

Mislav Kukoč

University of Split, Faculty of Philosophy, Ivana pl. Zajca b.b., HR–21000 Split
mkukoc@pilar.hr

Liberal Philosophy and Globalization

Abstract

One of numerous definitions of globalization describes it as a dynamic process whereby the social structures of modernity, such as capitalism, bureaucracy, high technology, and philosophy of rationalism and liberalism are spread the world over.

Indeed, in that sense, liberalism has in general prevailed as the authoritative policy framework in present-day globalization. Most governments have promoted neoliberal policies toward globalization, as well as influential multilateral agencies have continually linked globalization with liberalization. Champions of neoliberal globalization have also abounded in commercial circles, particularly in the financial markets and among managers of transborder firms. Business associations and business-oriented mass media have likewise figured as bastions of neoliberalism which has overall ranked as policy orthodoxy in respect of globalization. Generally speaking, neoliberal ideas recently gained widespread unquestioned acceptance as “common sense”.

On the other hand, neoliberalism as a sort of philosophical, political and economic theory known as libertarianism, which has generally prevailed as theoretical approach in contemporary globalization, does not have much in common with the ideal of liberal democracy of well-ordered society, which arises from quite different ideas, aspects and dimensions of liberal philosophy.

Social philosophy of liberalism, developed by Kant, Hayek, Dworkin and Rawls, has promoted the idea of modern liberal democracy which is generally based on the rule of law, protection of human and civil rights, ideas of equality and justice as fairness. In that sense “affirmative action” programmes in favour of the least advantaged groups are fully consonant with a general liberal philosophy that protects individual rights.

Economic and cultural globalization should be accompanied by a clear conceptual analysis and a normative requirement of a globalization of responsibility in order to protect the global future of humankind. A democratic control as well as the rule of law in our globalized world is necessary, too.

Central tasks of global policy to prevent global chaos as a consequence of uncontrolled globalization include, among other things, a legalized international order with a sort of global democratic governance. Concerning the improvement of global democracy and global rule of law the genuine question is: who can realize a policy of global governance in our divided world?

Key words

globalization, globalism, neo-liberalism, libertarianism, social liberalism, democracy, global governance

What is globalization? Its numerous controversial definitions can hardly answer the question. In normative terms, some authors have associated ‘globalization’ with progress, prosperity and peace. For others, however, the word has conjured up deprivation, disaster and doom. No one is indifferent, but many are confused. Confusion concerning understanding of the meaning of globalization is not unusual. The word ‘international’ suffered a similar misunder-

standing when it was coined by Jeremy Bentham in the 1780's, in the age of not yet developed cross-border relations between nation states.¹

Globalization and Globalism

As one of the authors, I defined globalization as:

“a complex and controversial process of building of the world as a whole by creation of global institutional structures (...) and global cultural forms, i.e. the forms that have been produced or transformed by global available objects. It is declared as a) free market-economic unification of the world with uniform patterns of production and consumption; b) democratic integration of the world based on common interests of mankind such as equity, human rights protection, rule of law, pluralism, peace and security; c) moral integration of the World concerning some central humanistic values, important for sustainable development of humanity.”²

This definition tries to comprehend controversial positive and negative parts of the phenomenon. Proponents of pro-globalization policy use to stress its positive effects, arguing that worldwide statistics strongly support globalization.³ Anti-globalists, however, show quite opposite figures.⁴

Methodologically we can make, however, a difference between globalization as an objective present-day reality, a value-free phenomenon that has its positive and negative elements and characteristics and globalization as neo-liberal oriented policy directed from leading world centres and powers. This sort of pro-globalization policy is usually labeled as ‘globalism’. In the *Interdisciplinary Dictionary* we defined globalism as a viewpoint, doctrine and/or ideology that *promote* the principle of interdependence and unity of the whole world, of all nations and states instead of a national and state particularism. Differentiating of similar notions of *cosmopolitanism* that stresses the cultural identity of pre-national “citizen of the world”, and *internationalism* that promotes ideology of revolutionary brotherhood among the nations, idea of *globalism* is based on the post-national economic, informational and intercultural planetary binding and interdependence. Behind the ideology of globalism can be hidden an intention of economic and cultural hegemony of the Western powers, as well as the proletarian or socialist internationalism had served as an ideological fig leaf for the Soviet i.e. Greater Russian hegemony over other nations from the Communist block.⁵

Such pro-globalist understanding has equated globalization with *westernization* or *modernization*, especially in an “Americanized” form.⁶ Notable critical theorists, such as Immanuel Wallerstein emphasize that globalization cannot be understood separately from the historical development of the capitalist world-system.⁷

Karl Marx, together with Friedrich Engels, was probably the first one who just 160 years ago in the *Communist Manifesto* predicted the capitalist globalization very precisely and exactly.⁸ Ironically, the biggest paradox in the whole this story is that that Karl Marx’s eloquent prediction of globalization did not begin to come true for more than 140 years – this is to say, after the World’s system of Communism collapsed. Globalization has confirmed in a way of Francis Fukuyama’s thesis on *The End of History* with the breakdown of communism and the final victory of liberal democracy and global capitalism.

