

Globalization: A short study Conference at the *Eurasian Market Institute*ⁱ

Dr. A. HOODASHTIAN

Director of the Center for Research and Development, KIMEP

Professor of Political Science and Philosophy

Abstract

What is Globalization? When and how did it begin? And what are the main consequences of such a global movement? Should it be considered as a mere economic movement and, if not, what are the other aspects that should be taken into consideration? These are the main questions that were discussed in my Conference organized for the second and third year students of 'Eurasian Market Institute', International Economic Relations Department, Almaty, January 2001.

This paper seeks to introduce some theoretical and practical concepts, in order to understand the real function of the world system and the movement of Globalization. After a general description of Globalization in the first two parts, the last parts of this paper will look into some ideas concerning the consequences of this world movement. The international economic movement, which is termed Globalization, is Westernization! At this point, the final parts of this study will focus on the problem of the confrontation of Eastern/traditional and Western/modern cultural values and the possibility for the creation of the 'Métissage of values' between the continental cultural spaces. It will also question the two different political interpretations of Globalization; one related to Francis Fukuyama's work which describes Globalization mostly as 'Homogenization' of different parts of the world in which countries become closer to each other. The other belongs to Samuel Huntington, which emphasizes the idea that Globalization creates a very 'Heterogeneous' cultural and political world system.

Overview

The study of Globalization is remarkably complex. Different schools of thought have analyzed Globalization through application of various disciplines. I will try to give a short description of Globalization in the most comprehensive way.

From an Economic point of view, Globalization has to do with the 'opening up of the frontiers', and the tendency called "*deregulation*", which started in the Western world between 1980 and 1988 and is considered to mean the domination of one economic model, the *free market economy*. The economic performance of South-East Asian countries is another aspect of this approach. From a political point of view, Globalization took off in parallel with the collapse of communism and the end of the Cold War era.

Besides these two, there are other aspects and other approaches of Globalization. For each of these approaches there are a significant number of studies which have been carried out by western scholars and different schools of thought. My approach will focus on 'global studies'. This short presentation, which is prepared for the second and third year students of '*Eurasian Market Institute*', will first consider two aspects of the issues of Globalization namely:

historical and economical. While it can be argued that Globalization has some cultural and political consequences, it is important to mention that Globalization has tremendously accelerated the contact and interactivity between the East and the West. This fact of course, has at the same time evoked some other issues related to the confrontation of traditional and modern cultural values, and consequently the emergence of a new global concept described as combination or 'Métissage of Values'. This will be analyzed in the last parts of this study.

I. Historical approach

In order to better understand Globalization, one should first examine it as an historical period. Why is Globalization an historical phase? Because it evolved hand in hand with the collapse of communism and the end of the Cold War era - both of which were political events that created a new phase in the history of the twentieth century. From my point of view, the rise of Globalization, as world economic movement takes its root from this world political change, a sure precondition for world wide development.

The study of the history of the twentieth century reveals four major events: First, the Russian Revolution (1917), second, World War I, third, World War II, and fourth one is the fall of communism¹¹. For the purpose of this study, the most important will be the last two. As we all know, after the Second World War, the world was divided into Eastern and Western blocks, with two main headquarters (the United States and the Soviet Union which in fact, were the main actors of this period). This major division triggered the beginning of the Cold War. Therefore in order to understand how Globalization is related to this parallel movement, we need to describe the Cold War, the confrontation between the two blocks based on the following three preconceptions:

Ideology

During the Cold War era each block had its own ideology, distinctly different from that of the other, and based on a specific Philosophy of History: *communism* and *liberalism/capitalism*. Obviously, the interpretation of History is presented as one of the aspects of these ideologies. The ideologue of Communism understood History as the evolution of Stages. It is based on the Philosophy of the "Historical Determinism" with a very clear final stage which will, according to their interpretation, inevitably lead to *Communism*.

Consequently, the definition of "time" is specific here. There is the past, the present and the future; there is a "timetable" for History in which, finally *future* becomes the most determinant. In this perception of time, everything seemed programmable and human action is fixed in relation with the future where Communism is the ultimate goal. The time of this last stage was to be the last fate of all History of humanity. This idealism coupled with the idea of the last stage presented as one of the interpretations of History, influenced by the Hegelian philosophical theory (accomplished by Marx), became the most important characteristics of the ideology of the eastern block for more than half century.

