Assistant Professor Srđan Milašinović, PhD
Police Academy, Belgrade
Mladen Bajagić, PhD
School of Interior Affairs, Belgrade

GLOBALIZATION & FRAGMENTATION – RULING DYNAMICS OF GLOBAL SOCIETY

Abstract: *Globalization and fragmentation represent parallel and universal phenomena of post-Cold War epoch, which makes them important sociological and politicology-related topic. By their extraordinary complex and contradictory nature, these two processes appear as a subject of many a dispute and interpretation in various contexts and for various purposes. At the same time, globalization and fragmentation are subjects of both idealization and disputing. Many authors see these processes as destruction of authentic human existence which leads towards instability, risk, even world chaos, while for some others they are the beginning of contemporary democracy and "true human history." However, both these groups of authors lack strong arguments and clear visions about the further course and consequences of these processes for the overall relations and processes in the world. Therefore, in order to consider main courses of integration and disintegration processes in contemporary world, as well as their positive and negative sides, there is a need to answer the following questions: what are globalization and fragmentation? Are we going towards the creation of a uniform world society or society of a chaos, in other words, are these regular processes in the development of a human society?*

Key words: *globalization, modernization, fragmentation, fragmegration, neo-liberalism.*

1. Globalization and dimensions of interdependence

Integration and disintegration are the processes which mark fate and development of human civilization and global future at the crossroads of two millennia. While integration implies processes of "globalization, democratization and humanitarianism, disintegration refers to falling in of nation states and the

appearance of parochialism."[1] As the most important integration process, globalization marked decisively the international relations after the Cold War in two directions: in the direction of accelerating economic integrations and in the direction of political fragmentations. However, before we start the discussion on all aspects of globalization, which has primarily contributed to surprisingly fast and revolutionary changes in the fields of economy, technology and exchange of information, it is necessary to say something about the very notion of globalization.

At the end of 20th century, globalization became a buzzword[2] which was used in various contexts and for various purposes, although its meaning is neither simple nor obvious (Jan Aart Schote)[3]. A large number of researchers from various scientific fields were preoccupied by the phenomenon of globalization and synthesized category and concept of the contemporary world, which refers us to the conclusion that the term globalization has finally acquired a status of serious analytical notion and secured an important place for itself in theory, both as a discourse and as a specific project. This is why the term globalization is neither "innocent nor neutral", says Douglas Kellner – "it is used to mark many things and to replace some old discourses such as for instance imperialism and modernization.[4] As a substitute for imperialism, the term tends to change focus of interest from the developed countries to one and the most developed country (the USA), or from national and local economies to transnational corporations. As a substitute for modernization, globalization refers to the meaning of a process which has a positive sign: it takes care of a progress and improvement as parts of universal path of progress and development of civilization. On the other hand, the term often assumes negative meaning, being suitable for covering and/or neutralizing the "horrors" of colonialism, becoming a part of neo-imperialism in this way. It is actually an attempt to cover up the continuity of exploitation carried out by a few powerful states and giant transnational corporations. "In this way some forms of barbaric and destructive aspects of contemporary world are covered by a veil (Douglas Kellner)." Yet, regardless of the various ideological approaches to the phenomenon of globalization, in terms of positive or negative valuable determination, it is multi-valence term that determines multi-dimensional process in the fields of contemporary technology, economy, politics, culture, as well as everyday life.

---

[1]   Ch. W. Jr. Kegley, G. A. Raymond, *Exorcising the Ghost of Westphalia: Building World Order in the New Millennium*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2002, p. 156, 168. These processes, according to Joseph S. Nye, converge together with transnationalism and nationalism – two competing forces in the world after the Cold War.

[2]   D. Kellner, *Globalization and the Postmodern Turn*, Internet 23/11/2001, www.gseis.ucla. edu/courses/ed 253a/dk/GLOBPM.htm.

[3]   Ch. W. Jr. Kegley, G. A. Raymond, op. cit., p. 157.

[4]   D. Kellner, op. cit.

In social theory the term globalization is most frequently used to mark process of creation of a unique economic and political space on our planet, in other words the process of connecting and uniting contemporary societies into a world society. This is why globalization is not a historical *novum*, but a realistic historical process that has been developing over centuries and which has considerably accelerated in the recent decades. In the light of modern interpretation, this process is characterized primarily by "universalization, homogenization and unification of the world according to some important principles, determinants and standards of behaviour, as well as establishing of growing mutual connection and conditional quality among individual countries and regions."[5] However, it is important to underline that the ideas of universalization, homogenization and unification are neither new nor unknown, "they appeared in the heads of creators of powerful states and empires even before these ideas were borne in Judean and Christian civilizations and religious-ideological movements, which gave them powerful ideological foundation. Objective conditions for their realistic putting on the agenda of historical priorities was brought over a hundred years ago by the epoch that English historian E. Hobsbawm called the *era of empires*, while Lenin called it the *epoch of imperialism*.[6]

Globalization as a world historical process refers to strengthening of inter-relations and interdependence not only in politics and economy but also in culture. It is "a great transformation, new stage of techno-capitalism, which includes thorough restructuring and reorganization of world economy, politics and culture."[7] Therefore, globalization is a term used to describe an accelerated process of strengthening of technological, economic, social, cultural and political interdependence in the world. Since it is an unforeseeable and turbulent process that researchers understand and explain variously, Anthony Giddens decides in favour of a classification according to which there are three streams of thought: skeptics, hyper-globalists and transformationists.[8] The stream of thought that according to Giddens is the closest to contemporary reality is transformationist one, primarily because its proponents observe globalization as "central wide-spectrum power of changes that shapes contemporary societies today." Although the global order is being transformed and changed, the proponents of this stream of thought think that some deep-rooted patterns of behaviour still survive. Nation states and their governments still keep a part of their power regardless of ever increasing global interdependence. Main changes occur not

5   D. Ž. Marković, "Sociologija i globalizacija"; V. Drašković, "Pojam, uzroci i posledice globalizacije", *Globalizacija i tranzicija*, op. cit., p. 139.

6   Č. Popov, *Novi svetski poredak – prethodnici istorijske epohe*, "Smisao", Beograd, 1999.

7   D. Kellner, op. cit.

8   On skeptics and hyper-globalists see more details in: E. Gidens, *Sociologija*, Ekonomski fakultet u Beogradu, 2001, 63-65; S. Milašinović, "Globalizacija i mogućnost izbora", *Bezbednost*, 1/2005, Beograd, pp. 35-51.

only in economy, but also in politics, culture and personal life of individuals.[9] Transformationists consider that this is why globalization is a dynamic, open, multi-directional, reflexive and contradictory process, a product of intertwined global networks.