Focusing to the point, globalization is a dynamic process whereby the social structures of modernity, such as capitalism, bureaucracy, information technology, and philosophy of rationalism and liberalism are spread the world over. Globalization in this sense is described as *hyper capitalism*, as an imperial-

ism of McDonald's (or "McDonaldization"),⁹ Hollywood and CNN,¹⁰ also as neo-colonialism.¹¹

New inaugurated globalization process has perpetuated if not heightened inequity in relations between countries, as well as between the West and the

1

See: J. A. Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, Palgrave, New York 2000, pp. 14, 43.

2

V. Spajić-Vrkaš, M. Kukoč, S. Bašić: *Obrazovanje za ljudska prava i demokraciju: interdisciplinarni rječnik (Interdisciplinary Dictionary on Education for Human Rights and Democracy)*, Croatian Commission for UNESCO, Zagreb 2001, pp. 178–179.

3

Alleged positive trends and effects of globalization: 1) From 1981 to 2001, according to World Bank figures, the number of people living on 1\$ a day or less declined from 1.5 billion to 1.1 billion in absolute terms, in relative terms from 40% to 20% of the population. (Anti-globalists argue the opposite: world poverty increases!); 2) Income inequality for the world as a whole is diminishing; 3) Life expectancy has almost doubled in the developing world since World War II; 4) Democracy has increased dramatically: universal suffrage increased from 0% in 1900 to 62.5% of all nations having it in 2000; 5) Feminism has made advances in areas such as Bangladesh through providing women with jobs and economic safety; 6) The proportion of the world's population living in countries where per-capita food supplies are less than 2,200 calories per day decreased from 56% in the mid-1960s to below 10% by the 1990s; 7) Between 1950 and 1999, global literacy increased from 52% to 81% of the world. Female literacy as a percentage of male literacy has increased from 59% in 1970 to 80% in 2000; 8) The percentage of children in the labor force has fallen from 24% in 1960 to 10% in 2000; 9) There are increasing trends in the use of electric power, cars, radios, and telephones per capita, as well as a growing proportion of the population with access to clean water.

4

Distribution of world GDP, 1989 (Quintile of Population / Income): Richest 20% / 82.7%, Second 20% / 11.7%, Third 20% / 2.3%, Fourth 20% / 1.4%, Poorest 20% / 1.2%. Source: United Nations Development Program. 1992 Human Development Report.

5

V. Spajić-Vrkaš, M. Kukoč, S. Bašić, *Obrazovanje za ljudska prava i demokraciju: interdisciplinarni rječnik*, str. 179.

6

T. Spybey, *Globalization and World Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge (MA) 1996; P. J. Taylor, "Izations of the World: Americanization, Modernization and Globalization", in: C. Hay & D. Marsh (eds.), *Demystifying Globalization*, Macmillan, Basingstoke 2000, pp. 49–70. See also: V. Spajić-Vrkaš, M. Kukoč, S. Bašić, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 625.

7

I. Wallerstein, "Globalization or The Age of Transition? A Long-Term View of the Trajectory of the World-System", <http://fbc.binghamton.edu/iwtrajws.htm>

8

"The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. (...)

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, (...) industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls (*sic!*), (...)



non-Western civilizations.¹² In these accounts, globalization is a post-colonial imperialism that has not only reinvigorated the exploitation of the South, i.e. “periphery”, by the North, i.e. “centre”, but also added former communist-ruled areas of the Second World, i.e. “semi-periphery”, to the list of victims. It is especially related to those countries that have been permanently deserted “east from Heaven” – behind the new established iron curtain between the European Union and the Eurasian (South) East. For these countries, globalization means perpetual financial and related economic crises, the immiserating effects of structural adjustment programs imposed by the IMF and the World Bank, further subordination in world trade, ecological problems without economic benefits, and cultural imperialism of global communications.¹³ Globalization has frustrated hopes and expectations that decolonization would give the South equal opportunity and self-determination in world affairs. The role of globalization in the relationship between civilizations, particularly in the context of civilization diversity, is rather negative. Globalization does not diminish but significantly engender inter-cultural tensions.

Neo-liberalism as libertarianism

Neoliberalism has generally prevailed as the authoritative policy framework in contemporary globalization. Indeed, this approach has generously served powerful interests, particularly those related to dominant classes and countries in today’s world. Most governments – including in particular those of the major states – have promoted neoliberal policies toward globalization, especially since the early 1980s. From the side of multilateral institutions, agencies such as the IMF, the WTO and the OECD have continually linked globalization with liberalization.

The International Monetary Fund, in that sense, defines globalization as “the growing economic interdependence of countries worldwide through increasing volume and variety of cross-border transactions in goods and services, freer international capital flows, and more rapid and widespread diffusion of technology”. In the same neo-liberal direction, The International Forum on Globalization defines it as “the present worldwide drive toward a globalized economic system dominated by supranational corporate trade and banking institutions that are not accountable to democratic processes or national governments”.