Liberalism on the other hand understands history differently. There is no "great future" which should come about one day, in which there may be a question of long-term plan for justifying the present, or for directing human activities. In fact, in this conception of history, following the division of time into the past, the present and the future, the *present* becomes the most determinant for liberalism. Consequently, things are constructed to be used and the products

are made to be consumed, a reality that created what is called ‘*The Consumer Society*’ (Baudrillard, 1986). This pragmatism gives to liberalism the ambition of using time for time, not for some other illusive objectives in an unknown future.

Politics

After the World War II, each block reinforced its own political structures. The communist block was a ‘one-party system’ with Communist party dominating both State and society. We did not observe, during the Cold War, any serious efforts toward real open political pluralism in the Soviet Union, even in China, Albania or Yugoslavia.

In the Western world political system is based on pluralism of ideas. We had have at least two different political structures in this pluralism: ‘the two-party system’, e.g. United States, and ‘the multi-party system’, e.g. Europe, mostly France, Germany and Italy. Both of these systems have been, and are considered democratic systems.

Socially speaking, Communism applied a kind of Collectivity concept of interpersonal relations, while Liberalism is historically based on Individualism. For Communism, the collectivity or the community takes priority over individual, and its interests; for liberalism, individual has priority over collectivity. Here the idea of individualism fits in perfectly with the philosophy of a free market economy.

The nature of Capitalism and the movement of Globalization during the last twenty years, has forced most of the Socialist parties in the West and in other countries to accept and apply the key characteristics of Liberalism.

Economy

During the Cold War there were two main directions of the economy. The first was based on ‘State economy’. The Communist system considered the State as the only proprietor and actor in the market. No individualism, neither at the social nor the market level was accepted thus economic competition was considered the first enemy of the society. Following this logic, almost all attempts to introduce the notion of private ownership were radically suppressed.

On the other side, in the western world, at least two interpretations of the capitalism, socialism and liberalism, dominate. The U.S. applies liberalism if not neo-conservatism knowing that liberalism is understood differently in most part of Europe, from its application in the United States. In most part of Europe, except in the UK, Europeans preferred socialism for the society and liberalism/capitalism for the market! Market, for the majority of Europeans should be run with some State Control. Britain however has always been considered the main European pioneer of liberalism if not certainly neo-conservatism, promoting the free market economy.

* * *

The end of the Cold War is synonymous with the end of the philosophy of two opposing blocks and this is an historical evolution. We no longer see any *major* ideological, political, or economic confrontation in the world, between major countries and between the economic blocks. There is no more ideological division or ‘Block Conflict’ in the world as we could notice during the Cold World.

Nevertheless, the world still has some difficulties such as geopolitical fragmentation, the rise of various political dictators and finally the development of fundamentalism. This will be discussed in the later part of this work.

II. Economic Approach

After the end of the Cold War, Globalization gave a new structure to the world. One would ask about the new universal formation and its main direction. I would like to divide the discussion of this trend into the following parts.

Deregulation

Where does Globalization begin from? Generally speaking, Globalization is related to the 'opening up of the frontiers', the movement called "*deregulation*", which started with relaxation of governmental controls of the market activities. The Reagan administration was the first promoter of deregulation in the United States from 1980 to 1988. During Reagan's two terms in the office, the airline sector of the economy was deregulated, a measure that solved major air transport problems, by allowing the airlines to determine the fares for their services on the basis of competition independent of government sanctioning. Indeed, this tendency began under the Presidency of Jimmy Carter when telecommunications network were partially deregulated creating competition for long distance telephone services in the United States (Cooper, ...1988). Basically, deregulation should be regarded as a very British-American practice. American reforms received an active support from the British Prime-Minister - Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. Shortly after the Canadian conservatives conformed to the deregulation. Privatization gained a momentum, and western countries gradually reduced the State interference with the market. Other countries in the East, Latin America, and Africa, followed this progressive initiative, trying to adopt similar economic systems thus boosting a new competition in the world (Wackerman, 1995).

Relieved of the government control, American and European companies rushed to the Eastern markets in droves. Consequently, the main/or first direction of the movement of Globalization was *from the West to the East*. Soon one could observe a high acceleration of western businesses in eastern economies. For many of the eastern States, with the exception of Japan, it is the first time they will become so actively involved in international businesses.

At the end of the 1990's the top three hundred companies in the World were western. Moreover, $\frac{1}{4}$ of all production resources in the world come from the West. European companies like Phillips became active in 45 countries. Nestle became a Global companyⁱⁱⁱ, having headquarters all over the world. By 1997 Macdonald's, which was created in 1955, had built 22,000 restaurants in more than 100 countries, serving more than 40,000,000 clients per day (The Economist, 1999).

