

POWER IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION

ZEKRIST RIDA

Research Scholar, Department of the Philosophic Science, Kazakhstan

Professor, Department of the Humanities, Kostanay Social -Technical University, Kostanay, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the problem of power and the nation-state, which is understood from the perspective of the modernity global challenges as the multi-level process system of world-historical development. The analysis showed that in the modern world there are three levels of government - macro, mezzo- and micro. Author examines the interaction between them through the prism of fundamental concepts of modern globalization. Raises the question about the fate of the nation-state in modern conditions, also makes distinction between globalization and globalism.

KEYWORDS: Modernization, Globalization, National State Power, Hierarchy, Globalism, The System, The Elite

INTRODUCTION

For the twentieth and after coming the twenty-first century characterized by unprecedented dynamism of all spheres of life, especially politics and economics, which increased in the last decades of the twentieth century [1, p.6]. These transformations were the subject for analysis of philosophers, political scientists and economists. Variety of theories were appeared, the most famous of which was the shock concept of the collision with the future by A. Toffler, end of history by F.Fukuyama and the theory of the clash of civilizations by S.Huntington.

In the twentieth and the coming XXI century in Western philosophy the issues of state and government, have given and continue to give researchers such as A. Avtorhanov, J. Alexander, H. Arendt, R.Aron, N. Bobbio, D. Baldwin, T. Ball, P. Bourdieu, T. Wartenberg, M. Weber, B. Deleuze and F. Guattari, N. Elias, L. Ellison, N. Enkelmann Baechler, J., Clark, I., Cox, R. W., Dahl, R. A., Hirst, P., Thompson, G., Lasarus, N., Marshall, D., Moosmüller, A., Naudet, J.-L., Navarro, V., Nuscheler, F., Perrot, E., Reinicke, W. H., Schwartzman, K. C., Stryker, R., Valaskakis, K., Waters, M., Wrong, D. H. [2-19]. In the former Soviet philosophy touched on these issues, as a rule, only in connection with the analysis of policy areas in the criticism of power and the state concepts so-called "bourgeois" of philosophy, sociology, political science. More than any other in this manifested showed himself –M. Keizerov.

Intensively studied problems of state and power, including the context of globalization at post-Soviet social philosophy, political philosophy and political science.

This is, firstly by authors such as K. Abishev, V. Abramov, V. Adrov, S. Baybakov, S. Barsukov, G. Belov, I. Belogradov, A. Gazitski, V. Grafsky, S. Gurin, V. Gusev, A. Degtyarev, S. Zhushupov, V. Ivanov, A. Zdravomyselov, B. Zelenko, Z. Zotov, M. Ilyin and A. Melville, A. Kamalidenova, V. Kantor, V. Ledjaev, O. Ledjaeva, M. Post, A. Sagikyzy, P. Sapronov, D. Slizovsky, V. Khalipov, A. Hamid, V. Tsann-kai-si and many others.

We will not consider them, we will look to the concepts that suggested by many authors with real basis. Let's

consider the power and the nation-state problem, which understood from the perspective of the global challenges at present time, as the multi-level process system of world-historical development. In the modern world, there are three levels of government - macro, mezzo and micro. Consider the interaction between them through the prism of the fundamental concepts of modern globalization. The current situation on our planet is characterized by the processes of modernization and globalization. These processes, no matter how they are understood and interpreted, can not affect to the state's education, which are predominantly national states, and also on national-state power. Our analysis focuses on the opening features of functioning state and political authority of the Transitional Society (and those are still have the post-Soviet state's education) in contemporary processes of globalization.

The concept of globalization can be divided into: 1) those in which the processes of globalization and their implications are reviewed and evaluated exclusively positive; 2) those in which the processes of globalization and their implications are reviewed and evaluated exclusively negative (the authors are so-called anti-globalizes); 3) those in which their authors see both positive and negative points. But before we analyze them, we should look at how the phenomenon of globalization treated. Indeed, the assessment of this phenomenon depends on its interpretation. Some authors distinguish between the concepts of globalization and globalism. So, A Galkin distinguishes globalization as an objective process and global studies, or globalism as a form of understanding (ordinary or theoretical) of the objective process. He believes that the concept of "globalism" today has replaced the notion of "internationalism", which, in his opinion, overly ideologically loaded, and the concept of "globalization" and "globalism" from this are free. Consequently, globalization, according to him, is one of the stages of historical development of mankind, replacing the previous one. Authors: A. Panarin and A. Hamidov also distinguish between globalization and globalism, but on entirely different grounds (which shows - below).