Many researchers see globalization as a plague, identifying it with Leviathan that threatens the world by totalitarianism and complete Orwelization of individual and collective existence of people, while for the others it is a beginning of contemporary democracy and "true human history", although as a world phenomenon of "economic, technological, political and ideological and cultural unification of the world it is *a priori* neither good nor bad."[10]

Therefore, in the widest sociological sense, globalization is a contradictory process of connecting particular societies in the relations of interdependence and cultural connections, based on new information technologies and means of communication, so that a new world society appears on the Earth as well as consciousness of belonging to that society, both in the minds of individual societies and in the minds of their members. It actually reflects historical and civilization-related pattern of development of human society which is directly conditioned by the development of production powers of a man and means, interpersonal and inter-societal communication based on science, the most authentic indicator of capabilities during the development of a man as a contemplative and creative being.

One of the constitutive elements of the term globalization is interdependence – the notion which includes situation in which all participants or events in various parts of international system influence each other. Therefore, starting from the notion of dependence, Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye define interdependence as 'mutual dependence', which in world politics means situations characterized by interaction among states or among actors in various states."[11] Interdependence is, therefore, mutual dependence: "I depend, you depend, we depend – this is a rule," says Joseph S. Nye.[12]

Dynamic changes in the world, especially accelerated scientific and technological development in the fields of telecommunications and information systems (information revolution), liberalization of world market and promotion of new

---

[9]   E. Gidens, op. cit., 65; M. Pečujlić, *Globalizacija – dva lika sveta*, "Gutenbergova galaksija", Beograd, 2002; V. Pavićević, *Aspekti globalizacije – sa pregledom osnovnih pojmova*, "Dosije", Beograd, 2003.

[10] J. Trkulja, "Globalizacija kao potčinjavanje ili šansa", in: V. Pavićević, et **al., eds.,** *Aspekti globalizacije – sa pregledom osnovnih pojmova*, Dosije, Beograd, 2003.

[11] R. Keohane, J. S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (3. ed.), Longman, New York, 2001. p. 7.

[12] J. S. Jr. Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, New York: Longman, p. 179. Interdependence among states within the international system is not a new phenomenon. Many theories within the sicence of international relation delt with this phenomenon, primarily from the angle of research of conditions that might contribute to avoiding the conflicts among sovereign states.

values (human rights and care for the environment) influenced to start looking at interdependence after the Cold War from considerably different perspective. Namely, as opposed to traditional asymmetrical interdependence, the concept of "complex interdependence" becomes more and more prominent. This concept implies such a dynamics of the international system and world politics on which the crucial influence is made not only by the states but also by many intra-state and transnational actors. It can be merited to information revolution primarily, which contributed to technological and telecommunication innovation and increase of exchange of scientific, commercial and strategic information that have become general public good.[13]

Contrary to asymmetric interdependence, the following aspects of contemporary world may be considered the main features of complex interdependence: first, contemporary societies are connected by multiple channels which imply multitude of formal and informal links (official government connections, transnational institutions and organizations, connections between private actors – syndicates, non-government organizations, interest groups), whereas state boundaries are wiped off, and transnational organizations (for instance, multinational corporations and financial institutions) achieve ever increasing influence on national politics; second, military issues are not dominant on the agenda any more – there is an increasing influence of economic and ecological issues, and security is not the main preoccupation any more; third, the importance of "hard power" is decreased considerably since many contemporary problems (poverty, destruction of the environment and similar) cannot be solved by military means. Power can be used only in case of international consensus on its use, and the focus is on "soft power", whose main dimensions, in addition to the degree of scientific-technological and economic development, are educational and age-related structure of population, predominance in knowledge and information superiority (information power).

This is why complex interdependence implies the fact that states are not the only actors any more, since transnational actors act beyond state boundaries and become more and more important factor in creation of world business. Also, power is not crucial – domination is overtaken by economic instruments and activities of international institutions. Finally, the primary goal thinks J. Nye "is not security but prosperity."[14]

Therefore, the adoption of new and universal values and manners of behaviour in the international relations that make the integral part of the ideal of globalization has stimulated – in addition to political and military – economic, scientific, ecological and cultural aspects of interdependence, which together make

---

[13]   R. O. Koehane, J. S. Jr. Nye, *Power and Interdependence in the Information Age.* – In: *Foreign Affairs*, Vol 77, No. 5 (September/October 1998), p. 84-85; R. O. Keohane, J. S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (3. ed.), op. cit., p. 15, 20-30.

[14]   J. S. Jr. Nye, *Understanding…*, op. cit., p. 188.

a complex and intertwined network of complex interdependence. Contemporary problems of humankind (social, economic and political inequality and weakness, environment, human rights, etc.) under the conditions of complex interdependence become crucial fields of interest and negotiations in the global sphere, where transnational subject are more and more dominant. Thus economic and ecological issues and respect of human rights have priority over traditional issues related to security, and the consciousness of global risks (global heating, uncontrolled increase of world population, destruction of flora and fauna versatility, uneven economic development, pollution of waters and decrease of arable land), complete with the issues referring to preservation of world peace and protection of civil and political rights of people, have become the main topics of the international negotiations. In this way complex interdependence in the international politics contributes to the adoption of new patterns of political communication, which implies new methods and channels (building of trust and cooperation among states and participation of transnational subjects in the negotiations) in solving political issues important not only for nation states but also for the international system as a whole. This is why contemporary globalization, founded on the respect of crucial principles of complex interdependence, may be understood as "true revolution in human connections and relations, which contributes to fundamental changes of the manners according to which civilization is organized and behaves."[15] This is the process which unites the world and strengthens the consciousness of the world as a whole, pointing to the importance of connecting, uniting and mutual interaction of the world despite its material, spiritual and existential diversity and versatility. It is directed towards a man as a citizen of the world, but also towards the states, in other words towards the forms of direct connections among states by means of transnational (supranational and international) institutional intermediaries.

Globalization understood in this way, on the one hand, leads inevitably towards uniting of humankind and creation of the world society, while on the other, it refers to the need to arrange the relations among individual societies within that world society, but also to create assumptions for new forms of arrangement of relations in the future united humankind.

As a series of processes that expand and accelerate mutual connections all over the world, globalization creates complex networks of exchange, which are not organized according to territorial principle. In comparison with state-center model of international system, it favours gradual and constant expansion of interactive processes, organizational forms and forms of cooperation beyond traditional boundaries defined by sovereignty. It is a process of growing interdependence among societies, which enables the event in one part of the world to have more and more influence on distant peoples and societies. It means uniting

---

[15]   D. Pirages, *Globalization: A Cautionary Note*, Internet 14/07/2004, www.aaas.org/spp/yearbook/2000/ch9.html

of social-economic changes in the world as a whole, abandoning state and state boundaries as relevant factors in solving global problems, whose driving power is made of two main processes: globalization of production and globalization of finances. Many aspects of globalization (economic, infrastructure-related, social-institutional, cultural, ecological and political-legal) pervade each other and make a complex network of interactions.

