Globalization and its History

At the end of this session, you should be able to understand

- How the modern state system evolved through the periods of colonialism, imperialism, world & cold wars, U.S. neo-liberal hegemony/neo-imperialism
- Definition, dimensions, characteristics and effects of “globalization”
- Example (Video: “Greetings from Grozny”): Chechnya--Violence & resistance against hegemony. Prologue to our future? (Iraq, Afghanistan, Middle East….)


Theme: One’s view of the modern world is shaped by his/her own view of history and his/her perception of historical events, as well as physical, political and ethnic characteristics.

Effect: Because of this, people’s world view is very limited in scope and inevitably will differ from others’ views of the world.

Example: To understand modern reality, look at history:

The world in 1350 although Europe thought to be pinnacle of progress/civilization, other states/civilizations far more sophisticated.
(Example: China an elaborate state w/ education, art, economy, etc; Mayans in Mexico. as center of religion and trade.) Thus, Europe needed to explore.....led to:

Euro-Dominance (1400-1900) was a economically motivated exploration and exploitation resulting in colonialization and imperialism. The European expansion also helped to spread the idea of the nation-state comprised of:

- Bounded Territory –controlling a population and resources
- Government – monopoly of force and laws, effective if viewed as legitimate by its citizens
- Loyal Population – patriotism in combination with cultural, ethnic, religious symbols creating nationalist feelings.
- Recognition by Other States – significant when a government changes hands by way of revolution or war.

Post WWII trends (1950-2000):
- U.S. used its’ hegemonic power to establish international system with self-serving rules and institutions (Example: IGO's such as World Bank, IMF, GATT, WTO, UN).
- U.S. power was threatened by Soviets during Cold War resulting from differing ideologies/values/practices BUT only proxy conflicts because of nuclear patt/deterence
- End of colonialism resulted in "1st World," "2nd World," "3rd World" designations
Market capitalism, new (communication) technologies, and the idea of "democracy" seem to be most important factors that drive current processes of "globalization." Some skeptics believe that the ideology of "globalization" is only an excuse for Western capitalist societies (in particularly the United States as the only superpower), to continue its domination of the world. They believe that "to maintain profits, capital constantly has to exploit new markets. To survive, national capitalisms must continuously expand the geographical reach of capitalist social relations" (Held and McGrew, 2000) and eventually include non- or pre-capitalist and lesser economically developed societies.

This is what happened after China's leaders embraced the market economy and after 1989 when the Soviet Union collapsed. At the same time "the gulf between rich and poor is growing even wider. [...] A globally disorganized capitalism is continually spreading out" (Beck, 2000).

"Globalization" in this respect means the existence of a world society without a world state and world government.

But the question persists. How can globalization benefit the entire world and not only a few countries and elites? What international institutions and laws are necessary to control the excesses of global capitalism? Is "welfare capitalism" or state intervention promoting "justice and equality" a solution to prevent or reduce the growth of exploitation, poverty, and greed on a global scale?


**Definition of Globalization**
= growing mobility across frontiers (goods, info, communication products, services, people)
- EFFECTS:
  - encounter, new cultural forms, hybridization
  - tension, confrontation, collision of cultures, westoxification, anti-Americanization
  - BUT G does not supersede and displace everything/is multifarious/uneven & unequal
    elite control vs. powerless masses

**Other Definitions of Globalization**
- **Beck**: globalization = existence of an interdependent world society without a world state and world government, a globally disorganized capitalism, globality = world perspective, globalism = neoliberal ideological interpretations and reactions of globalization
- **Robins**: growing mobility across frontiers (goods, info, communication products, services, people)
- **Warde**: social entities moving more frequently, farther, and faster
- **Beck/McGrew**: time-space/spatio-temporal compression, growing interconnectedness/interdependence of human affairs, reordering of power,
consciousness (cognitive aspect)

**Results of Globalization:**
- evokes cosmopolitan ideals & multicultural practices
- consumer citizenship (Benetton, McDonald, Cola) transcends, incorporates local &
global rather than dissolves, promotes cultural encounter and interaction
- disorients, questions traditions and hierarchies, frontiers, divisions [container cultures]
- defensive and protective resistance, backlash, resurgence/revalidation/revitalization of
  particular cultural roots and identities (regional, national, ethnic, territorial) =
  religious fundamentalism
- struggle for dominance and space, negotiation of cultural convergence and
difference/diversity, economic-cultural dynamic resulting in confrontation,
  contestation, negotiation