Champions of neoliberal globalization have also abounded in commercial circles, particularly in the financial markets and among managers of transborder firms. Business associations like the International Organization of Employers and the World Economic Forum have likewise figured as bastions of neoliberalism. In the mass media, major business-oriented newspapers like the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Financial Times* have generally supported neoliberal ideologies and policies. Given this widespread hold on centers of power, neoliberalism has generally ranked as policy orthodoxy in respect of globalization. Indeed, in recent years neoliberal ideas gained widespread unquestioned acceptance as “common sense”.¹⁴

Neoliberalism as philosophy, ideology, political or economic theory has, indeed, an awful reputation in the context of the dark side of globalization; moreover it is blamed for all evils of globalization. Neoliberalism, without a doubt has originated from liberalism and represents one of its genuine contemporary streams. Can we, however, condemn philosophy of liberalism in general, even the genuine idea of liberty, of freedom?

Let's examine first the concept of liberal philosophy!

Philosophy of liberalism generally emphasizes a set of principles, including individual rights, extensive freedom of thought and speech, limitations on the power of governments, the rule of law, the free exchange of ideas, equality of opportunity, a market economy, and a transparent system of government.

However, different sorts of liberal philosophy may represent very different ideas, depending on predominant role of one or another above mentioned liberal principles. In that sense, we can distinguish between classical (or economic liberalism), cultural liberalism, political liberalism, social liberalism, (left and right) libertarianism etc.

Neoliberalism originated from classical or economic liberalism, which is based on conviction that the only real freedom is freedom from coercion. As a result, it opposes the welfare state, understanding state intervention in the economy as a coercive power that restricts the economic freedom of individuals and favor a *laissez-faire* economic policy.

Neo-liberalism is also closely related to libertarianism. To be more precise: to the *right libertarianism*, *libertarian conservatism*, (there are sorts such as *paleolibertarianism*, *neolibertarianism*, *libertarian transhumanism*, *biolibertarianism*, as well as many other derivative notions. On the other hand, there are left or socialist libertarians, as, e.g. Noam Chomsky, that originate from different sorts of anarchism). Mainstream libertarianism, however, is an individualist philosophical, political and economic doctrine developed by Robert Nozick, David Friedman, Murray N. Rothbard (and theorists closed to the Ludwig von Mises Institute) with common theoretical and ideological commitments including a belief in the efficiency and freedom-enhancing properties of the market economy, private property, the ultimate sovereignty of the individual, and the rule of law, but only through the concept of "minimal state", with the *laissez-faire* principle, i.e. with its singular role to maintain and warrant "fair" relations on the free market. Libertarianism is then resolutely opposed to any form of paternalism by the state. Neo-liberalism and libertarianism are based on the convictions that market forces will bring prosperity, liberty, democracy and peace to the whole of humankind. In particular, neoliberals have prescribed the abolition of most state-imposed limitations on movements between countries of money, goods, services and

It compels all nations (...) to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image. (...)

Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West." K. Marx, F. Engels: *The Communist Manifesto*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1967, pp. 83–84.

9

G. Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society*, Sage, Thousand Oaks (CA) 2000.

10

H. I. Schiller, "Not Yet the Post-Imperialist Era", *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 1 (8/1991), pp. 13–28.

11

M. Khor, "Address to the International Forum on Globalization", New York City, November 1995.

12

S. P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Simon & Schuster, New York 1996; A. Hurrell, & N. Woods (eds.) *Inequality, Globalization, and World Politics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1999.

13

C. Thomas & P. Wilkin (eds.) *Globalization and the South*, Macmillan, Basingstoke 1997.

14

J. A. Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, pp. 29, 35, 40, 242.

capital. They also have advocated the removal of state controls on prices, wages and foreign exchange rates. Neoliberals have furthermore argued for thoroughgoing privatization of productive assets and for reductions in state provision of welfare guarantees.

Libertarian proponents of neoliberal *laissez-faire* capitalism even argue that higher degrees of political and economic freedom in the form of democracy and capitalism in the developed world are ends in themselves and also produce higher levels of material wealth. They see globalization as the beneficial spread of liberty and capitalism.

Apart from classical or economic liberalism and libertarianism as neo-liberalism within the philosophy of liberalism there are quite opposite streams of thought which compete with neo-liberalism over the use of the term ‘liberal’.

Cultural liberalism focuses on the rights of individuals pertaining to conscience and lifestyle, including such issues as sexual freedom, religious freedom, cognitive freedom, and protection from government intrusion into private life. Cultural liberalism generally opposes government regulation of *literature, art, academics, gambling, sex, prostitution, abortion, birth control, terminal illness, alcohol, and cannabis* and other controlled substances, resisting some or all administrative intervention in these areas.¹⁵

Political liberalism, on the other hand, stresses the importance of liberal democracy as the form of government with open and fair elections and equal rights for all citizens warranted by law, or the rule of law.

And finally, *social liberalism*, also known as *new liberalism* (not to be confused with ‘neo-liberalism’) and *reform liberalism*, concerning stark differences of opinion, confronts the most with neo-liberalism.

Liberal democracy of well-ordered society

However, that sort of neo-liberalism, i.e. libertarianism, which has generally prevailed as theoretical approach, as the authoritative policy framework in contemporary globalization, does not have much in common with philosophy of social liberalism and political liberalism, particularly with the ideal of liberal democracy of well-ordered society.