Free Market Economy

Globalization however, can be regarded to mean the domination of one economic model – 'the free market economy'. But, many people still believe that free market system is the only model of capitalism. Far from this, from the very beginning of the emergence of capitalism, the European capitalists have held different perceptions on the concept of liberty, Civil

Society, State, and market. Liberalism is one of these. It was only when the Cold War ended that liberalism and free market economy became the dominating factors in the West and in the rest of the world.

But what exactly is free market economy? There is a need to understand the concepts and consequently the definition of the free market economy which surpasses the economic sphere. To define the concept, the free market economy can be better explained by using three main parameters. (The following explanations should not be considered as the only way to describe the free market economy):

a- *Individualism* which is not an only economic concept, but a very deep social and political one. Individualism involves giving all/first values to Individuals. It is a political and social concept, in which individual and his interests are above those of the collectivity. A lot of non-western societies which are trying to adopt the free market economy have very little understanding of this basic concept of liberalism. Many of them fail to comprehend that the free market economy is not necessarily the "War of All Against All" as ascertained Hobbes, a British political philosopher of 17th Century society (as cited in Enoch, 1993). In fact, the free market economy is based on a moral principle, in which an individual is accepted with mutual respect. Scholars do agree that the most referred theoretician on such legal society and its moral principles has always been Emmanuel Kant, the most important German philosopher of 18th Century (Kant, 1956). Therefore, the first and original model of a real free market economy is applicable only to a society with high cultural values and thus, it is related not only to the level of economic production, but specially to the level of political and cultural maturity of that society as well.

b- *Competition*. Competition should not create a jungle-like environment, but follow a rule, in which the needs of both the rich and the poor are mutually respected. In a society with high cultural level, law and constitution should protect the rule of competition and the competitors. No real competition will be possible without the application of a mutual individual respect and the legal support of inferior groups. This is the first fundamental concept of a real Civil Society.

c- Although competition is supported by a mutual individual respect, the philosophy of the free market economy, as liberalism stipulates, is based on the idea that the market and its interests come first and the law of demand and supply as its driving force. A situation whereby society's behavior and industrial outputs follow the market principle. Intellectual schools and economists are still debating on this third aspect of the free market economy. In Europe, the crucial discussion turns around the appropriate level of the State intervention in the market and the interrelation between the State law and the market interests. After the end of the Communism, many among the communist and socialist supporters, specially in Germany and in France, have joined liberalism and by so doing launched debates concerning the way in which a State might operate and assure social protection in the competition that market imposes on the civil society. Some of them suggest that the free market economy should not be restricted to material needs only, but that priority should always be given to the society. Therefore a certain degree of State regulation of the market will certainly be necessary. We will come back to this point.

Consequently, Competition is directly related to individualism. Competition would be

possible when individual as a social unity, and the individual sectors of the market, are respected by the rule of the society..

III. World Economic System and its main characteristics

Numerous western analysts have noted that the world economy functions as ‘One Unique System’. The origin of this idea comes from the great French historian and economist Fernand Braudel (1985). He launched his theory in the 1970’s, which seems to be mostly related to the so-called period of “Internationalization” in the world economic evolution (Schwald, 1995, p. 42). Immanuel Wallerstein^{iv} in the United States has been working on this theory which is based on the idea of Capitalism functioning as one *whole system* with one *World Center*.

Following Braudel’s theory, at least in 1970’s, one can say that the World Economic Center is the United States, particularly with the city of New York considered to be the heart of all major economic activities in the world. Consequently, we understand that the World System is highly hierarchical. Today, many things have been changed. A new theory of world economy is needed to be established, capable to explain the characteristics of the current world system. In the phase of Globalization, the World Economic System has a new formation. Some of its suggested characteristics are elucidated below.

Three economic blocks

Observers have noticed that in the phase of Globalization, the World Economic System is based on the emergence of three different economic blocks in three regions of the planet: Europe, America and South-East Asia. That is called the ‘*three-polar core*’ or the ‘*Tripolarity*’ (Cordellier, 1997; Lafay, 1996; Defardges, 1993). In each of these regions, many economic Associations are active, but only one between them coordinates or dominates the activities of the whole block. These regional/continental associations, in competition with each other, are the European Union, NAFTA in America and ASEAN in the South-East Asia. Each of these regions is organized based on geographical proximity with some inherent cultural affinity on a closer observation (Hoodashtian, 2001a).