Many authors emphasize the objective and necessary and inevitable character of globalization and with that it's limited. Of course this is not enough. Some isolated stages of the globalization process. Thus, the American journalist, three times winner of the Pulitzer Prize T. L. Friedman identifies three main stages of the globalization process, which began, according to him, before the rise of capitalism, although in Western Europe. According to him the first stage, covers the period from 1492 to 1800 (approximately). He embarked of H. Columbus journey in search of western route to India and the discovery of a new continent, later called America. This stage T. Friedman calls "Globalization 1.0." "It's - he writes - established a new dimension: the world has ceased to be great and became medium " [20, p.14]. The second stage, "Globalization 2.0," lasted, according to the author, from 1800 to 2000 years. "During this period the world has ceased to be medium and became a small" [20, p.14]. Finally, from 2000 became the third stage of globalization - "Globalization 3.0." Finally, 2000 was the third stage of globalization - "Globalization 3.0." The author writes: "Globalization 3.0 reduces the world to the limit: the world ceases to be a small and becomes tiny and at the same time it evens the worldwide playing field. And if driver of Globalization 1.0 was countries, Globalization 2.0 - the company, the driver of Globalization 3.0 - which is its unique feature - it becomes unformed potential for global cooperation and competition, which is now available for "individual person "[20, p.16].

World, according to T. Friedman was not only tiny - it has ceased to be spherical: the round world becomes flat. Wherever you glimpsed, all hierarchical structures are either "forced to withstand the onslaught of the bottom, or they themselves are converted from vertical structures to more horizontal, more responsible model of equal cooperation" [20, p.14]. Rise of new social, political, economic and cultural model. At the same alignment of the world, T. Friedman says, occurs with astonishing speed and ubiquity: it covers the whole world. We can say that two of globalization phase is still

possible to accept, but the third is more complicated. The process of globalization began to take shapes, which are not consistent with the ideals of the Enlightenment Age. In this regard, some researchers such as A. Panarin and A. Hamid (second - more consistently) distinguish globalization and globalism. This distinction is based on other grounds than the distinction of A. Galkin. The position of these authors is as follows (based on quite reliable historical facts): after the Second World War, on the planet was established world order, which was dominated by the two poles, which were presented as the capitalist world and the socialist world (what was thought to be), and even more specifically - between two superpowers - the United States of America and the Union Soviet Socialist Republics (USA and USSR). Countries of the so-called "third world" gravitated toward one pole, the other - to another. This period in the history of mankind was called "Cold War."

By leading capitalist countries was elaborated doctrine according to which the planet's resources for a full existence may last only a very small group of the population, numbering about a billion. This doctrine was named the "the golden billion". Naturally, in this "golden billion" were included governments of most developed countries, and first of all - the United States, as the main among them. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the so-called "socialist camp" doctrine of the golden billion turned into a real strategy and tactics primarily the United States. Consequently, the new world order doctrine no longer connects the progress of history with all of humanity on our planet; it's links with the progress only limited part of humanity - so-called "golden billion". This doctrine, the opposite doctrine of globalization, authors calls globalism. "In this new world order - says A. Hamidov - USA and several other leading capitalist states took Center place, all the rest of the world suffered the fate of the periphery. Occupying the center position, USA usurped the right to dictate their will becoming increasingly disenfranchised periphery. Consequently, the only doctrinal before globalism became almost-effective. Today's world order - this regulation and rules of world-historical process of a single center unilaterally and only in the interest of the Centre. The main instrument of implementation of the strategy and tactics monocentric globalism is an international financial capital "[21, p.25]. In light of this understanding, if the first two-stage form which marked by T. L. Friedman, you can still take steps as a form of globalization, the third - we can not, because it is not globalization, its globalism.