The modern liberal democracy is generally based on the rule of law. In German tradition the rule of law as *Rechtstaat* means that rulers and their agents are subject to the law as much as anyone else. The state and its agents cannot do as they like, behave in an arbitrary, self-willed fashion – they must obey the law. Friedrich von Hayek (*The Constitution of Liberty*) argues that true laws must pass a Kantian test of universalizability – which means the application of the Kantian categorical imperative – that is they must be general abstract rules which apply to all equally and without discrimination between groups and individuals.

Philosophy of *social liberalism* arose in the late 19th century influenced by the utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. Generally speaking, social liberals support free trade and a market-based economy only if satisfy basic needs of all individuals. Furthermore, socially progressive ideas are commonly advocated by social liberals, based on the idea that social practices ought to be continuously adapted in such a manner as to benefit the substantive freedom of all members of society. According to the tenets of social liberalism, as explained by John Dewey, Ronald Dworkin, John Rawls, and Mortimer Adler, since individuals are the basis of society, all individuals

should have access to basic necessities. The provision of basic necessities to all citizens ought to be ensured by the political community. Social liberals argue that real freedom can exist only when citizens are healthy, educated, and free from dire poverty. They generally favor the right to an education, the right to health care, and the right to a minimum wage. Some also favor laws against discrimination in housing and employment, laws against pollution of the environment, and the provision of welfare, all supported by progressive taxation.

All these ideas of social liberal philosophy, which do not have anything in common with predominant dogmas of neo-liberal globalization, have been connected with the experience of the Great Depression and the New Deal based on the J. M. Keynes' theory of the welfare state. This sort of social liberalism confirms the theory that the market is not self-correcting. On the contrary, instead of creation of full employment, the market creates poverty and inequality which are destructive of personal liberty. Hence, by this sort of liberal approach, state democratic action is essential in all welfare areas, including pensions, unemployment insurance and medicine. One of the most prominent social liberal philosophers Ronald Dworkin has been the most sophisticated advocate of the view that so called "affirmative action" programmes, in favour of the least advantaged groups, are fully consonant with a general liberal philosophy that protects individual rights.

In the similar way John Rawls exposed the two principles of justice as fairness in the "well-ordered society", i.e. liberal-democratic society:

"*First principle* – Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all. *Second Principle* – Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity."

Based on these principles he exposed: *First Priority Rule* (The Priority of Liberty), and *Second Priority Rule* (The Priority of Justice over Efficiency and Welfare). And finally, *General Conception*:

"All social primary goods – liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect – are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any or all of these goods is to the advantage of the least favored".¹⁶

Similar European ideas of "social market economy" are developed in Germany: "ordoliberalism" (Friedrich von Hayek, Ludwig von Mises) and "social liberalism" of the Freiburg school by Ludwig Erhard. This idea of "regulated liberalism" combines the principle of freedom in the market with that of social equilibrium. Social-liberal creation of the post-World War II social market economy resulted with German "economic miracle" (*Wirtschaftswunder*).

15

John Stuart Mill aptly expressed cultural liberalism in his essay *On Liberty* when he wrote: "The sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant." *Essential Works of John Stuart Mill*, Bantam Books, New York 1961, p. 263.

16

John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1972, § 46, pp. 302–303. See also J. Rawls, *Political Liberalism*, Columbia University Press, New York 1993, § 1, pp. 5–6. Exposed Rawls' ideas correspond with the "affirmative action" principle, and originate from Jeremy Bentham's utilitarian ethics maxim on "the greatest happiness for the greatest number".

Let's examine how this idea of liberal democracy and the rule of law functions in the context of contemporary globalization.

Globalization and Democracy

The relationship between *democracy*, *rule of law*, on the one hand, and *globalization*, on the other, is rather controversial, ambivalent, as globalization itself, with its bright and dark side.

First, accelerated globalization of recent decades has unfolded in tandem with a notable growth of liberal democracy in many states where it was previously absent, such as in Central and Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America. A so-called "third wave" of democratization in the late 1980s and early 1990s has gone hand in hand with contemporary globalization and its mechanisms such as the global mass media, human rights campaigns and other transborder civic associations etc.¹⁷ In short, neo-liberal policies of economic globalization encourage democratization of the state and the collapse of many authoritarian and totalitarian regimes all over the world. On the other hand, from its ancient origin up to now, democracy as political order has always been established in a limited territory or community, as Greek *polis* was before and as nation-state is in the modern age of liberal democracy.

Globalization, however, has promoted non-national, i.e. supra-national institutions and communities with transborder mutual relations. Globality has transcended territory and thwarted state sovereignty. Forces of globalization have undermined the democratic capacities of national governments. States cannot tame the tyranny of global corporations. Global financial markets, too, have often constrained the possibilities for democratization. Particularly small and poor states cannot ensure democracy for their citizens in respect of global governance bodies like the WB and WTO. Ironically, then, a number of states have adopted liberal democracy at the very moment when state-centric democracy has passed its historical sell-by date. Simultaneous historic paradox has happened: At the very moment when western democracies have triumphed over the communist alternative, they own democratic systems of self-government are being gradually unraveled by the market system.

