

Чинник глобалізму як головна перешкода на шляху до формування демократичної моделі світового політичного порядку

Означено труднощі на шляху до побудови глобального демократичного політичного порядку. Охарактеризовано і обґрунтовано глобалізм як одне з найбільш проблемних явищ сучасного світового розвитку. Подано розгорнутий огляд негативних практик/деструктивних впливів, обумовлених глобалізованою політичною кон'юнктурою. Наведено ключові положення стратегії системного реформування.

Ключові слова: глобалізм, демократія, система світового порядку, міжсуб'єктні відносини.

Globalism phenomenon as the main obstacle toward settlement of the democratic model of world political order

The author defines difficulties on the way toward formation of the global democratic political order; characterizes and treats globalism as the main problematic phenomenon of world's modern development; gives a wide prospect of negative practices/destructive influences, which are considered to be the consequences of globalized political climate; offers the key elements of systemic reformation's strategy.

Keywords: globalism, democracy, system of the world order, inter-subjects' relations.

In the XX century democracy in its various forms managed to approve her vitality, found the way out from plenty of crisis situations. The reality of the XXI century – revealed in deep social, economic, political, cultural, spiritual transformations – actualizes the imperatives of renewal of democratic system. The dynamics of these transformations put them in one boat with the dominant tendency of world modern development – globalization, which causes the foundation of new world political system and unfolds the perspectives of global society establishing. Fully pledged organization of the two formations demands the network of global administration which would be able to articulate common interests, to rise and to protect the system of universal values, to supply the common needs and to encounter the challenges. The features of global structures are obvious already; their contours could be seen on the basis of

space enlargement of international and supranational regulation, rising of global supranational institutions' authorities.

At the same time ability of the real-active shifts, which are being made first of all in the institutional sphere of inter-subjects' relations according to the motto of democratic model of world political order formation, is complicated by numerous challenges, which put the adoptive source of democracy to careful trial. They are the system challenges: specific problems of democratic system settlement, related to the absence of social-psychological and cultural premises, which would be able to assist the effective functioning of democracy in terms of new environment; as well as the challenges of internal, qualitative nature of democracy itself that rely on the strong cultural-historical fundament. Estimating the consequences of globalization processes in this spectrum we can claim that present reorganization of the world space, regulation of the interrelations, management of the world development are accomplished mostly in the interests of subjects of global governing. So, spreading of the global democratization processes, intensification of the world interconnects encourage theoretically constructing of the global social reality due to the democratic ideal. However, usage of manipulative technologies within the global processes, broad arsenal of various tools for political pressure displays a sharp problem with establishment of the democratic order of decision making on the global level. Globalization, from one point, becomes a promoter of global democracy construct, stimulates searching and unfolding of the democratic forms of global interrelations. Globalism, from the other point, supports the reverse forces, causing as the result emergence of the peculiar paradox, when "the democratic rhetoric hides antidemocratic content of political process"¹.

Consequently, the aim of this article is to outline the perspectives of final emergence of the democratic model of world political order through overwhelming of negative practices/destructive influences caused by injunctions of the globalism system; as well as to suggest the way of solving the actual problems in accordance with reorganization of world's political process due to the democratic ideal.

Let's note that most of the remarks dedicated to the analysis of versatile aspects of global democracy's mechanism constructing are predominantly critical on modern system of globalism, those practices and phenomena, which are produced by it. At the same time researchers do not usually put the full-stop after sharing with the critics, which logically follows from the comprehension of the diffusive processes of modern global reality and from realizing the essence of its political expression. After the description and the precise explanation of numerous problems, as a rule, they give deep and well elaborated recommendations, leading afterwards to the fine strategy of systemic reformation. Before articulating of its program theses we shall clarify the obstacles standing against the fully completeness of this process.