Following the emergence of the Tripolarity and the formation of the world major economic groups, the fate of the so called world economic Center is now uncertain. Two hypotheses have been launched at this stage:

a- The first one underlines the idea that the USA continues to remain the world central economic power, because all other structures are following more or less an American model; and also because of its internal economic health and also because American companies are actively involved in the global economy, controlling a big part of the world economic outputs. (Laïdi, 1994). But, in recent times however, there are many new theories from the American scholars envisaging the ‘Decline of the USA’ dominance (Kennedy, 1989, pp. 570-587).

b- The second hypothesis stresses the idea that, because of the emergence of the Tripolarity, we do not have a specific World Center with the characteristics prescribed by Braudel. According to this hypothesis, the world in the time of Globalization is in a *transitional* period. The present Center seems to be vulnerable to transition to a yet

unknown geographic new destination. This could be eventually the East or the South East of Asia, which is currently in strict competition with the United States (Hoodashtian, 2001b).

Difficulties for the World Economic System

In the time of Globalization, there are no more essential ideological or political conflicts between the most active western and eastern countries and the Tripolarity does not create any political oppositions between the blocks. In fact, even the concepts of the West and the East do not have that geopolitical identification implemented in the period of the Cold War. However, there are still some inherent problems here.

Three difficulties have appeared since the end of the Cold War:

1) The geopolitical fragmentation which besieged some 'marginal' countries like Yugoslavia. However, nationalism, the origin of such fragmentation, does not pose any real and fundamental ideological opposition to liberalism and/or the general politics of the West. Almost all of these new independent countries are applying the free market economy.

2) The emergence of some political dictators as in Iraq, coming up in direct confrontation with the West. Yet this isolated country, in War against the majority of the western powers, has not been able to organize any real mobilization in the non-western countries. Moreover, Iraq has been unable to establish an anti- Occidental political block, because there is lack of any specific political program or substantial economic capacity, capable to challenge the West and to create a real anti-western block.

3) But the most important political and ideological antagonist to be noticed since the end of the Cold War was the emergence of Islamic fundamentalism, starting with the Iranian revolution in 1979. The focal point and ideology of this revolution was to set and mobilize any countries against the West, capitalism and its universal development. In fact, the Easter Block did not support this revolution, which was realized in the period of the Cold War, wholly. We noticed the first stages of an event that nearly took shape beyond the two blocks *before* the end of the Cold War. Fundamentalism, does represent a *minor* problem in the world economical and political arena, in comparison with the whole problems of the World System enhanced by Globalization movement. Why? Because, Fundamentalism in over 20 years of its existence, could not influence or disturb the main objectives of the Global movement of capitalism and its rush from the West to the East. Basically fundamentalism cannot effectively impede the movement of Globalization, for the simple fact that Islam, from the beginning, did not have (and basically does not have) any *real economic program* which could be presented as an *alternative* to capitalism. And the so-called "Islamic Economy" (Banisadr^v, 1982), launched by some Iranian activists and theoreticians, seemed not to be viable practically even in Iran during the height of Islamic State.

As mentioned, none of these three fronts against the West was able to create a real 'block conflict' and divide the world into two parts, as we noticed during the Cold War.

4) There exist certain political confrontations between ex-soviet countries, China and the West. But apart from some exceptions, again, such confrontations are insignificant enough to

create any 'block conflict'. In fact, almost all countries in the world (except Cuba, North Korea and Afghanistan^{vi}), implicitly and/or explicitly now agree with the necessity of converting to the Free Market Economy^{vii}. Today, it is well known that even China, Cuba and North Korea do not represent any more the real communism States.

The main confrontations between countries applying this free market economy would originate from the rules of the game and possibly the issue of State provision of Social welfare scheme. Some socialist movements in France and other western countries continue to criticize what is called the "excess of Globalization". They propose that State should continue to support the poor masses and provide Social Security system for society. The "Anti-Globalization" pressure group has developed stronger in the last ten years in Europe^{viii}.

The three European socialist leaders in the UK, Germany and France are not always following the United States plans. We know that the UK is an exception, representing a very pro-American power in Europe, but the main opposition comes from the last two countries, and especially from France. The head of the French socialist Government, Leonel Jospin, who some time acts independently from the President of the Republic, the Centrist Jacques Chirac, representing, in fact, the largest party in France, launched his last political program related to Europe and Globalization against the American line and the one which has been pronounced by the head of the German Government. He supports more social security, the establishment of certain rules in the market competition, and certain level of the State intervention in the society (Le Monde, 2001, 30 and 31 May; Financial Times, 2001, May 29).