2. Globalization and changes in the structure of power

Within the context of objective changes produced by globalization after the Cold War, the following are particularly highlighted:
- dizzy growth of world telecommunications (communicational aspect);
- increased mobility of goods and services, capital and labour (economic aspect), and
- increased number of ecological problems, which cross the national boundaries (ecological aspect) (*Robert T. Kudrle*).[16]

Globalization in the field of communications is the consequence of powerful development and expansion of information technologies (development of mobile telephony, possibility of satellite transfer of information in global sphere and the appearance of the Internet), which helped build a bridge over spatial boundaries among states and regions, connecting people into so-called virtual electronic community. Revolution of telecommunications, according to some futurologists, transforms the planet into a big "global village", where everyone shares common supranational identity, while more cautious authors estimate that it creates "global metropolis", which does not have a social intimacy characteristic of a well integrated community. However, telecommunication revolution must be paid tribute for fundamentally having changed the existing structure and disposition of power. Traditional elements of power are still important, but not dominant in world business. Ever increasing importance is given to "soft forms of power"[17] – capability to shape interests and opinions of others in accordance with certain desirable cultural values and ideas. Hard power in globalized world is not sufficient for any state or other actor to achieve their charted goals. The change of the nature of power had crucial contribution here, the diffusion of which is influenced by five key trends: economic interdependence, transna-

---

[16] Op. cit., p. 157.

[17] Technology, information science, trade and finances are stated as new dimensions ("soft forms") of power. Z. Bžežinski, *Američki izbor – globalna dominacija ili globalno vođstvo*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2004; CID, Podgorica, 2004. Joseph Nye talks about new, soft, impalpable and less coercive forms of power in comparison with traditional, hard forms of power (military force and similar). J. S. Jr. Nye, "Soft Power", *Foreign Policy*, No. 80, 1990, p. 153-170.

tional actors, nationalism in weak states, expansion of technology and change of nature of political issues which are currently the focus of interest of the international relations (ecological changes, for instance).[18] From the angle of a state, soft power is "contained in national willpower, diplomatic skill and support that the power in a country has by its people", while from a wider point of view, under the conditions of creation of information society *information power* becomes more and more prominent.[19] Those who create, control and have access to information have the advantage in the international politics in comparison with those whose greatest source of power is that they can threat by the use of weapons. Power, therefore, flows not only from states towards non-state (private) actors, but from "the rich in money" towards "the rich in information."

Table 1: *Effects of information technology on power*[20]

	Hard power	Soft power
Benefits of big actors	• Revolution in military field • Primacy of development • Gathering of information by "technical method"	• Ranking of economies by production quantity • Slight poverty and marketing power
Benefits of small actors	• Commercial capability • Infrastructure • Intelligence activities in the fields of economy and commerce	• Expansion of non-government organizations and cheap mutual communication • Appearance of small and new virtual communities

The other aspect of globalization – economic globalization, can be considered from several important viewpoints. First, it is a global expansion of neo-liberal economic and market principles and establishing of global technological and information networks and flows which erase national boundaries. Economic, technological and information-related organizational and spatial connecting of the world into an entity contributes to strengthening of interdependence among states, which are not capable any more to provide their respective populations with favourable economic conditions only by their own national potentials. Fast exchange of information and technological innovations "condenses the world" in which the states would pay less and less attention to territorial issues and would wave their "parochial national interests."[21] The focus moves towards globalized

---

[18]   J. S. Jr. Nye, *Soft Power*, op. cit., p. 160.

[19]   Op. cit., p. 164.

[20]   R. O. Keohane, J. S. Nye, *Power and...*(3. ed.), op. cit., p. 223.

[21]   Ch. W. Jr. Kegley, G. A. Raymond, op. cit., p. 160. "Condensing" in its content represents objective processes of globalization, which include: waves of technological revolutions that lead towards compression of space and time, reduction of distances and time required for ever increasing communications; establishing of global economy – world bloodstream

international economy in which "irrepressible economic forces – transnational financial capital, corporations and world economic arbiter (IMF) – transform national economies into their own local units."[22]

Under these conditions the most influential states will be so-called virtual states (Rouskrens), the states which would have sufficient financial and managerial skills to create products, provide services and control the goods beyond their boundaries, so that the signs pointing to the process of virtualization of the world economic system are more and more notable. On the other hand, the developing countries, despite the difficulties they are facing on an everyday basis, make efforts to catch the connection with contemporary economic and technological flows in order to join the global exchange of goods and services from as good starting position as possible and to maintain an acceptable level of economic development.

Briefly, old-fashioned nationalist chauvinism and geocentric ideas do not have their place in the economy of a united world any more. Under the conditions of globalized economy of 21st century, multinational corporations perform the majority of commercial and financial transactions by means of global information systems (e-trade), which creates an increasing asymmetry between economy and politics, electronically integrated world economy and territorially determined nation-states, as well as between geographic and cyber space. Such a development, conclude Kegley and Raymond, has created such circumstances under which "Westphalian model is no longer a corresponding instrument to conduct global businesses."[23] The consequence of this is that production, capital and markets are globalized and intertwined into a network of world economy that has exceeded the traditional political jurisdictions of a state. Economic globalization thus causes weakening of the state, which is no longer a manager of national economy, but the instrument of adjusting national economy to the requirements of expansion of world economy.

Finally, ecological globalization includes also some important issues that are in focus of current researches and refer to the influence of globalization on the environment, world population, resources, etc. Neo-liberal economy and world market globalization have brought to important migrations of world population. The increase of number of people in industrial centers, great economic migrations within states and world in general, unemployment and bad living conditions in megalopolises, especially in education, social services and health care,

---

– intertwined arteries and capillaries leading to more and more condensed networking; information and media revolution and its cultural products (news, documentaries, music hits etc.) that cross over geographic boundaries and reshape the local cultural space by their cultural meaning; and networks of powerful supranational institutions which represent the outlines of new global political order.

[22]   M. Pečujlić, op. cit., p. 14, 18.

[23]   Op. cit., 162.

cause various problems and threaten with outbursts of violent and non-violent conflicts among various social, ethnic and religious groups. If we add to this the problems of the world population growth, the picture is not at all optimistic. Economic globalization also leads to degradation and decrease of quantity of vital non-regenerating resources (water, food, energy sources, minerals, arable land, forests, etc.). Arms race turned into *resource race* in the globalized world, threatening with conflicts over the rights to exploit and control these resources. By the end of 20th century, due to excessive use, many rich natural resources came to the verge of destruction, and if that verge was crossed, quite logically, there would be destruction of the very basis of these resources. At the same time, Earth's atmospheric envelope is being destructed and the danger comes from greenhouse effect and global climatic warming, soil erosions, rivers dry out, animal and plant species die out, seas and oceans become more and more polluted; in short, there is a danger from an overall collapse of the nature. All this refers to the statement that "political world perhaps represents a chess board of sovereign states, but natural world represents a seamless network," where "all things are mutually connected."[24] Economic and ecological interdependence, as a consequence of economic and ecological globalization, becomes ruling trend in 21st century, so that all international actors must urgently make additional efforts in order to solve accumulated problems which threat the physical survival of humankind. Many countries, still aspiring to the concept of autonomy and sovereignty (sovereign right to use their natural resources and to treat the issue of environmental protection as national only) are still reluctant to join the efforts for environmental preservation, unless they are sure that other states would do the same. Such a situation results from the fact that damage caused by ecological destruction progresses slowly, and solutions for these problems are still too expensive. The states are tempted to behave like "stowaways", who negotiate about the agreements which reflect the lowest common denominators of determined interests and which lead to maximum responsibility of other nations, reducing at that their own duties. Despite some attempts to solve these problems at international level, the results have been rather small so far. This is why the additional efforts by states as well as international and non-government organizations are required in the years to come to establish new patterns of global negotiations concerning environmental issues in the widest sense, as establishing of new standards of conduct for all concerned. For without the global approach in solving these problems, "the formula of Westphalian peace will reappear as a barrier to successful solving of common problems," conclude Kegley and Raymond.[25]

---

[24]   Ch. W. Jr. Kegley, G. A. Raymond, op. cit., p. 162.