¹ Шепелев М.А. Проблеми і перспективи глобальної демократії / М. А. Шепелев // Матер. IV Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. „Розвиток демократії та демократична освіта в Україні” (Львів, 20-22 трав. 2005 р.). – Львів, 2005. – С.35

Among the main problems, which threaten democracy on both international and internal-political levels, are: narrowing of the sphere of sovereign power of state democratic institutions, contradictions between the system of international law, national interests and human rights, and also the “growing autonomy of politics”. As D. Korobka argues appropriately, in the third millennium all the main parameters of global intersubjects’ relations are being changed dramatically, as well as the settings of international security: “previously they were defined by the military balances, the level of conflict potential, the threat of the world war; today on the fore ground steps the fight against untraditional dangers – international terrorism, transnational criminality, illegal migration, informational diversions”². In terms of individualization that is getting strengthened postmodern society faces the problem of disagreement between the system of international law, based on the state concept of national interests, and the human rights, which became the symbolic capital of the democratic theatre of world politics (the first fiddle in its orchestra belongs to the USA and to a number of Western democracies). The specificity of this situation is characterized by the fact that the right of a state on sovereignty contradicts the right of the citizens on freedom. This contradiction appears clearly when using of international military forces or economic sanctions is necessary for defense of citizens of the state, their rights and freedoms from authoritative (undemocratic) government. Military campaigns in Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya, Syria – are the examples of parallel asserting of human rights and of limitation of state’s right on sovereignty.

Until quite recently it was considered that only West predominantly, if not exclusively, abused of appealing to its traditional symbolic capital – declaration of human rights, democratic rules and freedoms – for putting of itself on the first place in geopolitical structure of mastership. Therefore many experts emphasized too exaggerated that the democratic rhetoric, international law’s priorities, holding of humanitarian interventions – regardless of any ideological or ideal excuses – are merely West’s intentions to inculcate in other countries his values and models of social-political conduct. However, today we can observe some other external-political subjects to pass the same rout in trying to confirm their influence on global political arena; they just mask their tricks and methods under the other conceptual prerogative. The prominent example of this is protection of the “life’s space” of “Russian world”: defense of national minorities’ rights, representatives of ethnic (and not only) Russian speaking communities, residing out of the territory of Russian Federation. Comparing of the two polar concepts – of global democracy and of the “great Russia” – gives no favor to the last one.

Nevertheless, in each case, the level of legitimacy of the supranational governing structures, which represent world modern political order, remains too low; applying of their force potentialities is quite uneven – they are too eager to intervene into the internal affairs of some national states and to the contrary fail to mention the refractory activity of the others. Thus,

² Коробка Д.С. Символизация международных отношений. Бренд США на мировой арене: Pro et Contra / Д.С. Коробка // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. – Серия: Политология. – 2008. – №5. – С. – С.74

the crisis of sovereignty is coming – because of the external dependence governments aren't able to deal with the internal problems effectively. In the end the factual system of global democracy meets serious hurdles.

Concerning the internal national level many researchers argue frankly that climate of globalization creates the conditions when the governing groups become unable to implement the principles of democratic policy; under these conditions the leading elite must behave according to the strict models of conduct; it has to accept decisions due to the “narrow corridor of choices”. Sometimes a part of elite tends voluntarily to appreciate such limitations. It occurs then that elite's traditional estrangement from the interests of common citizens, accompanied by the desire to restrict their participation in political process and to cut the area of public politics, is being revised in the globalized world: an elite loses integrity of its mentality, gets divided into nationally oriented part and the cosmopolitan part; is not guided any more only by its certain egoistic corporative interests, but becomes responsible for the new national interests. Cosmopolitan sector under these circumstances pursues the policy appropriate to the injunctions of globalization – treats it as the only possible way of providing the social progress and supplying of the public needs, as well as denies the importance of existence of a national state in the modern world. Opposition to this policy is considered as a sign of narrow-mindedness or of provincial manner to be behind the times.

According to S. Huntington, S. Bauman, K. Lash, the emergence of this new global elite was provoked by arising of the highly integrated global economics. It consists from the upper functionaries of numerous international organizations, managers of transnational corporations and of high technologies enterprises' controllers. Besides it includes a large number of the establishment of the developed countries. “Those who bear transnationalism' identity, – S. Huntington argues, – are quite careless to the national loyalty; they look at the national borders as at the obstacles which are disappearing luckily. The national governments are treated by them as the relics of past; the only efficient function of theirs is assisting to the successful global activity of elites”³. As the result the positive correlation between the citizens' expectations for changes in the internal and the external policies and the manner of government's conduct is getting reduced rapidly.

