

## GLOBALIZATION FAILURE AND THE RISKS TO THE EUROPEAN AND GLOBAL SECURITY

*Brigadier-general (ret.) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, PhD \**  
*Colonel (ret.) Professor Benone ANDRONIC, PhD \*\**

**Abstract:** *The article, resulting from an analysis of the globalization process, attempts to answer, arguably, why this process was a failure.*

*According to the authors, globalization made its presence felt, sharply, after 1990, of the last century, manifesting itself in a sustained rhythm and widely influencing all sectors of the social life of humanity, especially the economic and financial sector, based on the concept of the global market as a sum of national markets.*

*Following the analysis, the authors note that, until 2008, when the crisis of the global and social economy started, the globalization process had manifested its presence, having a significant growth rate. Yet, after this year, it slowed down its expansion, to the point today that this phenomenon, once giving great hope – particularly to developing countries – has failed.*

*The authors wonder whether or not the “old globalization” is now heading for a new horizon, in which it can be reinvented, passing into a new stage of evolution in such a manner that it is as equitable for the whole mankind, without generating insecurity for the nations of the world.*

**Keywords:** *the evolution of globalization; exchange markets; global economy; hegemonic countries; international institutions; sovereignty.*

### **Introduction**

Globalization was and still is, at the same time, a process, and a state of facts. It was and still is a process because it implies deep quantitative and qualitative transformations in time, both political and economic, but it is also a state of facts, because it allowed and still allows actions of comparison between constitutive elements in various evolutionary moments. Beyond its

---

\* Professor PhD, "CAROL I" National Defence University Bucharest, entitled member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, [udrescumircea@yahoo.com](mailto:udrescumircea@yahoo.com).

\*\* Consultant professor PhD, "CAROL I" National Defence University Bucharest, corresponding member of the Academy of Romanian Scientists, email: [benoneandronic@yahoo.com](mailto:benoneandronic@yahoo.com)

political reasons, globalization can be justified through two major components: technological evolution and exchange markets evolution. Thus, it is understandable why globalization does not generate the same levels of satisfaction, because neither technical nor scientific knowledge is uniform. As such, the income per capita in countries involved in globalization waves does not present a convergence behavior towards a state of balance, because the countries did not acquire the said technical knowledge in the same amount, but a relationship can be established between indigenous productivity progress and external influences. If a commodity is produced in a better economy country, the said commodity becomes better for global market from both quality and costs points of view. Some examples in this regard may be microprocessors, cars, airplanes, mobile phones, etc., commodities with a constantly increased quality, but with a constantly decreased cost with increased experience. In an implacable way, the greatest challenge for the century we stepped into, from globalization point of view, was creation of institutions that were going to put all the globalization promises in practice and avoid global crises. However, the isolation policy of United States of America (USA), by boycotting deals that made globalization a political and economic ideology, made the globalization ship fail miserably. Democratic globalization failed, being victim of claims of hegemonic exceptionality from USA, through the famous quote *America first*, but also of nationalist and powerful actions from states that ignore the international laws requests.

### **1.Sustainability and evolution of globalization**

In 2000, Professor Charles Doran was amongst the first to define the globalization phenomenon, as: *“the interaction of information technology and the global economy. It is indexed in terms of the intensity, scope, volume and value of international transactions in the informational, financial, commercial, trade and administrative spheres worldwide. A sharp increase in the rate of these transactions in the last decade and therefore in their level is the most measurable manifestation of globalization”*<sup>1</sup> As long as globalization was on the agenda of the most powerful states, circulation freedom for capital, commodities and labor was to generate an unrestricted economy. But the global framework is made by state entities that can sustain

---

<sup>1</sup> Apud Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Marea dilemă: a domina sau a conduce*, Editura Scripta, București, 2005, p. 139.

or oppose the globalization principles. As such, it was stated that „Globalization offers these states a complex mix of motivations. On one side, it offers the possibility of economic growth, foreign capital income and gradual reduction of poverty. On the other side, there is a risk of massive dislocations, of loss of national control over fundamental economic goods and of the social exploitation... The more advanced the economy of a country is, the richer in capital and in innovation, the more enthusiastic the elite of the said country is in globalization spread”<sup>2</sup>.