[25]   Op. cit., p. 164.

3. Contradictions of globalization

Globalization includes many contradictions. On the one hand, while it denotes a powerful growth of virtual capital, economic potentials together with creation of world market by expansion of commerce and capital flow, as well as accelerated technological, communicational and information progress, on the other hand, it represents a highly unbalanced process which increases inequality among and inside countries, favouring certain regions in the world or some social groups and not the others. Due to these reasons globalization cannot be estimated solely from the angle of positive economic, technological and information-related effects, but in relation to uneven and negative consequences that it causes in world economy and politics. The paradox of globalization therefore comes from the fact that it "integrates and unites, but also fragments and marginalizes, creating huge pressures and tensions inside states. Does globalization therefore promotes democracy or condense it, or does it do both?"[26]

The relation between globalization and liberal democracy is ambiguous and contradictory for many reasons. One of them is that certain countries in underdeveloped regions in spite their efforts to adopt fundamental principles of liberal democracy and political pluralism have failed to do so, primarily because of dominant authoritarian social structure and lack of human rights. Due to complete absence of democratic institutions of power, political pluralism and free economic initiative, unaware of importance of building democratic institutions as a key element of micro-economic and macro-economic development, these countries responded to globalization in a completely negative manner. Antagonism towards main values of Western societies that took the initiative in their efforts to impose neo-liberal values, principles of absolutely free market and their cultural patterns globally, were the main characteristics of the behaviour of certain countries, so that they closed within their own boundaries even more. There were powerful social unrests as a consequence, and the lack of democracy and political pluralism resulted in strengthening of political protests and establishing of various and even radical social and political movements. Economic, cultural and political influences of globalization together with the mentioned weaknesses of underdeveloped societies contributed to flourishing of nationalist and fundamentalist movements, which destabilized even more general condition in these countries. These processes were particularly characteristic of the countries of East and South-East Europe (the former USSR, Yugoslavia), the countries of East Asia (Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran) etc. Bloody ethnic and religious conflicts brought into question some elementary standards of a developing world order. This is why one of the biggest problems in interpreting the effects of globalization was reduced to the question how to overcome the disagreements on the

---

[26] Z. Öniş, "Neo-liberal Globalization and the Democracy Paradox: The Turkish General Elections of 1999", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 54, No. 1, pp. 284-285.

manner of arrangement of globalized world and create the new international order. The opinions on this are still divided. According to one opinion, the new international order can and should be arranged by establishing international organizations and institutions in democratic procedure, respecting and maintaining national and cultural identity of every participant and there should be equality of all subjects in expressing and achieving their interests within such created organizations and institutions. According to another opinion, the establishing of the new world order should be a framework for arrangement of globalized humankind where the most developed and the most powerful countries in terms of economy and politics would have a decisive role.

Some of the processes that mark globalization, especially global technological and information revolution, have contributed not only to the appearance of some forms of soft power but also to revolutionary changes in the structure and distribution of power. Namely, new technologies and information systems influence the accelerated development of conventional military potentials and military industry in general, as well as the expansion of mass-destruction weapons, particularly chemical and biological weapons. Despite strengthening of awareness of the need to put production and trade of these weapons under the strict international regime, which would in all aspects contribute to standardization of its use, primarily to peace purposes, many countries due to their narrow selfish interests and led by the logic of security dilemma tend to get in possession of these weapons. They are largely supported by the fact that the world is connected into global information network, which offers huge possibilities to obtain knowledge, means and materials required to produce mass-destruction weapons.

Economic and technological globalization, globalization of material production and expansion of information influenced the establishing of new cultural patterns and life styles, which are the condition to create global culture. Cultural globalization caused sudden changed in traditional paradigms, so that in "hypermedia environment of today, which is characterized by the explosion of communication technologies, the fundamental logic of real-politics intertwines with the logic of culture-politics (kulturpolitik)."[27] This means that achievement of state interests, including security, depends considerably on the promotion of state values and ideas (cultural specific characteristics) within other nations. Cultural globalization[28] can thus be understood as "making individual inter-

---

[27]   P. C. Pahlavi, "Cultural Globalisation and the Politics of Culture", *CEPES*, Quebec, Canada, October 2003, p. 5.

[28]   The term (neologism) "glocalization" is also used here; op. cit. p. 6. A well-known expression "think globally, act locally" expresses the essence of this neologism in that it reflects the true content of dynamics expressed through relation globally vs. locally. J. N. Pieterse, "Globalization as Hybridization", in: F. J. Lechner, J. Boli, eds., *The Globalization Reader*, Malden, Blackwell Publishers, Massachusetts, 2000, p. 102.

ests universal", "global valorization of individual identities,"[29] or the process by which local values, standards and practice flow over and expand to global level by means of transnational communication channels, which are characterized by convergence – closing and disintegration. Namely, when some sources have more influence than the other, then the process of cultural globalization contributes to understanding, social and political convergence of nations, while in a situation when several sources have equal influence, the process results in divergent behaviour. Technological globalization has decisive influence on creation of the world where it is rather hard to protect from outside cultural influences, so that cultural globalization is characterized by dynamics of homogenization which sets aside the importance of local cultural identities and creates "post-traditional collective identity", or universal cultural patterns and identity. Cultural globalization can thus be described as a process characterized by centripetal forces of convergence and centrifugal forces of disintegration. Disintegrating forces mark the process of reaffirmation of local cultures (reinstating of local traditional cultures and promotion of autochthonous identities) in comparison with the efforts to create universal cultural values and patterns of behaviour by means of integrative forces of convergence. Cultural homogenization is opposed by cultural differentiation.

Globalization in the field of culture, therefore, causes two processes: universalization and creation of "global culture" and fragmentation and multiplication of identities. However, for many people aspirations towards formation of global behaviour patterns, "global culture" and "global civil society" have produced dissatisfaction, fear and uncertainty for the future of traditional values such as national and cultural autochthony. In comparison with globalization, which in all its aspects tends to reduce the influence of nation states in many spheres of life, fragmentation, as an opposite process, contributes to revival of ethnic and religious identities and anew reproduction of nations.

The idea of establishing global culture at the principles and foundations of "cultural imperialism" has been born within so-called Western civilization circle, where globalization also originated as a universal process. This is why globalization in the field of culture is also called "Americanization", "Westernization" or "cultural imperialism" and "cultural synchronization – homogenization".[30] Where is the significance of culture within the context of discussion on disintegrating influences of globalization, especially within the context of anew revival of autochthonous cultural patterns as a response to attempts of the modern Western world to impose its own cultural values, ethical principles and life style as a foundation of modernization of the rest of the world and its cultural homogenization? Samuel P. Huntington made some attempts to give some answers to growing tensions between various cultures (cultural circles) in his

---

[29]   Op. cit., p. 102.