The territorialist state-centric nature of traditional liberal democracy is inadequate in contemporary world where numerous and significant social relations are supraterritorial. *Global democracy needs more than a democratic state*. In principle the growth of multilayered governance of local, regional and transworld bodies could be hopeful development for democracy. In practice, however, post-sovereign, decentralized governance induced by globalization has proved to be less democratic than national governance in a sovereign state. Although the current worldwide trend of decentralization from national to provincial and district authorities is generally welcome, it does not automatically mean democratic progress, but rather democratic deficit. Suprastate democracy of regional and transworld regimes has shown even more democratic deficits. *EU and UN are more bureaucratic than democratic institutions*. The veto power of the permanent members of UN Security Council has no democratic justification, as well. Moreover, the democratic record of suprastate regulatory agencies, like WB, IMF, WTO or OECD has been decidedly poor. On the other hand, globalization has opened greater space for democratic activity outside public governance institution through different unofficial channels, such as *global marketplace*, *global communications*, and *global civil society*, but the legitimating potentials of this mechanisms are generally weak,

particularly concerning democratic credentials, participation, transparency and public accountability.¹⁸

Democratic control of globalization: A global governance?

Are there any solutions for the democratization of globalization, except naïve utopian projects of “globalization from below”, “a virtual democratic revolution, or rebellion against capitalist globalization”, emergence of a new global “social movement unionism” etc. ?

Some theorists pledge for global Keynesianism and progressive redistribution of world wealth by so-called “Tobin tax”, cancellation of debts, and the reorientation of international financial institutions toward domestic economic growth and full employment rather than export-led growth.

J. A. Scholte argues for ambitious democratic reform of globalization “toward something of a supraterritorial Keynesianism”. He proposed three sets of reforms of globalization with the purpose of enhancing human security, social justice, and global democracy. All that should result with more humane globalization than it is now.¹⁹

Hans Küng also thinks that globalization can and must be controlled: “globalization is not a natural phenomenon like an approaching weather front, in the face of which one is powerless.” As well as the dogma of “invisible hand of divine providence”, today there is widespread economic dogma of the “invisible hand of competition” which is supposed to rule the world, but market can fail as a regulatory instrument, so there is a need for politics and the order that it brings. Should the supreme criterion in the process of globalization prove to be the maximalization of profit, we must be prepared for future serious social conflicts and crises. An uncontrolled world economy will finally lead to world chaos through another world economic crisis. Therefore he proposed a sort of neo-Keynesian reform of globalization, better sooner, before the global crisis, than later, after the crisis.

According to Küng “democracy must not be understood too reductively in economic terms”, in neo-liberal or libertarian sense, as “continuation of private business with political means, on the basis of a social contract (à la Thomas Hobbes).” On the contrary, “democracy is to be understood ethically: as a social contract (in Kant’s sense) which is fair to all, grounded in a basic consensus on universal human rights and responsibilities.” In that case, “everyone is in principle recognized as a person and a subject with a legal status”, concludes Küng and asks: “what follows from all this for the market economy?”

The market economy, according to Küng, has to be in the service of humankind:

“The market economy is not an end in itself; it must serve people’s needs and not subject them totally to the logic of the market. The world market, too, is there for people and not *vice versa*. And as far as politics is concerned, the market economy should supplement democracy, not replace it or reshape it. This danger is more real than ever under the conditions of globalization.”

As a conclusion Küng exposes his *conditio humana*: Primacy of politics over the economy; the primacy of ethics over the economy and politics. The coun-

17
S. P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman 1991.

18
J. A. Scholte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, pp. 261–282.

19
J. A. Scholte, *ibid.*, pp. 283–317.

ter-model to the widely-prevalent economic system must be “a global market economy which is politically obligated to humane and social goals”.²⁰

Küng’s conclusion that “globalization needs a *Global Ethos*” has been accepted by different scholars and theoreticians of globalization. In the similar way economist Peter Ulrich asks for “ethically defined global framework which imposes reasonable and uniform rules on competition and shapes it in a way which is compatible with society, the environment and humanity”.²¹

Ingomar Hauchler proposed central tasks of global policy to prevent global chaos and crisis as a consequence of uncontrolled globalization, including: 1. the creation of an international competitive order; 2. link between the international flow of financing and the real economic goals of growth and employment; 3. social security as a protection against the growing structural discarding which the globalized economy has intensified; 4. a balance between the drastic economic and social differences among the regions of the world; 5. internationalization of the mounting social and ecological costs which accrue from economic globalization; 6. a legalized international order which puts a stop to the excessive consumption of non-renewable resources.²²

On the other hand, philosopher Hans Lenk thinks that globalization of liberal economics should be accompanied by a clear conceptual analysis and a normative (socio-political and moral) requirement of a *globalization of responsibility* in order to protect the global future of humankind and global commons, i.e. global public goods, and to avoid secondary social traps stemming in part from the ideology of globalization nowadays publicly utilized by corporations and neo-liberal market economists.²³

Central tasks of global policy to prevent global chaos as a consequence of uncontrolled globalization include, among other things, a legalized international order with a sort of global governance.