These tendencies which are present in social-political life of many democratic countries obviously give the strong reason to ascertain the progressive loss by the modern democracy of its representative origin. Despite the remaining practice of the rotation of political leaders due to the democratic procedure of free elections, the “representativeness” of these democracies is simplified to formalism – concerning a lot of issues political leaders take the decisions which go against the wishes of a big part of public. In the other words, a deep cleavage appears between the public requirements and the real policy's implementation. Such situation is outlined

³ Хантингтон С. Кто мы?: Вызовы американской национальной идентичности / Самюэль Хантингтон; Пер. с англ. А. Башкирова. — М.: ООО «Издательство АСТ»: ООО «Транзиткнига», 2004. — С.507

by the notion of “growing autonomy of politics” (or “deficit of democracy”). It reveals in the gradual reducing of the trust in official power, its institutions, in particular in political parties; the last point of it is the parliamentary crisis. In the consequence citizens’ participation in the political process is getting lower and lower; their political alienation could get converted into alternative, radical, even extremist forms of public-political activity. Undoubtedly, it pushes the changes of qualitative significance within the functioning of democratic systems, as well as testifies against the possibility of F. Fukuyama’s thesis about the “final triumph of western model of liberal democracy over the other forms of political organization” to come into true. Consequently, the split in the society appears; a struggle or a concurrence between the liberal democracy and the alternative ideology, which is called also the “transnational progressivism”, is getting more and more sharpen⁴. Representatives of this ideology adhere to an idea that liberal-democratic model of a national state’s governing is not relevant any more to the needs of the modern world; that globalization demands the updated form of transnational “global governing”.

Thus, the *raison d’être* of democracy itself, as well as its reorganization, is still indefinite. R. Darendorf supposes that today searching of the new institutional forms of the conflict of interests’ reveal is occurring, so long as representative democracy is not any more such an evident idea as it used to be. However forming of the new model is a matter of the future perspective. Some other researchers assume this tendency as the one which is being fulfilled at the moment. They offer using of term “leader’s democracy” instead of term “representative democracy”, as far as the distinction lies in a fact that character of the political process is defined not so much by the electoral preferences, as by “striving and ambitions of the politicians”⁵.

The British sociologist C. Crouch, who devised the concept of “post-democracy”, obtained many followers. For instance, American researcher R. Rorty examines the main features of passing of the western societies’ political systems to the post-democratic stage. Among them is growing weakness of the organized social forces, what makes it impossible to counteract the risen concentration of power in hands of political elites and of transnational corporations’ representatives, which become more and more professional. One could find here the hint of “growing autonomy of politics”, from one hand, and realize the problematic perspective of treating of the representative democracy, from the other. The issue of “growing autonomy of politics” makes a large amount of citizens feel no anxiety over the decisions taking process, which is provided absolutely freely by elites; nevertheless those decisions are still decisive for broad social daily life. Somehow it means the formation of the new type of political culture in democratic societies, which leans upon the silent agreement of the most of population with

⁴ Fonte J. Liberal Democracy vs. Transnational Progressivism: The Future of the Ideological War within the West / John Fonte. [Electronic source] – Access regime: file:///C:/Users/Svyatoslav/Pictures/Fonte%20].%20Lival%20democracy%20vs%20...pdf

⁵ Мак-Грю Е. Транснаціональна демократія: теорія і перспективи / Ентоні Мак-Грю // Демократія: Антологія. Упорядник О. Проценко / Інститут європейських досліджень. «Смолоскит». – К. – 2005. – С. 1025-1050

covering of the decisions taking process, with its becoming private, and upon the readiness to refuse voluntarily from one's rights and freedoms.

Globalization's negative influence upon the democracy's general position is recognized by researchers in many countries. Ukrainian political scientist M. Shepieliev stands that global technologies serve the interests of subjects of the global rule. The problem of correlation between democracy and this new reality runs into difficulties, on his mind, with unfolding of the democratic model of decision making within the global scale; it is highly problematic to guarantee legitimacy of the supranational mechanism of force application and of intervention into the internal affairs of sovereign states, which become usual under globalization's conditions⁶. As the researcher suggests, sovereignty's crisis shortens state's ability to form and to provide on its territory those policy which is effective for social rule and for solving of the internal problems.

By acknowledgement of incompatibility of the globalized economics' tendencies with liberal-democratic principal of "self-government" in the national state M. Plattner shares the idea: "with intention to vanish all the borders and to transfer the center of decision making from national to transnational level globalization threatens not only to the authoritarian regimes, but to the democratic as well". Moreover "globalization at its final stage is hostile to every self-government per se; thus the world without borders can hardly become democratic"⁷.