[30]   J. Tomlinson, "Cultural Imperialism", in: F. J. Lechner, J. Boli, eds., op. cit., p. 311.

brilliant study titled "The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order", in which he analyzed various trends within unique human civilization, as well as relations between modern civilizations, offering, as said by Henri Kissinger, "provocative framework for understanding world politics in 21st century."

One of the main features of civilizations is religion on which great civilizations have been established and recline. Civilizations develop fast fostering their tradition, culture, language and religion, and with all that their own identity. It is the same thing with religion, thinks Huntington. Since no universal language can appear, neither can universal religion. This is why according to Huntington the end of 20th century represents the period of overall cultural and religious renaissance worldwide, and the nature of contact between civilizations is determined to a large extent by ethnic and religious feelings and various cultural identities. The renaissance of non-Western cultures and non-Christian religions marks the world relations at the beginning of 21st century, since non-Western civilizations and cultures refuse Westernization and return to their autochthonous cultural values and identities. Huntington explains the renaissance of cultures in the following manner: "The distribution of cultures in the world reflects the distribution of power... Expansion of civilization power usually occurred in the course of history simultaneously with the flourishing of its culture and almost always implied the use of this power to expand one's own values, practice and institutions on other societies. Universal civilization requires universal power."[31]

Therefore, if there is not universal power, the chances to create universal civilization, universal values and patterns of behaviour are small. The processes go to quite an opposite direction. Awakening and renewal of religion and religious renaissance are natural response to the attempts to establish cultural hegemony of the Western world. This does not mean the refusal of modernization as a universal value, but refusal of secularism, moral relativism and surrendering to pleasures, so that it comes to reaffirmation of some other values (order, discipline, work, mutual help and human solidarity). The question usual for the Cold War time: "Whose side are you on?" has been replaced by the question: "Who are you?"[32]

Some authors express serious reserve for Huntington's determination and classification of civilizations, as well as his claim about the certain conflicts between civilizations in the future.[33] The conflicts similar to Huntington's conflicts of civilizations occurred in 18th century (huge adversity between Hapsburg and Ottoman Empire). Guided by such logic, it could be said that cultural differences among people can cause divisions and reduce efforts in solving the possible conflicts. However, there is little proof that they alone can cause conflicts or their extreme forms – wars. Also, there is not a proof that collective loyalty

---

31 S. Hantington, *Sukob civilizacija*, CID, Podgorica, 1998, p. 100.

32 Op. cit., p. 139.

33 C. Brown, *Understanding International Relations*, 2. ed., St. Martins Press, New York, 2001, p. 233.

could be transferred from one nation to the entire civilization. The criticisms of Huntington's postulations of civilization conflicts can be supported by the fact that considering some concrete historical events following the Cold War (conflict in Rwanda) the lower level conflicts (between ethnic communities within one state) are more certain, i.e. small ethnic communities could sooner get to the level to do genocide than civilizations. This is confirmed by the fact that warring parties in Rwanda belonged to the same civilization. Therefore, cultural tensions that have occurred due to expansion of secular Western values lead rather to re-flaring of aggressive particularism or at least parochialism than to supporting of solidarity within a civilization spreading along the periphery of the international system.

4. Dynamics of fragmentations and fragmegrations

Frequent statement of renowned scientists, when it concerns contemporary processes and relations in the world, can be expressed in the following manner: "If the Cold War was marked by some forms of certainty and stability, current international order is characterized by great instability, even chaos."[34]

The end of 20th century thus marked for some authors the appearance and strengthening of contradictory organizational energies connected with globalization and fragmentation, which make a harmonized framework for attack on primacy of sovereign territorial states that represented a material pillar of the world order by then.[35] Simultaneously with these processes, some transnational social forces begin to incline towards creation of some form of global civil society, providing the sources for the project of establishing so-called global democracy.[36] The revival of religions closely connected with the rise of awareness of belonging to certain civilizations is also important. This is why the pessimism expressed by Richard N. Haass concerning the future of the world is not surprising at all: "We live in the epoch of contradictories: globalization and fragmentation, peace and conflicts, prosperity and poverty."[37]

Regardless of the fact to what extent and to which proportion the stability and security in the future can be broken due to internal (intra-ethnic, inter-ethnic, inter-religious) conflicts or conflicts of civilizations, the world politics at the

[34]   Z. Bzezinski, *Out of Control, Global Turmoil on the Twenty-First Century*, New York, 1993; J. N. Rosenau, "Ominous Tensions in a Globalizing World", in: Conference on International Relations, Middle East Technological University, Ankara, Turkey, 2002.

[35]   R. Falk, "World Prisms: The Future of Sovereign States and International Order", in: *Harvard International Review*, Summer 1999, p. 30.

[36]   F. Kiningam, *Teorije demokratije*, "Filip Višnjić", Beograd, 2003; A. Lajphard, *Modeli demokratije*, CID, Podgorica, 2003.

[37]   R. N. Haass, "What to Do With American Primacy", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 78, No. 5, 1999, p. 37.

beginning of a new millennium is characterized by deep tectonic disturbances, which are contributed by re-flaring of conflicts on all levels. The consequences of globalization have not left only positive traces on current reality of international relations so far. Due to many reasons, globalization influenced crucially the appearance of another process that marks the new millennium – *fragmentation*. So the nation states today find themselves between two forces: fragmentation, which appears and develops inside nation states, and globalization, which unwinds beyond (the power) of nation states. In today's world, which is characterized by processes of accelerated economic, technological and information integration, cultural homogenization and asymmetric interdependence, "state sovereignty is brought into danger by two intertwined processes: globalization and political fragmentation. Globalization and fragmentation have thus become "twin themes"[38] of scientific and popular literature that deals with the future of states and world as a whole.

Fragmentation is a term used to describe the process opposite to globalization. It refers to opposing to pressures of globalization, efforts to maintain traditional independence of states or social groups in solving some key issues, independent from entities acting beyond national boundaries. In the majority of literature fragmentation is focused on ethnic (and religious) conflicts within the existing states. Fragmentation, therefore, induces disintegration of globalized international system of states, as well as multiplication of sub-national identities inside nation states.

In the post-Cold war world the nation state sovereignty is largely limited by the process of globalization, so that many predict the crisis of the nation state and the end of nations in comparison with traditional comprehension. On the other hand, some predict that the power and authority of states would flow over into two directions: towards the international regimes and organizations, and towards local governments, nations and tribes. These two directions of nation state power overflow are consequences of globalization and fragmentation.[39] Fragmentation, i.e. disintegration of states is one of the most important consequences of globalization. The causes of this disintegration are double: the process of globalization has led to reduced capacities of states and loss of their traditionally understood legitimacy; the end of the Cold War has led to demonstration of political identity and cultural heritage of some nations, and hidden ethnic and religious intolerances surfaced and led to armed conflicts.[40]

---

[38] Sh. Biswas, "W(h)ither the Nation-state? National and State Identity in the Face of Fragmentation and Globalisation", *Global Society*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2000, p. 175-198.