However, nature is so ordered that the main resources of the world are concentrated in areas of the world, which are deployed on the territory of the state, globalists enrolled in the periphery of the discharge. Many of these areas are concentrated more or less strong national state. Consequently, the main obstacles in the way implementation of policies of globalization are strong national state. Many foreign researchers agree with this. So, P. Berger writes that "there can be no doubt that the economic and technological change, which is caused by the phenomenon of globalization, has created serious social and political issues such as the division winners and losers (both within a single society and between societies) and challenge to traditional notions of national sovereignty "[22, p. 9]. V. Reinecke argues that globalization "defies the sovereignty of nation-states" [23, p. 129]; F.-H. Kaufman argues that globalization by inherently has to cross borders of national-state formations [24, p. 3-10]; R. Berbah and U. Robinson writes that the defining characteristic of globalization is the "crowding out nation-state as an organizing principle of capitalism and the establishment of the interstate system at the same time as the foundation of capitalist development" [25, p. 30]. However, these authors emphasize that the system of global capitalism cannot exist external phenomena: any intrastate processes must become global character. This means that all institutions of the nation-state should be ousted and replaced by global transnational institutions [25, p. 30]. R. Berbah and U. Robinson notes, that sovereign nation-state for the purpose of self-preservation

forced to adapt to an ever growing trends and challenges of globalization.

Stands somewhat apart viewpoint of K. Ohmae, the Japanese scientist, journalist and businessman. It dispenses with the concepts of "globalization" and "globalism." He - a typical technocrat. The global economy, according to him, is formed due to the irreversibility of scientific and technical progress. The main factors of historical progress at the present stage are, in his opinion, "four I" which he meant investing, Industry, Information Technology and Individual consumption. In the way of progress at the moment, says K. Ohmae, are closed states with their boundaries. As such, they have become outdated and anachronistic. The state itself as an institution in our eyes becomes "nostalgic fiction" [26, p. 12]. Loopback state, he says, start being replaced with specific territorial entities, K. Ohmae called "regions-states." But they - only intermediate forms in the way the global economy, ignorant of state borders. "In the same way, - he writes - as the current paralysis of nation-states shows that they were only transitional form of organization management of economic processes- regions, states may well lose its value in the future. Nothing is forever. But at the moment they are - just what "the doctor ordered." After receiving the necessary degree of independence-regions of the state, due to its unique ability to function on the basis primarily of global logic will be that demand time - efficient engines of prosperity and quality of life of people working in the global economy "[26, p. 149].

But the fact that the national state prevents the processes of globalization (more precisely, of course - globalism) and that it is - unwanted Institute, also written in the literature. So that the nation state is supposedly brake further evolution of mankind, wrote the former head of the Club of Rome A. Peccei in 1977 in his well-known book "Human qualities." A. Peccei and his supporters have adherents among the post-Soviet philosophers and political scientists.

Does globalization associated with modernization? Many researchers answer this question in the affirmative. Globalization could not start and get by without any upgrades. Modernization, of course, continues, but now it becomes the mechanism of the globalization. Some authors also believe that in fact today we are dealing with the same upgrade. V. Inozemtsev, for example, writes: "Which now calls globalization, more accurately be defined as westernization" [27, c. 60]. But this is certainly not the case. On the planet realizes strategy and tactics of globalism, directed from single center, which skillfully uses the mechanisms of modernization. Thus, the objective which still persist, the processes of globalization in the sense as understood by A. Hamidov, V. Inozemtsev and others, carried out under the authority of the globalists, adjusted and regulated them. Gennady Zyuganov, recognizing fact of some secret existence "world behind the scenes", however, he states: "There is no doubt that these forces today are trying to take maximize benefits from globalization and implement "American globalization" scenario. However, this does not mean that globalization - completely handmade phenomenon. Need to be aware that globalization processes have an objective character, they occur regardless of our desires and intentions "[28, c. 97]. Above it was noted that many authors emphasize the objective nature of globalization. Of course, this process carries completely objective character. But does it? Some, however, speak more carefully. But, Kazakh scholar R. Sartayeva accurately noted that "globalization is an objective process, in which a significant role is played by subjective factors.... Subjective factors can influence the direction for the objective process (future scenario) "[29, c. 325]. Exactly "golden billion» states are not just seeking to extract itself from the dividends of these processes, but also strive to substitute globalization by "manmade" (the expression of G. Zyuganov) phenomenon by characterization of A. Panarin and A. Hamidov, globalism. Thus, we consider not only justified the distinction of globalization and globalism, but we convince that it will allow to navigate in the modern world processes. There is point of view that the nation-state interferes with the processes of globalization (more precisely, of course - globalism) and that it is

- unwanted institute [30, c. 301].

Unprecedented pretenses of globalists gave rise to anti-globalization movement. Anti-globalists denounce and reject the globalist's usurpation rights to determine the prospects and driving force of history, their self-serving monopoly on the dispensation of the Future. Intellectual elite representatives, biased by globalism center and their emissaries, strongly brand the anti-globalization and anti-globalization. However, noted by A. Hamidov, "anti-globalization, whatever form it takes, can not be considered meaningful alternative to globalism. Insolvency antiglobalism, - said A. A. Hamid, - consists in that it represents only backlash against globalism [22, c. 30, 32].