**Questions:**
1. Discuss the pro's and con's of globalization based on its effects
2. Is G. truly promoting globalization or is it negated by its side effects?
3. Is the dominance of U.S. American culture a threat to the existence of other
cultures? What do other like about it and what do they detest? Why?
4. While experiencing globalization, how important is it that people of different
cultures, especially U.S. Americans, understand and learn about other cultures?
5. Do you think governments should censor foreign cultures and languages and
  restrain the flow of global information and interaction?
6. Could resentment against globalization cause it to slow down?
7. Is a hybridization of cultures something we should strive for?
8. Why do people in the same locales experience globalization differently and
   people in different places experience it similarly?
9. The whole world is now divided into “nation-states.” Can you think of another or
   better ways to govern people? Do we already see signs of another future?
10. How can one incorporate more "responsibility" and democratic control into the
    globalization process considering the speed and universality of changes?
11. The authors speak of effective government in terms of legitimacy (i.e. Citizens
    view their national government as legitimate through representation via elections.
    Applying this to the international level, do "3rd World" countries view the
    international system as a legitimate entity when they receive little
    recognition/representation?
12. How might a citizen of a "3rd World" country view the modern world differently
    than a "1st World" citizen (based on differing historical perspectives)?

**View and Discuss the Wide Angle Video: “Greetings from Grozny”**
  Source: http://www.pbs.org/wnet/wideangle/

**Objectives of the video**
Investigate the history of the war in Chechnya, the impact of the Russian occupation on the lives of Chechens, and the consequences of the violence employed by both the Russian forces and the Chechen separatist rebels.

Explore the issue of violence vs. non-violence as a means of resistance to oppression and as a way to achieve independence.

Consider the alternatives to violence and what the pros and cons of such non-violent means might be.

Understand the following terms and concepts: separatists, guerrillas, occupation, civilians, independence

Develop research, presentation, writing and conflict resolution skills that can be applied to numerous other content areas and case studies.

**Background:**
For nearly five years, Chechnya, set in the mountainous country of the North Caucasus, has been the scene of some of the most intensive warfare in Europe since World War II. The video explores the question of whether violence is an acceptable means of resistance to oppression or whether diplomacy and political solutions must be pursued instead.

1722: First known battle between Chechen fighters and Russian soldiers results in defeat for Peter the Great.
1944: Stalin deports the entire Chechen nation to Siberia and Central Asia as suspected German collaborators.
1991: Chechnya declares its independence.
1994-1996: War with Russia results in de facto independence for Chechnya although the Russian army tried to crush Chechen separatist guerillas, killing tens of thousands of civilians in the process. A second conflict began in 1999 when Russia re-invaded Chechnya with a death toll reported to be in the thousands. The Russian occupation of Chechnya has also resulted in the disappearance of 1,200 to 2,000 suspected rebels and a major refugee crisis: As Russian military losses continue, a refugee crisis builds in neighboring Ingushetia. 150,000 people fled Chechnya and 160,000 were displaced during the second conflict alone. Chechens have suffered both physical and psychological damage under the Russian army's occupation. During the 1994-1996 war in Chechnya, The Russian army's official death toll since 1999 is 3,000, and the Chechen rebels' violent tactics have taken the lives of both Russians and Chechens who cooperate with them. The rebels' deadliest weapons are mines, which run the risk of killing innocent civilian bystanders.

Both Russians and hard-line fighters have an interest in talking up the Islamic factor. The most radical Chechen guerrillas, in their propaganda material disseminated through the Web site kavkaz.org describe their fighters as "mujahadin" or "martyrs," fighting a "jihad" or holy war against the Russian armed forces. That helps them raise money for weapons and supplies in mosques from London to Jeddah. Russia points out that these radical fighters had a link to the Al Qaeda movement through a Saudi-born warrior of fortune known as Ibn ul-Khattab, who had fought in Afghanistan, and moved to Chechnya in 1995. Khattab, a
professional "mujahadin" fighter who sported thick curly shoulder-length black hair, was reported murdered by poisoning in Chechnya in March.

**Fighting for Chechnya: Is Islam a Factor?**

After September 11, Russia's president Vladimir Putin was quick to use evidence like this to prove to the United States that he was an stalwart ally in the fight against "Islamic terror" -- only, as he repeatedly pointed out, Russia had already been fighting the terrorists in Chechnya for years, not months.

This message succeeded in further softening Western criticism of Russia's brutal military campaign. "Russia is fighting terrorists in Chechnya, there's no question about that, and we understand that," U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell said in May. At the same time, the U.S. sent military trainers to Georgia, on the other side of the Caucasus mountains from Chechnya, to try to help the local security forces clean up the Pankisi Gorge region of Islamic militants.