Concerning the improvement of global democracy and global rule of law – it is necessary to:

- increase local government involvement in global policies;
- establish mechanisms for the representation of nonterritorial constituencies;
- establish efficient democratically elected suprastate governance;
- increase monitoring of suprastate governance by elected regional, state and substate bodies;
- improve transparency of suprastate governance.

However, the genuine question is: Who can realize a policy of global governance in our divided world?

Literature

Ake, C. (1999) Globalization, Multilateralism and the Shrinking Democratic Space, in: M. G. Schechter (ed.), *Future Multilateralism: the Political and Social Framework*. Tokyo: UN University Press, pp. 179–195.

Barnet, R. J. & Cavanagh, J. (1994) *Global Dreams: Imperial Corporations and the New World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Barry, N.P. (1986) *On Classical Liberalism and Libertarianism*. London: Macmillan.

Berger, J. (1999) The Threat of Globalism. *Race & Class*, 40 (2–3).

- Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- George, S. & Sabelli, F. (1994) *Faith and Credit: the World Bank's Secular Empire*. Boulder CO: Westview.
- Gill, S. (1966) Globalization, Democratization, and the Politics of Indifference, in: J. H. Mittelman (ed.), *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Boulder: Rienner.
- Gills, B. et al. (eds.) (1993) *Low Intensity Democracy: Political Power in the New World Order*. London: Pluto.
- Hauchler, I. (1995) Weltordnungspolitik – Chance oder Utopie? Thesen an Steuerbarkeit globaler Entwicklung, in: Hauchler, Ingomar (Hrsg.), *Globale Trends 1996. Fakten, Analysen, Prognosen*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, pp. 10–32.
- Hayek, F. v. (1960) *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (1991) *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (1993) *The Clash of Civilizations?: The Debate, with responses by: F. Ajami et al.* New York: A Foreign Affairs Reader.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996) *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hurrell, A. & Woods, N. (eds.) (1999) *Inequality, Globalization, and World Politics*. Oxford University Press.
- The International Forum on Globalization* (<http://www.ifg.org/analysis.htm>)
- Khor, M. (1995) Address to the International Forum on Globalization, New York City, November.
- Korten, D. C. (1995) *When Corporations Rule the World*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Küng, H. (1997) *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*. London: SCM Press.
- Lenk, H. (2006) Perspectives and Dimension of Globalization – With Special Regard to IT, Science and Economics, in: *Interim World Philosophy Congress*, New Delhi.
- Marx, K. & Engels F. (1848/1967) *The Communist Manifesto*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McLuhan M. & Powers, B. (1988) *The Global Village: Transformations in World Life and Media in the 21st Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Milardović, A. (2004) *Pod globalnim šešišrom: Društva i države u tranziciji i globalizaciji*. Zagreb: Centar za politološka istraživanja.
- Mill, J. S. (1859) *On Liberty*. In: *Essential Works of John Stuart Mill*. M. Lerner (ed.), New York: Bantam Books, 1961, pp. 249–360.

20

H. Küng, *A Global Ethic for Global Politics and Economics*, SCM Press, London 1997, pp. 160–169, 211, 214–215.

21

P. Urlich, “Demokratie und Markt. Zur Kritik der Ökonomisierung der Politik”, *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften* 36 (1995), p. 75.

22

I. Hauchler, “Weltordnungspolitik – Chance oder Utopie? Thesen an Steuerbarkeit globaler

Entwicklung”, in: I. Hauchler, (ed.), *Globale Trends 1996. Fakten, Analysen, Prognosen*. Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, Frankfurt/M. 1995, p. 16.

23

H. Lenk, “Perspectives and Dimension of Globalization – With Special Regard to IT, Science and Economics”, in: *Interim World Philosophy Congress*, New Delhi 2006.

- Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ritzer, G. (1999) *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage.
- Rawls, J. (1972) *A Theory of Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1993) *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Robinson, W. I. (1996) Globalisation: Nine Theses on Our Epoch. *Race & Class*, 38 (2).
- Robinson, W. I. (1996) *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention and Hegemony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothbard, M. (1982) *The Ethics of Liberty*. Atlantic Highlands NJ: Humanities Press.
- Rupert, M. (2000) *Ideologies of Globalization: Contending Visions of a New World Order*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sachs, J. (2005) *The End of Poverty*. New York: The Penguin Press.
- Schiller, H. I. (1991) Not Yet the Post-Imperialist Era. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 13–28.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave.
- Senghass, D. (2002) *The Clash within Civilizations: Coming to Terms with Cultural Conflicts*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Spajić-Vrkaš, V., Kukoč, M. i Bašić, S. (2001) *Obrazovanje za ljudska prava i demokraciju: interdisciplinarni rječnik*, Zagreb: Hrvatsko povjerenstvo za UNESCO.
- Spybey, T. (1996) *Globalization and World Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Taylor, P. J. (2000) Izations of the World: Americanization, Modernization and Globalization, in: C. Hay & D. Marsh (eds.), *Demystifying Globalization*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 49–70.
- Thomas, C. & Wilkin, P. (eds.) (1997) *Globalization and the South*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- United Nations Development Program (1992) *Human Development Report*.
- Ulrich, P. (1995) Demokratie und Markt. Zur Kritik der Ökonomisierung der Politik. *Jahrbuch für christliche Sozialwissenschaften*, 36, pp. 74–95.
- Wallerstein I., (1999) Globalization or The Age of Transition? A Long-Term View of the Trajectory of the World-System (<http://fbc.binghamton.edu/iwtrajws.htm>)
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization>
- <http://www.ifg.org/analysis.htm>