A reasonable question arises: how does the phenomenon of globalization impact on the nation-state and its power in terms of the transition to the new system. This question bothers modern post-Soviet philosophers, political scientists and sociologists. Kazakh scientists and philosophers also sidestep the problem of the impact of globalization on national statehood [1, p. 50]. A. Nysanbaev emphasizes: "Especially becomes important such study (study of the processes of globalization. – R. Z) for independent states of Central Asia, our Kazakhstan too. In this context, occur acutely problem: how without deviating from the objective process of globalization - that is basically impossible - to preserve their national sovereignty, national "I am", an original and unique culture of Kazakhstan and Central Asia peoples, the great value of traditional culture which express the centuries-old experience of folk art and wisdom "[31, c. 85]?

What is the main problem? Post-Soviet states have set the transition to a market economy. However, this transition can happen in many ways. Market economy - is just another name for the capitalist economy. The ratio of the economy and the state (the government power) - take place those limits beyond which government interference in the economy is considered acceptable and even necessary. However, consultants of state power implementing policies of globalization, seeking to impose young post-Soviet states maximum policy of non-interference in the economic sphere, and especially in the financial sector. This market fundamentalism in fact does not lead to the consolidation of the young national states, but rather to their weakening. Indeed, in this case the national economy becomes dependent on transnational corporations and finance begin to serve for international financial institutions in the service of policy globalism. Of course, on the planet today is not the situation that took place immediately after the collapse of the bipolar world. Gradually the world arena come new "players" and growing trend multipolar world of education. But this is only a tendency. Countries - the implementation of policies of liberalism still dominate the planet. Consequently, the fates of nation-states are not clear yet. We emphasize: methodologically incorrect to raise the question of the fate of the nation-state in modern conditions, in conditions of modern world order without distinguishing between globalization and globalism. In the long term - with the proviso that the phenomenon of globalization as such will be eliminated - the nation-state (the state in general) may have exhaust itself. You can remember the Marxist idea of the state withering away. But K.Marx is linked this dying to overcoming exclusion and building societies that objective will not need to institute the state. But in the current situation is not the case. Globalists wish to get rid of many nation-states, while preserving their own state (and, of course - the hegemony). Consequently, those authors who argue that globalism - a dangerous enemy of national statehood, absolutely right.

With the current dominance of globalism, implemented by representatives of the "golden billion" nation-states should not take their positions and must strongly resist efforts of globalism. In this situation, consistency is very important in the functioning of all three levels of government - the macro-, meso-and micro power. And special attention should be

directed at the meso level of government, since it is level of the least reliable, already mentioned, and most corrupt. Only to that estimated action of globalists to weaken and (or) degradation of national statehood.

CONCLUSIONS

Transnational corporations and financial institutions tend to put for dependent from themselves of the national political and economic (primarily) the elite and make them your own puppets. A. Panarin said: "Today, to be an elite and realize itself as an elite means to put yourself in the position of an independent national interests and national aspirations. [...]Era of globalization has put the national elites in some intermediate position between its own people and the international centers of power "[32, c. 6-7]. On the same level macro power their performer must maximally promote the transition state from the legal to the social. Such a nation-state can effectively resist the efforts of globalism. This is especially important for multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state formations, what, for example, are the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kazakhstan. Under these conditions the strong national states can resist globalism and participate in the processes of true globalization.