Therefore, we can conclude that it has been approved and proven by international academic community that the reality of contemporary global democracy consists in the growing dependance of democratic governments upon undemocratic international systems. Over the past two decades academic studies have corroborated the statement that in the conditions of globalization the existing capacities of influence upon the realpolitik and the decision making process determine the citizens' estrangement from traditional institutes of global democracy. The objective decrease of national political systems' capacity to act in accordance with their citizens' demands intensifies their long-growing dissatisfactions about the "closeness" of political power and the lack of feedback. Therefore, it becomes an additional source of their dissatisfaction about modern democracy. That's why we deal with a certain paradox: social transformations in many countries of the world cause, on one hand, the unprecedented expansion of political democracy, along with the establishment of its values in social consciousness worldwide. Thus they change the world, inspired by "the democratic aura". On the other hand, more and more apparent becomes the lack of efficiency of contemporary democratic institutes, and more and more people feel distrustful about them. It has been determined by problems of both exogenous and endogenous nature. These tendencies are reflected in the

⁶ Шепелев М.А. Проблеми і перспективи глобальної демократії / Максиміліан Шепелев // Матер. IV Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. „Розвиток демократії та демократична освіта в Україні” (Львів, 20-22 трав. 2005 р.). – Л. – 2005. – С.37

⁷ Платтнер М. Ф. Глобалізація і самоврядування / Марк Ф. Платтнер // *Демократія: Антологія. Упорядник О. Проценко / Інститут європейських досліджень. «Смолоскип».* – К. – 2005. – С. 1051-1063

works of foreign and Ukrainian scholars, as well as in various analytical reports of international organizations and rating agencies. In his endeavor to trace out the roots of this paradox M. Shepelev develops the following statement: the main symptom of the crisis nature of contemporary democracy consists in the total estrangement of society from conceptual power. The problem of the true democratic government consists not so much in the manners of voting or other attributes of formal democracy, but, in the first place, in the construction of such social order, which would allow its every member to access the complete systematic knowledge, or the summit of conceptual power, which is the starting and final point of the contours of government in every society. It is specifically necessary to implement it at global level.⁸

Nevertheless, despite its apparent destructive influence, brought into focus by a term “globalism”, the globalization remains an important tool in the establishment of global democracy, since in its political and administrative dimensions it belongs to key tendencies of the development of modern world. The aforesaid prompts us to make the following conclusion: the process of global transformations along with recent world-wide challenges stimulate the active process of reflection upon the essence of global democracy and the ways of its dissemination through the channels of intersubjective communication among subjects of global space, with regard to their cultural and evaluative specificity. This, in turn, makes of urgent necessity the study of the ways of reflection of global democracy and the mechanisms of its institutional transformation in the dimension of contemporary global changes on the basis of methodological principles of post-nonclassical science, which reflect the new sociocultural reality of postmodernity.

Despite the obstacles, connected to the mentioned issues, we are sure that the strategy of political reformation can be successfully implemented. The route lies across the introduction of democratic legitimacy to global political life. The authors of cosmopolitical models of global democracy elaborated powerful normative resources, which elevated the democratic construction to the heights of ideal theory. Besides this, a number of scholars offer practical institutional models, by means of which they supplement the general construction of global democracy with a package of recommendations that are ready at hand for immediate implementation. While not being obsessed by revolutionary ambitions to change the pluralistic power structure and, instead, being aware of the impossibility to quickly reach the restructuring of the global machinery of public power, they keep their faith in the effectiveness of reformatory initiatives, which approximate step by step the realization of the project of global democracy.

The perspectives of global democracy are linked, in the first place, to the transition from the system of world order, in which the more or less decisive influence is exerted by democratic countries, to the fully pledged democratic model of global political order. Large amount of

⁸ Шепелев М.А. Проблеми і перспективи глобальної демократії / Максиміліан Шепелев // Матер. IV Міжнар. наук.-практ. конф. „Розвиток демократії та демократична освіта в Україні” (Львів, 20-22 трав. 2005 р.). – Л. – 2005. – С.37-39

work has already been done in this direction; however this work still has to be extended. It includes the three phases:

1. Reconsidering of their foreign policy by some subjects.
2. Reformation of the institutional structure, including the network of current international organization.
3. Improvement of the effectivity of international judicial system.