5) The diverse zones of the free market economy, serve as the main force of today's process of Globalization, have been progressively creating other zones including countries that are located in the *periphery* of the main three blocks. But "periphery" is not a new phenomenon of capitalism. We have always observed, in modern times, the movements towards 'Centralization' and 'Marginalisation' in the capitalist system. Some theoreticians tend to ignore these movements when they analyze Globalization, considering them a classical approach for describing international capitalism. However, within this periphery, some countries like Afghanistan, Tajikistan and others in the south and central Africa are still too poor to be integrated into the whole World Economic System as yet.

Consequently, we are far from the "Third World" theory of Alfred Sauvy (1989), the French inventor of the terminology and far from that geopolitical conception. But, we need to understand that today's World Economic System still has the form of a pyramid based on *three* hierarchical levels. First level: the countries located in the three regional blocks; Second level: those that are situated on the 'periphery'; Third level: the poorest countries.

Westernization

The international economic movement, which follows Globalization, is *Westernization*. It does not imply that all countries that embrace a free market economy have become a part of the West. The whole world is not becoming a part of the West, but westernized! This means that countries are becoming directly influenced by the process of *modernity*. Modernity is the basis of the western model of culture and civilization. As we noticed, Globalization is a world movement with a specific direction: from the West to the East, but this movement is never limited to only an economic sphere. Modernity is the foundation for western culture and achievements in economical and technological advancements. Therefore, Modernity is not

Modernization. It is more than that. Modernity is present everywhere we see western technology, western education, political thoughts, and concept of Civil Society etc (Hoodashtian, 1997; Nze-Nguema, 1989; Habermas, 1989, 1980; Lefevre, 1962).

To take some very practical examples: Westernization is responsible for the domination of English language in the world. This movement has been highly developed since the 1980s, the starting period of Globalization. Today English language has become the major language of business and international communication. About 85% of the web-sites on the Internet are in English. English language is taught as a second language in many schools all over the world. The same goes for the Anglo-Saxon culture, the younger generations in developing and even in poor countries prefer English/American music and films. American film industry, during the last two decades has achieved a total domination of the world movie industries. From a political point of view, we can assert that nowadays almost all countries even the Islamic Republic of Iran, but with the exception of Cuba and North Korea, are talking about democracy. A kind of international competitions between non-western countries have established to prove which country is more democratic than the other!

In short, today's most evident geopolitical realities is that non-western countries following Globalization are in the process of becoming *westernized*. The westernized countries are the non-western countries that use technologies based on the western conception, thus gradually becoming more westernized, but yet not giving up their own traditions. Certainly, one can observe a moderate conflict between modern/western values, on one part, and local/traditional values, on the other. This confrontation will never cease to be, as none of the two actors will be eliminated. To clarify this problem, some points need to be stressed:

IV. From Confrontation of values to “Métissage of values”

The Rise of Asia

Globalization is also the rise of Asia, the acceleration of contacts between East and West, and the confrontation between the modern and the traditional values in the non-western countries. Such international interactivity has its positive sides, one of which is that it allows the eastern countries to *use* the western technology for developing a domestic economy. The non-western countries, in Asia, Middle East and North African, are the best examples of such development process. In fact, the utilization of western technology has been among the advantages enjoyed by the non-western economies for the whole period of colonization and the neo-colonization. From 1960s-1970s, some of these non-western countries became progressively more familiar not only with utilization of the technology, but also with its main structures, functions, and more importantly, its conceptions. The concept of technology is the philosophy based on which the whole modern technology is constituted^{ix}. This process of becoming familiar with the structure and conception of modern technology helped the most active non-western countries to *produce* progressively *the western model of technology!*

From ‘*utilization to production*’, an important historical transition in the structure of the World Economic System was born, in which the ex-colonies are becoming the new industrialized countries and actively competing with the West. This is the significance of the rise of Asia. South Korea, the countries of the South East Asia are among the fastest. In 1970s-1980s, they have been called the ‘*NICs*’ (newly Industrializing Countries). Today, all the country members of ASEAN are in this exceptional process^x. It is impossible to conceive

of the economic performance of these non-western countries without the process of Globalization.

Métissage of values

As different regions of the world apply more and more western technology, embrace market economy, western democracy, and western model of education, they however do not become a part of the West but westernized. One very important fact is that: Westernization seems to *stimulate local values*, as newly industrialized countries retain their national, ethnic and cultural identities (Hoodashtian, 1997). This stimulation appears as an 'Identity Resistance' manifested by each country as they join the world movement and Globalization, which tends, by nature, to eliminate all differentiations. Globalization tends to homogenize the world. So, the more it is developing, the more Identity Resistance seems to attract people in some non-western countries.

