomenon due to the change in Russian identity rather than to the disintegration of the USSR. This critical change also marked the beginning of change in the world dominant culture. Alexander Wendt identifies three cultures of anarchy: the Hobbesian, the Lockean, and the Kantian. While it is impossible for a Hobbesian anarchy based on enmity, to have any kind of shared culture, the Lockean culture is different because it is based on a different role structure, rivalry rather than enmity. The Kantian culture is based on a role structure of friendship (Wendt 1999/2000: 246-312). So, theoretically, a global civilization based upon respect for human rights and individual freedom is more likely to arise in a Kantian culture than a Lockean culture. Hence, the Hobbesian culture is private and not shared, and as a culture is unqualified to produce or generate a global civilization. Here we face a
crucial question. How does the culture of the international system change from one epoch to another? Do Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian cultures represent different phases of cultural progress? Is this progress irreversible? There are no easy answers to these central questions. What we do have is a variety of approaches to these questions. Realists reject any progress. From their point of view, the contemporary international system is fundamentally similar to the world of Thucydides. Opposite to this approach, the Kantians argue for progress that implies irreversibility. Social Constructivists situate themselves between the first and the second approach. They recognize that the contemporary international system represents considerable progress over that of 500 or even 1500 A.D. But “there is no historical necessity, no guarantee, that the incentives for progressive change will overcome human weakness and the countervailing incentives to maintain the status quo” (ibid: 310-311).

The existing world order as the product of the end of the Cold War can be described as a Democratic Hegemonic Anarchy. It remains anarchical, yet dominated by the hegemony of the USA. It is true as Kenneth Waltz puts it that “[a] state that is stronger than any other [USA] can decide for itself whether to conform its policies to structural pressures and whether to avail itself of the opportunities that structural change offers, which little fear of adverse affects in the short run” (Waltz 2000: 24). Surely, the USA can decide for itself, thus not without any cost. The cost could be loss of prestige and diminished influence in certain domains. Surely, the USA can decide for itself, but cannot always successfully impose its will on others. Furthermore, the highly critical point is that the current hegemony is quite different from the previous hegemony in history. As mentioned before, the hegemony of the USA represents the first and unique historical example of a democratic hegemony. A democratic hegemony in an anarchical society is operating differently from a non-democratic, dictatorial and totalitarian hegemony. Surely, the USA is bound to lead the world, but it is also bound to observe democratic rules and free elections in its own quarters. Furthermore, despite the obvious fact that the USA is dominating the world in military, political, economic, technological and cultural domains, there is however a paradox that the USA is not always (even often not) able to impose its will, especially in normative and ethical spheres. Some scholars argue the American defiance to international law and its problematic commitment to international organizations may be explained by “US exceptionalism.” It is argued that the USA has a unique destiny to lead the world. “Translated into actions in respect of international law this means that the United States is an exception to what we might expect of a state as being accountable in terms of international law for its actions” (Scott 2001: 4). Exceptionalism describes the perception of Massachusetts Bay colonists that, as Puritans, were charged with a special spiritual and political destiny: to create in the New World a church and a
society that would provide the model for all the nations of Europe as they struggled to
reform themselves (Deborah L. Madsen quoted in Scott: 7). Furthermore, the reluctance
of the USA towards international institutions is not a recent attitude. It has in fact been
an integral component of US policy since Versailles in 1919. At that time, the USA did
not yet occupy the dominant position that it gained after the Cold War. Furthermore,
the Nixon years (1968-1974), especially with the Vietnam War, and the Reagan years
(1981-1989) were periods of particular concern at what was widely perceived to be a
pattern of unprecedented lawlessness and unilateralism in the conduct of American
foreign policy. Before these years, the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961, the Dominican
Republic intervention of 1965 must be remembered as actions disrespectful to
international law. These examples show that the current US position is not new and,
the new position of the USA cannot stand as the sole explanation for the American
reluctance. The “US exceptionalism” is also an important part of the explanation.