[39] Extensive discussion about the crisis of the nation state was published in the special issue of *Political Studies*, Vol. 42, *Special Issues*, 1994, and in the collection of papers *The Contemporary Crisis of the Nation State*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1995, John Dunn Edition; op. cit., ps. 176-177.

[40] S. Avramov, *Trilateralna komisija*, "Idij", Veternik, 1998. p. 105.

Many authors think that post-modernism or new forms of economic and cultural globalization led to ethnic fragmentation all over the world. However, ethnic fragmentation is not a new phenomenon in modern world system, nor is it the only aspect of the new stage of post-modernism or current globalization.[41] The establishing of ethnic identity and appearance of ethnic conflicts are historical processes, incorporated in the logic and structure of world system from its beginning. History knows ideological projects such as racism, which have favoured certain ethnic groups or the whole nations over the others, which have led to political inequality, polarization, exclusiveness, discrimination and repression. The ultimate effect of such projects was ethnic differentiation, suffocation of rights and marginalization of ethnic minorities. Therefore, violation of rights of ethnic and minority groups is historical fact and not new (modern) appearance caused by processes such as globalization.

Today ethnic conflicts appear as a result of structural contradictories between the efforts to establish cultural hegemony and ethnic diversity in the world. The origin of nations and national homogenization are dialectic processes, which in the modern world system have led to structural differentiation of ethnic groups. Also, certain nations tend to establish domination over other nations or ethnic groups and this leads to mobilization of ethnic groups and their resistance to such tendencies. Fragmentation along ethnic lines today is the main cause of destruction of states. In the biggest states in transition (Russia, China and India) fragmentation caused flaring of armed conflicts (Chechnya, Cashmere), and these conflicts by inertia led to additional political problems between these states in transition and market democracies. Also, fragmentation offered new possibilities for the expansion of international organized crime and global terrorism.

There is much contradictoriness and incompleteness in the essence of fragmentation. While for some authors fragmentation is negative (disintegrating) process, which tends to reduce the range of globalization (integration, homogenization), for some other it is positive (integrating) process, which includes the sources of re-strengthening of national consciousness, ethnic identities and autochthonous cultural values, and strengthening of nation states accordingly. This is why post-modern epoch is characterized by two key contradictory processes: the first one implies centralization, integration, and finally globalization, while the second refers to decentralization, fragmentation and localization. The processes of globalization and fragmentation, however, must be observed through a prism of interactive influences they have on each other on various levels of gathering and shape the destiny of the contemporary world.

---

[41] W. A. Dunaway, "Ethnic Conflict in the Modern World-System: The Dialectics of Counter-Hegemonic Resistance in an Age of Transition", *Journal of World System Research*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 2003, p. 4-7.

Table 2: *Some sources of fragmegration at four levels of gathering*[42]

Levels of gathering / Sources of fragmentation	MICRO	MACRO	MICRO – MACRO	MACRO – MACRO
Microelectronic technologies	Enables to like-minded persons to be in contact all over the world.	Creates more open, more connected and more dependent people; gives them power to provide support.	Forces governments to make opposition groups competent for more successful mobilization.	Accelerates diplomatic processes; makes electronic surveillance and intelligence work easier.
Knowledge and skill revolution	Broadens horizons to people globally; makes them susceptible to the importance of far-away events; makes focusing on local environment easier.	Increases the capabilities of government agencies to think "beyond the box"; offers the chance to analyze challenges.	Forces police to succeed through increased capability of individuals, to find out when, where and how to join the collective action.	Increases quantity and improves quality of connections between states; strengthens their communities and friendships.
Organizational explosion	Makes multiplication of identities, sub-grouping, associating with transnational network easier.	Increases the competence of opposition groups to form and make pressure for change of politics; separates people from their elite.	Contributes to pluralism and decrease of authority; increases probability for authority crisis.	Makes global scene more transnational, which becomes denser around non-government actors.
Branching of global structures	Gives priority to conflicts and induces tensions between individuals; directs people towards local sphere and authority.	Makes creation of new spheres of authority easier and consolidates the existing spheres in the world with several centers.	Makes stronger transnational representation by the groups and interests for achievement of influences through various channels.	Creates institutional plans for cooperation on major global outstanding issues such as: commerce, human rights, etc.
Increase of mobility	Stimulates imagination and provides for more thorough contacts with foreign cultures; increases importance of outsiders.	Increases value and importance of sub-cultures, diasporas, and ethnic conflicts, since people aim at new chances abroad.	Increases trans-border migrations, which decrease the capability of governments to control national boundaries.	Increases the need for international cooperation in order to control flows of narcotics, money, immigrants and terrorists.
Weakening of territoriality, states and sovereignty	Weakens tradition and loyalty to the nation; increases distrust in government and other institutions.	Contributes to porosity of national boundaries and difficulties to make framework for one's own politics.	Decreases trust in governments; makes difficult the possibility to achieve and maintain national consensus.	Increases the need for inter-state cooperation on disputable global issues; decreases control over events.
Crisis of authority	Re-directs loyalty; encourages individuals to replace traditional criteria by legitimate criteria of action.	Weakens capabilities of government and other organizations to create political frameworks on their own.	Makes it easier for people to make pressure or paralyze their governments, WTO and other organizations.	Increases the capability of government and non-government organizations; encourages diplomatic cautiousness in negotiations.
Globalization of national economies	Increases the consumer's status; increases unique tastes; increases job anxiety; widens the gap between the winners and losers.	Complicates the tasks of state governments vs. markets; stimulates business associations.	Increases the efforts to protect local cultures and industries; makes is easier to express power in protests; polarizes communities.	Increases commercial and investment conflicts; offers initiatives for creation of global financial institutions.

---

[42]   Op. cit., p. 18-19.

The contemporary world, therefore, represents a complex "pulsing organism" squeezed between two ruling dynamics – globalization and fragmentation. In order to note multiple interactions between these two processes, James Rosenau introduces the term "fragmegration", by which he makes efforts to explain the complex connections between fragmentation and integration, i.e. globalization and localization. According to this author, fragmegration highlights all contradictoriness, ambiguity and uncertainty of the time ahead of us. Its main sources are microelectronic technologies, knowledge and skill revolution, organizational explosion, branching of global structures, increase of mobility, decrease of territoriality, states and sovereignty, the crisis of authority and globalization of national economies.[43]

When all the suggested sources of fragmentation are considered at various levels of gathering, a number of conclusions can be made. One of the important conclusions is that the nature of current world politics can hardly be researched successfully without taking into account all the ways in which ordinary people at the individual level may directly shape the course of certain events and changes within the world system. Also, the states and other macro-communities are still the main actors at global scene, and they are fast joined by a great number of other actors (non-government organizations and others).