Here, I am going to look into this from the point of view of political and cultural values prevalent in the regions in question.

1) At the beginning of the movement of Globalization, around 1990-1997, the major debate among the western scholars was based on the vital question of whether Globalization, which is imposing to different domestic economic structure one and the same type of technology and model of production, could promote a certain political and cultural *homogenization* among different countries (Fukuyama, 1993). In other words: It is right to say that technology, rational by concept and construction, has the same *nature* and *function* all over the world. There is no 'geographical', 'racial' or 'cultural' priority for technology to be used (Ellul, 1977). Technology is not a racist! Once it is understood as a need, in India, in Africa, in America, all people are *capable* to use the same technology in the same way. The utilization of computer technology is the best example. Who could imagine, in the 1950s or even in 1970s, that the computer which possesses one of the most complex structures, could be *used* by all nations of the world in such an easy way? Who would believe that this technology was soon to be used one day in all areas of the society like: hotels, restaurants, universities, companies, ministries, creating a real world network as e-book, e-shopping, e-commerce, e-development, e-government, e-democracy, e-group, even e-diets and so many other e-s ? (The Economist, 2000).

The main question is in spite of such a common and general utilization of the same technology, we do not notice countries becoming *closer* to each other. Contrary to what Francis Fukuyama, in his famous «The End of the History», had expected to see, we did not notice the *same* understanding of the need for world peace, the same conception of democracy and Human Corporation among nations. Despite Globalization and penetration of the western technology in all countries, we did not see fewer wars around the world; we did not see peace dominating everywhere. This means that utilization of the same technology does not produce, mandatory and all round the *same* culture. According to some other authors, Globalization has prepared a better ground for new political conflicts between international powers through nationalism and the emergence of religion. According to Samuel Huntington, Globalization is creating a heterogeneous situation which stimulates confrontations between countries. From the beginning of the 1990's, we could notice in many developing countries, in Eastern Europe, Middle East, etc., the movement towards regional independence. Some countries become smaller due to internal divisions, such as in the ex-Yugoslavia. Along with the

emergence of nationalism, we notice that emergence of regional conflicts, particularly Islamic, in Middle East, North Africa and in some Asian countries, has created another source of confrontation between the West and the East (Huntington, 1996).

2) In short, the international economic movement of Globalization, or the process of Westernization, seems to stimulate local values and universal utilization of technology, though does not influence this reality very seriously.

For example, the Central Asian countries and specially Kazakhstan after the end of the Cold War established very advanced relations with the West and attracted numerous American and European companies to its territory. Westernization in Kazakhstan seems to have taken a fairly rapid pace in application of technology, business methods, and structure of education. At the same time, one of the first actions of the President of the country was to reinforce and support preservation of Kazakh language along with the Russian language, which was formerly dominating in the Republic, and to promote Kazakh national traditions. Another example is Japan, which was highly dominated by the United States both economically and culturally after the World War II. After 1950's Japan took a very serious movement towards Westernization in economy, industry, and education, while simultaneously strongly preserving some aspects of national culture (Demorgon, 1996). One can observe a moderately similar situation in South Korea.

This conflict of cultures creates a real confrontation between Western/modern and Eastern/traditional values in the non-westren countries. Nowadays, the question, and the issues of such value confrontation are posing big challenges. Scholars in Europe are focusing on this very important question, and some of them have come with ideas that the real issue of confrontation of modern and traditional values would be the creation of new context which could be called "Métissage of Values" (Barbier, 1996). This is a *Métissage of Western and Asian values*, in which non-of the values will be eliminated, but combined in a *new framework*. The Métissage is a framework which will not be anti-modern or anti-traditional, but will carry *both* of them. It will neither be modern, nor traditional. If this Métissage concerns specific kind of values related to the cultural and spritual life, "Structural Métissage" is a combination of values at all levels of life, in culture, social, politics and other levels, in the non-western countries. (Hoodashtian, 2001, September).

Following the theory of Métissage, we understand how *original* would the situation be in each non-western country. Each Structural Métissage is different from another, because each Structure is realized in relation with the specific historical/political and cultural situations of that specific country. There is no universal model of Métissage. Each combination of values is unique in this senes that it has been created in a specific time, and under a specific condition and in a particular historical context. Consequently, the theory of Métissage underlines that there is no more "real traditional society" in the world. The modernity and its values affect all countries, which are in relation with the West. In fact, Westernization of the world creates a framework of Structural Métissage in the non-western countries and pushes them automatically to emerge for facing the new problems created by this new situation. This is the same process, which motivates them to compete with the West.