At present, when taking a look at the general situation, we see that the USA itself is
challenged by norms proposed and established by other actors. For example, in the
case of the International Criminal Court, the USA did a triple flip: participating in the
negotiations, not signing, and finally signing just before the deadline (31 December
January 2000, together with Israel and Iran). Another example is the US opposition to
the Kyoto protocol on environment, which has not prevented other states in carrying
on with their efforts by adopting a document, similar to Kyoto with some
modifications (Bonn, Germany July 2001). Furthermore, pressure on the USA is
growing (especially from its European allies) concerning the abolition of death penalty.
One of the consequences of this pressure was reflected by the unprecedent decision
resulting in the non re-election of the USA as a member of the UN human rights
committee (April 2001). The US Congress is still reluctant to pass a resolution on
payment of US debt to the UN. Such an attitude is embarrassing for the US
administration and causes damage to the prestige and reputation of the country. The
terrorist attacks of September 11 have finally changed the American policy. The US
Congress accepted to pay a large part of the American debt to the UN. Another
example is the non-participation of US Secretary of States (Collin Powell) at the UN’s
anti racism gathering in Durban, South Africa (August 2001). These examples
demonstrate that in reality USA is challenged instead of being the challenger.
Therefore, the current world order is not fully identical with Pax Americana. In this
respect, Robert W. Cox who admits that “[t]he second Gulf War – the US and coalition
campaign against Iraq – made transparent a change in the structure of global politics”
(Cox 1996: 33). However, he seems skeptical about the depth and magnitude of the
change. In his view “[t]he change was not the transition to a post-Cold War order
proclaimed by US political leaders. Rather it was the shift from a hegemonic to a
tributary system. This change had been going on since the early 1970s. Retrospectively, it had begun with the US defeat in Vietnam, and the “Nixon shocks” that undid the Bretton Wood system. Since that time, the more or less spontaneous consensual hegemonic leadership the United States had commended in the non-Soviet world turned into a sequence of bargained deals, mostly taking the form of financial quid pro quo for US military cover” (ibid). In reality, what Cox calls a “tributary system” is almost the same that Joseph S. Nye talks about as an ability to get what one wants through attraction rather than coercion. Discussing the position of the USA, he states that “one source of soft power is our values. To the extent that we are seen as a beacon of liberty, human rights and democracy, others are attracted to follow our lead” (New York Times, 3 January 2000). This is obviously an optimistic assessment of reality. A less optimistic evaluation of the current situation as well as for the future is based on lessons from history. From a historical angle, the dominant empire, in general, has a strong tendency to excessive expansion which in itself creates/accelerate dramatic dissension within the empire. This rule is valid for empires: the Roman Empire, the Islamic Empire as well as the late Soviet Empire. For Montesquieu, what initially caused the fall of the Roman Empire was the grandeur of Rome and the internal divisions within the metropolis Roma (Montesquieu [1951]: Tome II, 111 and 119). One could easily put the same statement for the Islamic and for the Soviet Empire, in particular. In this respect, Waltz is completely right in claiming that “dominant powers take too many tasks beyond their own borders, thus weakening themselves in the long run” (Waltz: 28). Which was precisely the case for Soviet’s engagement in Afghanistan from 1979 until 1989. An adventure which essentially caused internal dissension among the Soviet leadership and ultimately the fall of the USSR. Precisely, the fall of the USSR was also related to Soviet’s non-democratic identity. The lack of free press, free election and other forms of media for the Soviet public opinion gave the USSR’s leadership free hands to conduct the catastrophic war in Afghanistan. Compared to this, the USA survived from the absurd and horrific war in Vietnam. Why? Because the US intervention was defeated not in Vietnamese but in US territory. An increasing majority of Americans against the Vietnam War, together with the opposition of the world public opinion forced the US administration to end the war. Such things did not exist in the USSR. Consequently, we have to conclude that the survival of the USA (after the Vietnam War) and the collapse of the USSR (after the invasion of Afghanistan) are partly due to the non-democratic character of the USSR and the democratic character of the USA. Based on historical evidence, we may conclude that a dominant Empire (a hegemonic power a fortiori) usually plays a double role. It is the main guardian for the stability of the world, and at the same time it is the main threat...
to it. Everything being equal, and in absence of a better alternative, it seems apparent that a democratic hegemony is preferable to a non-democratic one.

Under model 3, the world order became global as well as economy and the standard of civilization. The international system remained anarchical, yet under a democratic hegemony. The ethical and normative issues also became more powerful than ever before. The magnitude of hegemonic power (USA) is however limited and fixed to a set of rules. Violation of these rules will be costly for the decision-makers of the USA, both internally and on an international arena.

**Conclusion**

This chapter suggests that globalization has arrived at a stage where the international normative set is on the way to becoming global. As a result of the emergence of a new global standard of civilization, world identity as well as the culture of anarchy are accordingly transformed. These changes, however, left the ordering principles of the international system unchanged. It has also been argued that the international system constitutes a construction which is the product of a causal chain: the rise of capitalism and liberalism caused globalization, which in turn shaped the new standard of civilization. The chapter also focused on the interaction between international ethics, law, and politics. This “interaction” is not itself new. It actually dates from the seventeenth century. What is new is the increasing importance of ethics as well as new rules and norms. The role played by new technology and more efficient communications facilities considerably enhanced the dynamics of this interaction. Globalization together with the change of the Russian identity has pushed the world into a transitory phase best described as a “Grotian Moment.” What is hiding behind the Grotian veil of course remains to be seen at this stage. However, based on the knowledge that we possess today, a reversibility of globalization seems highly improbable. Globalization can be adjusted and corrected; its disastrous consequences can also be contained and repaired. Nevertheless, it can hardly be halted. The logical deduction of this assumption indicates a progressive replacement of coercion by attraction, and gradual reformulation of interests in terms of value rather than physical force. This is not to pretend that every problem will be solved and that a peaceful world will suddenly emerge. It is only to suggest that the elements of convergence are becoming stronger than the elements of divergence. The following remarks resume the world constellation under three different phases of the evolution of the parochial world-economy to the global economy as well as the impact of the latter on the identity of the world:

In a world with multiple and different world-economies, in Braudelian terminology, the standard of civilization as well as the world order became consequently regional.
This was the case for example in the fifteenth century. In Europe, this situation led to the Westphalian order. Under this model, the standard of civilization is both exclusive and discriminatory and the logic of consequences based on conquest and expansion prevails.

In a world with two concurrent and dominating world-economies, security issues determine the quality of relations between international politics, ethics, and law. This was the case during the Cold War. In this type of situation, the logic of consequences based on security will prevail. It should be noted that economy alone is not enough to fully explain the rivalry between the West and the East. This was equally a struggle or a clash between two competing civilizations.

In a world with a global economy, the logic of consequences and the logic of appropriateness are used alternatively. The standard of civilization will follow the pace of globalization. International ethics and international law will take more room and attract more attention than before because of a more or less pronounced degree of homogenization of the world identity and consequently the progressive transformation of state identity.
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