On the other hand, Rosenau's term fragmegration implies also "interactive and causal links between globalized and localized forces that change the main structure of world relations."[44] It looks like a hypothetic analytical crossroads cut by globalization and fragmentation, integration and disintegration, interdependence and pluralism, influences of various levels of gathering where the effects of these processes may be evaluated considering the valuable orientation towards dynamics characterized by the mentioned forces. Rosenau includes the following activities into the globalization forces: the activities which stimulate the process of liberalization of world economy and uniting of world market of goods and capital in global proportions; the activities that create conditions for establishing and work of global economic and political institutions; the activities which provide for the higher level of interdependence by introduction of technological and telecommunication innovations; the activities which tend to homogenize nation states and initiate the process of creation of modern global society; the activities that tend to impose American and Western predominance and values, especially in culture, primarily by imposing English language as the language of communication on a global level. On the other hand, the forces of localization include

---

[43] J. N. Rosenau, "Globalization and Governance: Bleak Prospects for Sustainability", *IPG*, No. 3, 2003, p. 11-29; J. N. Rosenau, "Ominous Tensions in a Globalizing World", Conference on International Relations, Middle East Technological University, Ankara, Turkey, 2002

[44] J. N. Rosenau, "Distant Proximities: The Dynamics and Dialectics of Globalization", in: B. Hettne, ed., *International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder*, Zed Books, London, 2004.

the essential changes in behaviour of people throughout the world, especially outside "the Western civilization circle", due to the efforts to establish "Western hegemony", as well as due to irresponsible behaviour of Western powers towards the rest of the world; deepening of the gap between the rich and the poor in the world (global apartheid);[45] reduction of quality and quantity of resources due to global warming, reduction of tillable soil and general destruction of the environment; the appearance of mass migrations, aversion and prejudices regarding the attempts to impose new patterns of behaviour and "hybrid universal identity"; revival of ethnocentrism, ethnic and racial hatreds and return to traditional customs; the appearance of movements for preservation of cultural heritage, especially language; the appearance of new security threats such as global terrorism; flourishing of religious fundamentalism and nationalism.

Table 3: *The example of mutual dynamics of fragmegration*[46]

Globalization forces	Localization forces
Free trade	Changes of behaviour of individuals and nations
International corporations, international insurance companies, exchange of money.	Due to irresponsible undertakings of the USA and the West, the gap between the rich and the poor countries in the world deepens.
Global political and economic institutions (UN, World Bank, IMF, WTO)	Lack of resources caused by global warming, reduction of tillable soil and destruction of the environment. Mass migrations, prejudices, ethnocentrism, ethnic and racial hatreds.
English as a universal language	Movements for the preservation of cultural heritage based often on language and customs.
American military, economic and cultural strengthening	Annoyance by American hegemony, terrorism
Modernization, scientific and technological innovations in information and traffic	Traditionalism, religious fundamentalism, nationalism.

When we speak about fragmegration, we must take into account two ambivalent dynamics characterizing the international system at the end of 20th and at the beginning of 21st century. The first one refers to process – forces of global-

---

[45]   S. Avramov, op. cit., *Trilateralna komisija*, p. 80

[46]   J. N. Rosenau, *Distant Proximities*, Internet 14/07/2004, www.pupress.princeton.edu/chapters/s7529.pdf; J. N. Rosenau, "Distant Proximities: The Dynamics and Dialectics of Globalization", in: B. Hettne, ed., *International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder*, Zed Books, London, 1995, p. 46-65.

ization, whose influences may contribute to building of a new and safer world order, and at the same time, may cause many negative consequences for the stability of that order. Because of the positive effects of globalization, the order may stimulate people at all levels of gathering to accept new forms of agreement in order to solve disputable issues in a creative and peaceful manner, allowing to various groups to participate in the discussion and solving of these problems freely. Otherwise the order can lead to a standstill in negotiations and establishing of so-called tyrant hierarchy which prevents free participation of all subjects interested in solving certain outstanding issues. The second dynamics refers to fragmentation that can lead to interruption of connection between people at various levels of gathering and chaos, but also to strengthening of influence of individuals on world events and increase of pluralism, which is a prerequisite for various groups to achieve their goals.

Therefore, in order to understand the connections between order and fragmentation appropriately, it is important to know that both terms are full of various meanings, that "order for one person is a disorder for another, and that fragmentation for one person is connection to some other" (Rosenau). Both order and fragmentation, in other words, may be desirable and undesirable, depending on the perspective of evaluation.

Key dilemma today is whether globalization inspires long-term processes of reconciliation between those groups that are seemingly involved in hard-to-solve tensions, and whether liberalization and globalization may counteract the general chaos in the world and provide for more security for nations and communities, and finally for the stable order? In order to solve this dilemma, it is necessary to distinguish between order and fragmentation and societies on the one hand, as well as between desirable and undesirable conditions on the other hand, by studying the influence of the mentioned dynamics on several levels of gathering.

Order and fragmentation have always been integral characteristics of world events, but due to technological progress today they are interacting more than ever. The rate of global life inside states and among them has accelerated so much that there are great prospects to confirm that every strengthening of the order leads to increased fragmentation, and vice versa. In order to point out and note the degree of this interaction, the researchers introduce so-called fragmegration into analysis, by which they try to explain the manners in which the tensions between order and fragmentation are inseparably interrelated. They do this by offering the table which describes four various social conditions and political forms that may prevail when valuable order and fragmentation dimensions are taken into account.

Table 4: *Desirable and undesirable order and fragmentation*[47]

	ORDER	FRAGMENTATION
DESIRABLE	Centralized democracy	Decentralized pluralism
UNDESIRABLE	Tyranny	Chaos

This is why "order and fragmentation are too important to ignore dynamics marking the contemporary world," says Rosenau, since "some new transformations beyond these processes may not be expected in the future."[48] Complex interactions between globalization and fragmentation would sooner contribute to the picture of the world where there would be more islands with desirable order and fragmentation (peace zones), surrounded by oceans of undesirable tyranny and chaos (zones of riots), where there would not come to stronger influences between them and mutual violations – which is a kind of stalemate position that does not offer hope for considerable changes in any direction.

5. Instead of a conclusion

Based on all that was said previously, what could be concluded about the prospects of processes of globalization and fragmentation in the course of the third millennium?

The essential characteristic of globalization is that it marks an objective and regular process of connecting, permeating and uniting of the world in spite of its economic, political, cultural and even civilization diversity. It has its roots and development path and represents an unstoppable flow of contemporary history and civilization that started with the expansion of production and financial markets in the second half of 19th century. Uniting the world into a human community, humankind, is the result of technological and information revolution and compression of time and space distance caused by them (Pečujlić), as a result of creation of global market and powerful transnational economic and political organizations, as well as formation of awareness on interdependence i.e. unavoidable connection, penetration and uniting of the world.

Prevailing neo-liberal form of globalization today means the unavoidable conquering of space, or by means of ''imposing criteria, conditions and rule according to the standards of the only super-power left'' (Prvulović), or economic necessity and power of mega-capital that knows no boundaries. Its economic dimension is highly contradictory and uncertain since it is expressed as comparative economic progress and social regression, complete economic superiority and social inferiority. Dismantling of welfare state in the West (through

---

[47]   Op. cit.