In the West, the study of Métissage of values as a new Anthropological approach to the question of cultural interactions between countries is yet to be fully researched. However, the interest of scholars in this matter has increased since the beginning of the period of

Globalization. At the University of Paris (St.-Denis), the Research Group *CRISE*^{xi} and its supgroup *GREMA* are focusing on the last issues of the cultural contacts between the Asia and the West.

Conclusion

Globalization is a world movement with a specific sense : from the West to the East. It should not be simply considered as an economic movement. Following the internationalization of the modern technology and the free market economy, cultural and political aspects should be taken into consideration as well. Globalization started with 'Deregulation' and the penetration of the capitalist model of economy based on the free market in the most parts of the world. Some scholars consider this as the best opportunity for the establishment of a future homogenous world. Others believe that Globalization accelerates a political antagonism between countries.

In any cases, Globalization is a global progress, highly motivating the interactivity of cultures, expression of some confrontations between Western/modern and Eastern/traditional values. For the non-western countries, this confrontation could create a kind of combination of values at all levels of the society, what we could call, in this study, 'A Structural Métissage'.

Endnotes

ⁱ This Conference was given to the second and third year students at 'Eurasian Market Institute' in Almaty in January 2001. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. A. Nurseit, President of the 'Eurasian Market Institute' and Ms. F. Seitova in inviting me to share some thoughts with students. I also would like to express my thanks to *Aset Kopbaev*, MPA, Research Assistant at KIMEP Research Center who took notes and helped me to prepare the first draft of this paper. The author has completely reviewed the last part of this paper.

ⁱⁱ We can notice how the history of Russia is related to the history of the world in the twentieth century and some how, conditions it, and how the internal movements of this country could up to now modify the map of the planet.

ⁱⁱⁱ One of the specific results of the movement of Globalization was the development of Global Companies. One main difference between Global companies and a Multinational companies is in the degree of Centralization of power and, consequently, in the style of management. The first model builds its headquarter wherever there would be the possibility of a new innovation related to the profitability and the development of the company. The second model is mostly based on one headquarter which is the source of diffusion of the main decisions and orientations of the company.

^{iv} Immanuel Wallerstein is the Director of the "FERNAND BRAUDEL CENTER for the Study of Economies Historical Systems, and Civilizations" at Binghamton University, State University of New York, which has been founded in September 1976 to engage in the analysis of large-scale social change over long periods of historical time (<http://fbc.binghamton.edu/>).

^v Abolhassan Banisadr is an ex-President of The Islamic Republic of Iran for the period of 1980-1981.

^{vi} Certain other countries, like China and Iran, have still some ideological confrontations with the West, but practically, they are almost applying the main lines

of capitalism with the State intervention. Both of them are highly, at least in theory, encouraging the private investments.

^{vii} Even Islamic Iran, under the reformist President Rafsanjani, and specially President M. Khatamy, does not wish any more to preserve the whole practice of the State Economy and the Government keeps inviting the capitalist Iranian living since the revolution in the United States and Europe, and encourage the western companies to invest in Iran.

^{viii} For the movement of 'Anti Globalization', see:

<http://www.unc.edu/depts/anthro/escobarpaper.html>

and

<http://www.corpwatch.org/news/2001/0038.html>

^{ix} What are the modern technology and its difference from the traditional technology? See: Goffi (1988). For more information, see Heidegger (1958), (1962), Habermas (1973).

^x ASEAN is 'Association of Southeast Asian Nations'. Created in 1967 for promoting regional economic and political stabilities, it includes Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and Philippines. Brunei and Vietnam joined ASEAN in 1984 and 1995 respectively.

¹² The idea of Métissage is coming from my Professor René Barbier, the head of the Research Group CRISE

(<http://www.fp.univ-paris8.fr/recherches/accueilCRISE2.html>)

at the University of Paris 8. His main theory is the 'Métissage Axiologique', which means a combination of cultural values. But the idea of 'Structural Métissage' comes from this author. Described in his doctoral dissertation, and then in a book, "*Une Modernité sans Occident*" and in an article, "*Eight models of the Structural Métissage*", this last idea refers to the point that Métissage is not only a reality of the combination of cultural and spritual values but it concerns *all values*, in social, politics, education etc, and would cover all aspects and the whole structure of the life of the non-western countries.

References

Banisadr, A. (1980). Egtesad eslami (Islamic Economy). Tehran: Chapakhsh.