The fundamental point of the first phase, according to D. Archibuti, is the reappraisal of their foreign policy priorities by democratic countries. First and foremost they must learn to build dialogical interactions with other countries, especially those which are developing, and those, who just try to take the path of active development, even if they would have to sacrifice some of their short-term interests. The consolidation of the developed democracy around this issue is the crucial condition of consolidated international community⁹. The establishment of a dialog with non-democratic political regimes is the other extremely important aspect. In the internal matrix of authoritarian states lies the fundamental inability for the reproduction of the principle of dialogical interaction in their foreign and domestic policy, since their very nature inclines them to coerce, to subdue, and erase the otherness, i. e. to realize the dialectics, embodied in the relationships "Me-It." That's why, the only solution to this problem is democratization of these regimes. The non-violent, democratic, purposeful and beneficially tuned pressure on the part of democratic countries would facilitate the qualitative transformation in such political regimes. The situation becomes further complicated, when non-democratic political regimes are mixed with democracies in the framework of cooperation and they become economically interdependent that precludes the possibility of direct pressure. Nevertheless, the unanimity of democracies in fundamental issues, the realization of common informational line against the aggressor, its forcing out beyond the scope of communications can put an end to the imperialistic expansion.

At the second stage, it seems necessary to set out the more efficient institutes of global regulation, which would expand the direct representation of citizens and would not serve as platform for discussions between authorized representatives of the national governments. The long-term program of global democracy anticipates a gradual reformation of the UN along with other international organizations, as well as the deployment of a network of new such organizations and their empowerment with a wider spectrum of executable functions in order to enhance their political independence and endow them with real political subjectivity.

At the third state it is very important to change the core of the international principle of the supremacy of law, further complete the mechanism of accountability and responsibility, in order to make the countries feel losses if they fail to comply with international law. Especially it is important to concentrate at the improvement of the system of criminal justice and

⁹ Archibugi D. The Hope for a Global Democracy / Daniele Archibugi et al. // Global Democracy: A Symposium on a New Political Hope. – New Political Science, Volume 32, Number 1, 2010. – P. 87

encourage as many countries as possible to accept the jurisdiction of, for instance, the international criminal court. It is necessary to fully systematize its activity in order to make it an effective tool of protection of the weak against the strong and the strongest. The latest events at the international stage, including Russian aggression against Ukraine, actualize the necessity of radical transformation of mechanism of solution of international controversies. The current system is under stagnation and demonstrates virtually zero efficacy. The decisive role belongs to the advantage in the ad hoc relationship “law-force”. All attempts to solve major international conflicts, which involved military confrontation, in legal framework failed due to the subjects’ reluctance to recognize the competence of international court and legitimacy of its legal acts. The extension of the principle of supremacy of law, which becomes a creative core of global democracy, depends on the assignment of coercive force to the system of international legal proceedings, which will make the courts function literally as tribunals.

In the context of construction of global democracy the space of subjectivity essentially expands, since the channels of communication change. Also grows the role of democratic deliberation. It isn’t necessary for deliberative communities to be situated in the same territory. Instead, the unifying democratic mechanisms are needed in order to make diverse groups feel as one. The territorial and national identity is changed for global. The effectivity of deliberative communication has been proven by transnational social movements. Such communities, as well as organization that represent them, become the full bearers of legitimate subjectivity. The states are still key representatives of their societies’ beliefs, as well as they continue to be the creators of the constructs of internal identification, however in these activities they become increasingly supplemented by other subjects. The need in alternative perpetrators of foreign-policy commissions, which would wield the sufficient amount of competence, becomes more and more pressing.

The key to the global democracy lies in creation of the alternative to national structures of political representation. Following this direction, D. Archibugi, for instance, suggests the idea of World Parliamentary Council as the perfect institutional model that could integrate politically people from all over the world, give them deliberative authorities to solve the problems of global significance¹⁰. Certainly it will be difficult to enrich such an institute with factual power and to set the logistics of implementation of its decisions. However, this institute will ideally serve as a forum for public opinion’s articulation and as a constructor of common global identity. It can also take care of asocial groups – minorities, refugees, immigrants, those who have no citizenship – to represent their interests, as far as no one does it appropriately today.

So, creating of the global democracy opens the infinite horizon for creative thinking. Intellectual expertise usually supports the innovative fulfillment of the concept. Let’s emphasize that foundation of global democracy is not just a work of certain subjects. The progress in the

¹⁰ Archibugi D. The Hope for a Global Democracy / Daniele Archibugi et al. // Global Democracy: A Symposium on a New Political Hope. – New Political Science, Volume 32, Number 1, 2010. – P. 88-90

intention to materialize the idea calls for the largest company to put together their efforts in forming the harmonic polyphonic ensemble. Conditions are up to it as never before.