Mislav Kukoč

Filozofija liberalizma i globalizacija

Sažetak

Jedna od njenih bezbrojnih definicija globalizaciju određuje kao dinamičan proces kojim su socijalne strukture modernizacije, poput kapitalizma, birokracije, visokorazvijene tehnologije i filozofije racionalizma i liberalizma ovladale svijetom. Uistinu u tome smislu liberalizam općenito prevladava kao zadani politički obrazac suvremene globalizacije. Vlade većine država promoviraju neoliberalnu politiku u odnosu na učinke globalizacije jednako kao što i utjecajne svjetske multilateralne ustanove redovito povezuju globalizaciju s liberalizacijom. Prvaci neoliberalne globalizacije ovladavaju također i trgovačkim krugovima, poglavito na novčanim tržištima te se množe među upravljačima prekograničnih tvrtki. Poduzetničke udruge, kao i burzovni mas-mediji isto tako postaju tvrdave neoliberalizma koji općenito smatraju ortodoksnim pravcem globalizacijske politike. Drugim riječima, tako shvaćeni neoliberalni svjetonazor u posljednje se vrijeme bezpogovorno prihvaća kao neupitna istina koju »zdрави razum« nalaže.

U tekstu se elaborira teza da neoliberalizam – vrsta filozofske, političke i ekonomske teorije znane i kao libertarijanizam, nametnuta kao prevladavajući teorijski pristup u suvremenoj globalizaciji – nema mnogo toga zajedničkog s idealom liberalne demokracije dobro uređena društva, koji izrasta iz dijametralno suprotnih ideja, aspekata i dimenzija liberalne filozofije. Socijalna filozofija liberalizma, razvijena u djelima Kanta, Hayeka, Dworkina i Rawlsa, promišlja koncepciju moderne liberalne demokracije, utemeljene na vladavini zakona, zaštiti ljudskih i građanskih prava, na idejama jednakosti, pravde i čestitosti. U tome smislu, programi »pozitivne diskriminacije« najnižih društvenih slojeva u potpunosti su sukladni s navedenom liberalnom filozofijom koja štiti individualna prava.

S navedenih polazišta ekonomska i kulturna globalizacija trebaju biti podvrgnute jasnoj konceptualnoj analizi s normativnim zahtjevom za globalizaciju odgovornosti sa svrhom zaštite globalne budućnosti čovječanstva. Neka vrsta demokratske kontrole kao i vladavina prava jednako su tako nužni u našem globaliziranom svijetu.

Središnja zadaća globalne politike – da zapriječi globalni kaos koji prijete kao neizbježni učinak nekontrolirane globalizacije – implicira, među inima, i ustroj međunarodnog pravnog poretka s nekom vrsti globalne demokratske vladavine. No, glede izgradnje globalne demokracije i vladavine prava nadaje se odsudno pitanje na koje je teško dati odgovor: Kako ustrojiti politiku globalne vladavine u našem podijeljenom globaliziranom svijetu?

Ključne riječi

globalizacija, globalizam, neoliberalizam, libertarijanizam, socijalni liberalizam, demokracija, globalna vladavina

Mislav Kukoč

Philosophie des Liberalismus und Globalisierung

Zusammenfassung

Eine von zahlreichen Definitionen bestimmt die Globalisierung als einen dynamischen Prozess, bei dem soziale Strukturen der Modernisierung wie Kapitalismus, Bürokratie, Hightech sowie die Philosophie des Rationalismus und Liberalismus die Herrschaft über die Welt übernommen haben. In diesem Sinne hat der Liberalismus als das vorgezeichnete politische Muster der zeitgenössischen Globalisierung tatsächlich die allgemeine Vorherrschaft inne. Vor dem Hintergrund der Resultate der Globalisierung propagieren die Regierungen der meisten Staaten eine neoliberale Politik, ebenso wie einflussreiche internationale und multilaterale Einrichtungen die Globalisierung regelmäßig mit Liberalisierung in Verbindung bringen. Die führenden Akteure der neoliberalen Globalisierung erweisen sich auch in Handelskreisen als ausschlaggebend, zumal an den Finanzmärkten, und ihre Zahl mehrt sich unter den Managern internationaler Unternehmen. Ebenso werden Unternehmensvereinigungen und Börsenpflichtblätter zu Hochburgen des Neoliberalismus, der generell als orthodoxe Richtung der Globalisierungspolitik betrachtet wird. Mit anderen Worten, eine solchermaßen verstandene neoliberale Weltanschauung wird in letzter Zeit widerspruchlos als offenkundige Wahrheit akzeptiert, die einem der „gesunde Menschenverstand“ auferlege.