And yet most of this is based on a big misunderstanding of what is really going on in Chechnya.

Proclaiming independence from Moscow in 1991, Chechnya's first rebel president, Jokhar Dudayev, declared a secular state. Dudayev, a former Soviet general, was so ignorant about Islam that he once famously advised his citizens that, as good Muslims, they should pray three - and not five - times a day.

Dudayev's cause was a nationalist one - freeing Chechnya, as he put it, from "two hundred years of persecution" by the Russian state. For him, the key date in Chechen history was Stalin's mass deportation of the Chechen people to Central Asia in 1944. Dudayev frequently said he was ready to have close economic and political ties with Russia, so long as "historical justice" was restored to his people.

Islam began to be a factor only after Moscow's first military intervention against Dudayev in December 1994. At the start of armed resistance to the Russians, many Chechens looked for inspiration to their history or to the war against the Russians in Afghanistan. Fighters, many of whom had been drinking vodka a few years before, wound green Islamic headbands around their heads and learned how to pray.

Lack of money also proved critical. When Khattab arrived in Chechnya in 1995, he brought promises of Saudi funding - and made grisly publicity videos of his attacks on Russian soldiers to entice potential funders in the Middle East. Yet Khattab was one of only perhaps a few dozen Arab fighters who came to fight in Chechnya.

In fact, most Chechens remained very suspicious of the incoming Middle East zealots, like Khattab, known as "Wahhabis" because of their allegiance to a particularly austere form of Sunni Islam. Most Chechen Muslims by contrast are adherents of
the mystical Sufi form of Islam and pray at home rather than in the mosques. They visit shrines and say prayers at the tombs of their ancestors. The women do not wear veils. Local traditions tend to be stronger than Muslim observance. Even in the 1840s and 1850s, when the Islamic chieftain Imam Shamil led resistance to the Russian tsar's armies in the region, he said that the Chechens were good warriors, but bad Muslims. He was unable to stop them smoking, playing music and dancing.

Proof that good guerrillas did not necessarily make good fundamentalists was in evidence in 1996, after the rebels had won their first military victory against the Russians. The separatists tried to introduce Islamic Shariah courts into Chechnya and order beatings for anyone convicted of drinking or drug abuse. Yet one high-profile Shariah judge turned out, when interviewed, to be an almost comic bundle of contradictions. Jumbalat Samkhatov was a former soccer player, who said he took his duties very seriously and admired the Taliban. He was also a typical Chechen, hazy about Islamic doctrine, laughing, chain-smoking Marlboros and flirting with a woman photographer colleague.

Samkhatov was the rule, not the exception. Apart from a few high-profile cases, Shariah justice never caught on in Chechnya. To settle their disputes Chechens continued to use their tried and traditional methods - the verdict of respected elders or the firearms of young men.

The two strains in Chechnya of support and opposition for radical Islam diverged so strongly that armed supporters of Dudayev's successor as rebel president, Aslan Maskhadov, fought a small civil war with fundamentalist Chechens in 1998.

The second Russian military intervention in October 1999 and thousands more civilian casualties have radicalised Chechnya again and inevitably made Islamic fundamentalism more attractive to young Chechens. Yet this war's links to the "war on terror" remain oblique and confusing. If the Arab volunteers in Chechnya went home and all foreign funding for the rebels ceased, radical Islam would again fade as a factor in the conflict. But the deep underlying - and overwhelmingly political - problems that divide most ordinary Chechens from Russia would still remain.


Chechen Children's Drawings: http://www.idee.org/chchilddraw.htm = very powerful pictures drawn by Chechen children depicting their daily realities in a war-torn society.
Questions about the video and student discussion:

1. Clarification questions—What references did you not understand? What new terms/concepts were used in the video?
2. What was the most important thing you learned from the video?
3. What important questions remain unanswered? Did you find faulty reasoning or questionable facts?
4. What is the film-maker’s purpose? His main idea?
5. How is the video related to globalization?
6. After watching this film, what else do you want to know?
7. Is it acceptable for those struggling for independence or freedom from occupation to use violent means?
8. How does Russia’s response to Chechen terrorism compare to recent U.S. anti-terrorism policies both and home and abroad—for example in Iraq & Afghanistan
9. What role do you see for the U.S., the West and the UN in this conflict. Has the U.S. a vital interest in the outcome? Why and when should the U.S. intervene in gross human rights violations?
10. Who decides the difference between legitimate independence movements fighting unwanted occupiers, and terrorist groups creating havoc to achieve their goals?
11. Can you think of alternative political solutions to this conflict?