[48]   Op. cit.

Regan-Thatcher privatization and deregulation) and destructions of any social state in the real-socialism countries according to the recipes of radical neo-liberals (such as Hayek), gave strength to virtual and corporative mega-capital to crash national and local barriers and create uniform rules of behaviour at a global level. The consequence of this is creation of world reservoir of cheap labour power and the lowest social provisions, i.e. widening of the gap between the ultra-rich and increasingly poorer both among and inside the states. Political dimension of globalization is manifested through the process of creation of global authoritarian "parallel state" which threatens with authoritarianism of new type, considering the possibility of military, humanitarian and anti-terrorist interventionism, instead of "open and democratic society" (K. Poper). In the sphere of culture, the annulment of authentic specific values of national cultures and efforts to create universal mono-cultural ("McDonaldizing") values does not lead towards peaceful but rather towards dangerous uniformity and conflict of civilizations which we witness all over the world, from Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo and Metohija, to the Near East.

On the other hand, the consequence of this, especially in the underdeveloped part of the world, is strengthening of consciousness to preserve traditional cultural authenticity, as autonomy of states or societal groups in solving some crucial issues, independent from supranational entities that act beyond national boundaries. In this way fragmentation stimulates the disintegration of already formed rules within the globalized international system of states under the auspices of the rich and powerful, as well as multiplying of sub-national identities inside nation states. This is why the future of the world and its security within neo-liberal globalization vision is highly uncertain, as well as within the vision that comes from dynamics of fragmentation and search for new identities and its possible consequences. Because of this, today in the third millennium, we must appreciate and not just take into account the warning experience of previous periods, primarily three world wars, two armed ones and one cold war, growing ethnic nationalism, international terrorism and conflicts on religious and even civilization basis. Therefore, today, as pointed out by F. Major, "the complete vision of the world that seeks new balance of power and influence can be based only on open and fruitful dialogue and full appreciation and respect of the dignity of others or, in other words, on appreciation of cultural specifics of every nation." This is why we must resist all spheres of man's personal and social alienation in every way and support appropriate expression of cultural identity, which does not mean imposition of process of mondialization since every imposing, even imposing of human rights, democracy and consumer society, represents a form of enslavement and non-freedom.

References

- Avramov, S.: *Trilateralna komisija*, Idij, Veternik, 1998.
- Biswas, Sh.: "W(h)ither the Nation-state? National and State Identity in the Face of Fragmentation and Globalisation", *Global Society*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 2000.
- Blas, V.: "Uticaj globalizacije na Istočnu Evropu", *Megatrend revija*, Vol. 2, Megatrend univerzitet primenjenih nauka, Beograd, 2005.
- Brown, Ch.: *Understanding International Relations*, 2. ed., St. Martins Press, New York, 2001.
- Bžežinski, Z.: *Američki izbor – globalna dominacija ili globalno vođstvo*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2004, CID, Podgorica, 2004.
- Bžežinski, Z.: *Velika šahovska tabla*, CID, Podgorica, 1999.
- Dal, R.: *Demokratija i njeni kritičari*, CID, Podgorica, 1999.
- Falk, R.: "World Prisms: The Future of Sovereign States and International Order", *Harvard International Review*, Summer 1999.
- Gidens, E.: *Sociologija*, Ekonomski fakultet, Beograd, 2003.
- Goše, M.: *Demokratija protiv same sebe*, "Filip Višnjić", Beograd, 2004.
- Haass, R. N.: "What to Do With American Primacy", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 78, No. 5, 1999.
- Hantington, S.: *Sukob civilizacija*, CID, Podgorica, 1998.
- Held, D.: *Demokratija i globalni poredak*, "Filip Višnjić", Beograd, 1997.
- Kegley, Ch. W. Jr. – Raymond, G. A.: *Exorcising the Ghost of Westphalia: Building World Order in the New Millennium*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2002.
- Kellner, D.: *Globalization and the Postmodern Turn*, http//www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses
- Keohane, R. O. – Nye, J. S. Jr.: *Power and Interdependence*, 3. ed., Longman, New York, 2001.
- Kiningam, F.: *Teorije demokratije*, "Filip Višnjić", Beograd, 2003.
- Koehane, R. O. – Nye, J. S. Jr.: "Power and Interdependence in the Information Age", *Foreign Affairs*, Vol 77, No. 5, 1998.
- Lajphard, A.: *Modeli demokratije*, CID, Podgorica, 2003.
- Marković, D. Ž.: *Sociologija i globalizacija*, Centar za usavršavanje rukovodilaca u obrazovanju, Beograd, 2000.
- Nye, J. S. Jr.: "Soft Power", *Foreign Policy*, No. 80, 1990.
- Nye, J. S. Jr.: *Understanding International Conflicts*, Longman, New York, 2002.
- Öniş, Z.: "Neoliberal Globalization and the Democracy Paradox: The Turkish General Elections of 1999", *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol 54, No. 1, 2000.

- Pahlavi, P. C.: "Cultural Globalisation and the Politics of Culture", *CEPES* (Centre D'etudes des Politiques Etrangeres et de Securite), Quebec, Canada, 2003.
- Pavićević, V.: *Aspekti globalizacije – sa pregledom osnovnih pojmova*, "Dosije", Beograd, 2003.
- Pečujlić, M.: *Globalizacija – dva lika sveta*, "Gutenbergova galaksija", Beograd, 2002.
- Pieterse, J. N.: "Globalization as Hybridization", Lechner, F. J. – Boli, J. eds., *The Globalization Reader*, Malden, Blackwell Publishers, Massachusetts, 2000.
- Pirages, D.: *Globalization: A Cautionary Note*; http//www.aaas.org/spp/yearbook/2000/
- Popov, Č.: *Novi svetski poredak – prethodnici istorijske epohe*, "Smisao", Beograd, 1999.
- Pravulović, V.: "Proces globalizacije – za i protiv", Zbornik radova, Megatrend univerzitet primenjenih nauka, Beograd, 2003.
- Rols, Dž.: *Teorija pravde*, CID, Podgorica, 1989.
- Rosenau, J. N.: "Distant Proximities: The Dynamics and Dialectics of Globalization", in: Hettne, B., ed., *International Political Economy: Understanding Global Disorder*, Zed Books, London, 2004.
- Rosenau, J. N.: "Globalization and Governance: Bleak Prospects for Sustainability", *IPG*, No. 3, 2003.
- Rosenau, J. N.: "Ominous Tensions in a Globalizing World", Conference on International Relations, Middle East Technological University, Ankara, Turkey, 2002.
- Sartori, Đ.: *Demokratija – šta je to?*, CID, Podgorica, 2001.
- Tomlinson, J.: "Cultural imperijalism", in: Lechner, F. J. – Boli, J., eds., *The Globalization Reader*, Malden, Blackwell Publishers, Massachusetts, 2000.
- Yergin, D.: "Globalization: the story of our new interconnected world", *Social Education*, Vol. 66, No. 2, 2002.