Im Text wird die These elaboriert, dass der Neoliberalismus – eine Art philosophischer, politischer und wirtschaftswissenschaftlicher Theorie, bekannt auch unter dem Namen Libertarismus, die sich als vorherrschender theoretischer Ansatz in der zeitgenössischen Globalisierung aufdrängt – nicht sehr viel gemein habe mit dem Ideal der liberalen Demokratie einer gut eingerichteten Gesellschaft, das aus den diametral entgegengesetzten Ideen, Aspekten und Dimensionen der liberalen Philosophie erwachse. Die soziale Philosophie des Liberalismus, die in den Schriften von Kant, Hayek, Dworkin und Rawls entwickelt wurde, reflektiert die Konzeption der modernen liberalen Demokratie, die begründet ist auf der Getzesherrschaft, dem Schutz von Menschen- und Bürgerrechten sowie auf den Ideen von Gleichheit, Gerechtigkeit und Rechtsschaffenheit. In diesem Sinne sind Programme zur „positiven Diskriminierung“ sozialer Unterschichten vollkommen in Übereinstimmung mit der angeführten liberalen Philosophie, die sich für den Schutz individueller Rechte einsetzt.

Die wirtschaftliche und kulturelle Globalisierung muss ausgehend von den genannten Standpunkten einer klaren konzeptuellen Analyse unterzogen werden, die der normativen Forderung nach einer globalisierten Verantwortung zum Schutz der globalen Zukunft der Menschheit Rechnung trägt. Eine Art demokratischer Kontrolle sowie Gesetzesherrschaft sind in unserer globalisierten Welt gleichermaßen notwendig.

Die zentrale Aufgabe der globalen Politik – ein globales Chaos zu verhindern, das unweigerlich auf eine unkontrollierte Globalisierung folgen würde – impliziert unter anderem auch die Etablierung einer globalen Demokratie, die mit einer internationalen Rechtsordnung ausgestattet wäre. Doch hinsichtlich der Errichtung einer globalen Demokratie und Rechtsherrschaft ergibt sich die entscheidende Frage, die sich nur sehr schwer beantworten lässt: Wie soll man in unserer geteilten, globalisierten Welt eine Politik globaler Demokratie auf die Beine stellen?

Schlüsselwörter

Globalisierung, Globalismus, Neoliberalismus, Libertarianismus, sozialer Liberalismus, Demokratie, Globalherrschaft

Mislav Kukoč

Philosophie libérale et mondialisation

Résumé

L'une des nombreuses définitions de la mondialisation la présente comme une dynamique ayant répandu à travers le monde entier les structures sociales modernes telles que le capitalisme, la bureaucratie, la haute technologie ou encore la philosophie du rationalisme et du libéralisme.

En effet, dans ce sens, le libéralisme a en général prévalu en tant que cadre politique dominant dans la mondialisation actuelle. La plupart des gouvernements ont promu des politiques néolibérales à l'égard de la mondialisation, tandis que des organismes multilatéraux influents n'ont cessé d'associer la mondialisation à la libéralisation. Les partisans de la mondialisation ont également proliféré dans les cercles commerciaux, notamment sur les marchés financiers, et su multiplient parmi les dirigeants d'entreprises transfrontalières. Les associations d'entrepreneurs et les mass-médias tournés vers la finance représentent de même des bastions du néolibéralisme qu'ils considèrent globalement comme une autorité en ce qui concerne la politique de la mondialisation. Autrement dit, les idées néolibérales sont depuis quelque temps acceptées comme une vérité absolue dictée par le « bon sens ».

Le texte élabore la thèse suivante : le néolibéralisme – une sorte de théorie philosophique, politique et économique, appelée libertarianisme, qui s'est imposée dans la mondialisation contemporaine en tant qu'approche dominante – ne coïncide pas avec l'idéal de la société bien ordonnée de la démocratie libérale qui découle des idées, des aspects et des dimensions de la philosophie libérale diamétralement opposés.

La philosophie sociale du libéralisme, développée dans l'œuvre de Kant, Hayek, Dworkin et Rawls, considère la conception de la démocratie libérale moderne, fondée sur le règne de la loi, la protection des droits de l'homme et des droits civiques ainsi que sur les idées d'égalité, de justice et d'équité. Dans ce sens, les programmes de « discrimination positive » des couches sociales les plus basses sont en parfait accord avec cette philosophie libérale qui protège les droits individuels.

Partant de là, la mondialisation économique et culturelle devrait faire l'objet d'une analyse conceptuelle claire avec pour impératif normatif la mondialisation de la responsabilité dont l'objectif serait de protéger l'avenir mondial de l'humanité. Une sorte de contrôle démocratique et de règne du droit sont tout aussi nécessaires dans notre monde globalisé.

Le devoir central de la politique mondiale – à savoir de stopper le chaos global qui menace d'être une conséquence inévitable d'une mondialisation non contrôlée – implique, entre autres, un ordre légal international avec une sorte de gouvernance démocratique mondiale. Cependant, une question décisive, à laquelle il est difficile de répondre, se pose à propos de la construction démocratique mondiale : comment bâtir une politique de gouvernance mondiale dans notre monde divisé ?

Mots-clés

mondialisation, globalisme, néolibéralisme, libertarianisme, libéralisme social, démocratie, gouvernance mondiale