Barbier, R. (1996, Août). Valeurs et sens du métissage culturel. Espace Social, Cultures et Travail Social, No. 5.

Baudrillard, J. (1986). La société de consommation. Paris : Poche.

Braudel F. (1985). La dynamique du capitalisme. Paris: Arthaud.

Clark, I. (1997). Globalization and Differentiation, New York: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, B., Kornberg, A., & Mishler, W. (Eds.). (1988). The resurgence of conservatism in Anglo-American democracies. N.C.: Duke University Press.

Cordellier, S. (sous la direction). (1997). La mondialisation au-delà des mythes. Paris: La Découverte.

Crise asiatique (La) (1998, Juillet). Géopolitique, No 62. Paris: Presse Universitaire de France.

Defarges, P. M. (1993). Relations Internationales, 2 Vol. Paris: Edition du Seuil.

Demorgon, J. (1996). Complexité des cultures et de l'interculturelle. Paris: Anthropos.

The Economist. (1999). The World in 1999. London.

The Economist. (2000). The World in 2000. London.

Ellul, J. (1977). Le système technicien. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

Ellul, J. (1991). La technique ou l'enjeu du siècle. Paris: Economica.

Enoch, S. S. (1993). Socrates to Sartre: A history of Philosophy. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Financial Times, May 29, 2001

Forsyth, M., & Keen-Soper, M. (1996). The political classics: Green to Dworkin. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1993). The End of History and the Last Man. Avon Books.

Gabriel, W. (1995). De l'espace national à la mondialisation. Paris: Ellipses.

Goffi, J. Y. (1988). La philosophie de la technique. Paris: Press Universitaire de France (Que sais-je?).

Habermas, J. (1973). La technique et la science comme idéologie. Paris: Gallimard.

Habermas, J. (1980, Octobre). La modernité, un projet inachevé. Critique, No. 413, Paris.

Habermas, J. (1989). Discours philosophique de la modernité. Paris: Gallimard.

Heidegger M. (1958). Essais et conférences. Paris: Gallimard (Tel).

Heidegger M. (1962). Chemins qui ne mènent nulle part. Paris; Gallimard (Tel).

Hoodashtian, A. (1997). La mondialisation et la Confrontation des valeurs. Tempête de Plume, No 10-11. Paris.

Hoodashtian, A. (2001a). La triade: La nouvelle formation du monde. Une modernité sans Occident. Paris: Harmattan.

-
- Hoodashtian, A.(2001b). La question du centre du monde. Une modernité sans Occident. Paris: Harmattan.
- Hoodashtian, A. (2001, September). Eight models of the ‘Structural Métissage’ of traditional and modern values in the Eastern and Western societies. Pratique de Formation/Analyses. Paris: Department of Education, the University of Paris 8.
- Huntington, S. (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the remaking of World Order. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Inglehart, R. (1995, September). Modification des valeurs, développement économiques et évolution politique. Revue Internationale des Sciences Sociales, No. 145, Paris.
- Jürgen, H. (1973). La technique et la science comme idéologie. Paris: Gallimard.
- Kant, E. (1956). Critique of Practical Reason. New York; The Liberal Arts Press, Inc.
- Kennedy, P. (1989). Naissance et déclin des grandes puissances, Paris: Payot.
- Lafay, G.(1996). Comprendre la mondialisation. Paris: Economica.
- Laïdi, Z. (1994). Un monde privé de sens. Paris: Fayard.
- Lefevre, L. (1962). L’introduction à la modernité. Paris: Minuit.
- Monde (Le). (2001, May 30). ‘Linel Jospin rejette la vision européenne de Gerhard Schröder’. ‘Un Etat pour la nation européenne’.
- Mondialisation et Gouvernance mondiale (1999, Avril, 7-14), Problème Economiques, No. 2.611-2.612. Paris: La documentation Française.
- Nze-Nguema, F. D. (1989). Modernité, tiers-mythe et bouc-hémisphère. Paris: Publisud.
- Sauvy, A. (1989, Août 14). Trois mondes, une planète. Observateur, p. 62. in: Etat du Tiers Monde. Paris: La Découvert.
- Schwald, S : De l’Internationalisation à la mondialisation (1995, Jan.-Fév.). L’économie mondiale, No. 269. Paris: Cahier Français, La Documentation Française.
- Wackerman, G. (1995). De l’espace national à la mondialisation. Paris: Ellipses.
- Zaki, L. (1994). Un monde privé de sens, Paris: Fayard.