REFERENCES

1. O. Nechyporenko, A. Nysanbaev, civilizing process at the turn of the century: globalization, modernization, transformation [Text] / O.Nechyporenko, A.Nysanbaev // Kazakhstan in the context of globalization. Philosophical - political analysis. - Almaty: K-IC ISP of MES RK 2006. - C. 6.
2. Baechler, J. Le pouvoir pur [Text]/ J. Baechler. – P. : Calmann-Lévu, 1978. – 273 p.
3. Clark, I. Globalization and fragmentation: International relations in the twentieth century [Text]/ I. Clark. – N. Y. etc.: Oxford university press, 1997. – X, 220 p.
4. Cox, R. W. Global “perestroika” [Text]/ R. W. Cox //Approaches to world order /Ed. by Cox R. W. with Sinclair T. J. – Cambridge, 1996. – P. 296 – 313.
5. Dahl, R. A. The concept of power [Text]/ R. A. Dahl //Behavioural science. – 1957. – Vol. 2. – P. 201 – 215.
6. Hirst, P., Thompson, G. Globalization and the future of the nation state [Text]/ P. Hirst, G. Thompson //Economy and society. – L. – 1995. – Vol. 24. – N 3. – P. 408 – 442.
7. Lasarus, N. Charting globalization [Text]/ N. Lasarus //Race and class. – L. – 1998/1999. – Vol. 40. – N 2/3. – P. 91 – 109.
8. Marshall, D. Understanding late-twentieth-century capitalism: Reassessing the globalization theme [Text]/ D. Marshall //Government and opposition. – L. – 1996. – Vol. 31. – N 2. – P. 193 – 215.
9. Moosmüller, A. Interkulturelle Kommunikation und globale Wirtschaft: zu den Risiken und Chancen von kultureller Differenz [Text]/ A. Moosmüller //Schwei-zerisches Archiv für Volkskunde. – Zürich. – 1998. – N 2. – S. 189 – 207.
10. Naudet, J.-L. Face au neo-liberalisme et la globalisation [Text]/ J.-L. Naudet // Analyses et documents econ. P. – 1998. – N 74. – P. 66 – 71.
11. Navarro, V. Neoliberalism, “globalization”, unemployment, inequalities, and welfare state [Text]/ V. Navarro

- //International journal of health services. – 1998. – Vol. 28. N 24. – P. 607 – 682.
12. Nuscheler, F. Reiche Welt und arme Welt [Text]/ F. Nuscheler //Die neue Welt-politik. – Baden-Baden, 1995. – S. 112 – 122.
 13. Perrot, E. Penser la mondialisation [Text]/ E. Perrot //Recherches descience religieuse. – P. – 1998. – Vol. 86. – N 1. – P. 15 – 40.
 14. Reinicke, W. H. Global public policy [Text]/ W. H. Reinicke //Foreign affairs. – Washington. 1997. – Vol. 76. N 6. – P. 127 – 138.
 15. Schwartzman, K. C. Globalization and democracy [Text]/ K. C. Schwartzman //Annual review of sociology. Palo Alto. – 1998. – Vol. 24. – P. 159 – 181.
 16. Stryker, R. Globalization and welfare state [Text]/ R. Stryker //International journal of sociology and social policy. – Hull. – 1998. – Vol. 15. – N 2 – 4. – P. 1 – 49.
 17. Valaskakis, K. Mondialisation et gouvernance [Text]/ K. Valaskakis //Futu-ribles. – P. – 1998. – N 230. – P. 5 – 28.
 18. Waters, M. Globalization [Text]/ M. Waters. – L.; N. Y.: Routledge, 1996. – XIV, 185 P.
 19. Wrong, D. H. Power: Its forms, bases and uses. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1979. – VIII, 326 p.
 20. Friedman, T. The World is Flat: A Brief History of the XXI century [Text] / T. Friedman. - Moscow: AST: AST MOSCOW: CUSTODIAN, 2006 - S. 14.
 21. Hamidov A. The problem of globalization without an alternative: globalism or anti-globalism. Almaty, 2011. - S. 25.
 22. Berger P. Introduction. Cultural dynamics of globalization [Text] / PL Berger // The Many Faces of Globalization. Cultural diversity in the contemporary world. - Moscow: Aspect Press, 2004. - C. 9.
 23. Reinicke W, Global public policy [Text]/ W. H. Reinicke //Foreign affairs. – Washington, 1997. – Vol. 76. – N 6. – P. 129.
 24. Kaufmann F.-X., Globalisierung und Gesellschaft [Text]/ F.-X. Kaufmann //Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte [Text]/. – Bonn, 1998. – № 18. – S. 3 – 10.
 25. Burbach, R., Robinson. W. I. The fin de sciecle debate: globalisation as epochal shift [Text]/ R. Burbach, W. I. Robinson //Science and society. – N. Y., 1999. – Vol. 63. – N 1. – P. 30.
 26. Ohmae K., The end of the nation state: The rise of regional economies [Text]/ K. Ohmae. – L.: Harper Collins, 1995. – P. 12.
 27. Inozemtsev V., Westernization as globalization and "globalization" as Americanization. - S. 60.
 28. Zyuganov G. Globalization and the fate of mankind. / GA Zyuganov - M.: Young Guard, 2002. - 446s. - S. 97.