Globalization theoreticians showed that this phenomenon has been and still is characterized by two major components of actual economic processes: evolution of scientific research and technological process, and global behavior of trade markets.

Evolution in scientific research and accelerated technological lead to significant mutations in all domains, but the ones in transportation and communication (telecommunication) were the ones with the most spectacular drop in costs. Overall, one can say that “Not only has the price of transport fallen; so has the importance of commodity trade in the world economy. The transport of raw materials and unprocessed food products has been replaced to a large extent by finished manufactured goods that are made with lighter materials and so occupy less space”<sup>3</sup>. In other words, trade products have nowadays a higher unit value, while the cost of transportation decreased, reducing the proportion of the first compared to the latter. Actually, the natural barriers of time and space between countries have diminished and as such, the cost of commodities expedition, of services, people, capital, services or information has diminished, too. The distances on a global scale were reduced by globalization of economy, which had as a result the increase in the independence degree between the world countries.

The second factor, i.e. the trade markets behavior in the global economy, led to liberalization of exchange of commodities, services and

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 140.

<sup>3</sup> Guillermo de la Dehesa, *Învingători și învinși în globalizare*, Editura Historia, București, 2007, pp. 120-121.

capital, generating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades, as a result of coordinated actions of World Trade Organization, Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development and International Monetary Fund, an Agreement put in practice through numerous bilateral and regional agreements. The neoclassic economic models consider that internal funding is the determinant engine of development. The countries that save more can invest more and, as such, develop faster. Reaching the desired income convergence varies though, because the social productivity and saved amount rates are not the same everywhere, but different from one region and one country to another. In these models, freedom of trade can indirectly speed up economic growth, generating higher economic efficiency by reallocating productive resources towards those sectors with relatively higher advantage, international competition making the companies more open to innovation and assimilation of foreign technologies, while closed economies are lacking the needed foundation for innovation and productivity increase<sup>4</sup>.

In globalization specific processes, international trade establishes, through competitive advantage levers, which sectors or products are developing, and which ones are declining, with the highest efficiency and productivity belonging to the developing domains. More, the global trade promotes technology spread, giving all the countries the possibility to learn not only from their own experience, but from the one of their commercial partners, with advantage of superior development, specialization, and trades. Nevertheless, global and commercial competition forces the companies to allocate more resources in research and development (the R&D Department) of new products, to expand the competitive advantages. In the globalized markets, the economies innovate, while the other economies assimilate innovations from the former, growth in developing countries being dependent on their initial wealth, on knowledge and costs of imitations. In cases when costs of imitations are smaller than costs of innovation, which are supported mainly by global firms, the developing countries will progress faster than the developed economies, that leads to conclusion that the more open the

---

<sup>4</sup> Michael Porter, *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, Free Press, New York, 1990, pp. 12-13.

economies are, the higher the probability to have new technologies and products, the cost of imitation being smaller<sup>5</sup>.

Globalization was and still is sustained by the mirage of global convergence of income and quality of life, through capital and workforce liberalization. International trade influences as well the emigration volumes because this trade is a substitute for production movement. As such, imports of commodities and services obtained with less qualified, intensively used, labor, from poor countries to the developed ones, is an obstacle for workforce migration in the same direction. If the workers have workplaces in export industries, they will be less motivated to migrate, but rather will export their work through exported products. For the same reason, migration can have the same effect on the labor market and income inequality in developed countries, as much as the international trade<sup>6</sup>.

It is not entirely coincidental that mass-media from the wealthiest countries – United States of America, European Union (EU), Japan, Canada, South Korea, etc. – constituted the flagship of sustaining the benefits of globalization. A major part of these countries' elite tried to convince the rest of the countries that globalization became a tangible reality, an explicit norm of international relations, and a moral support for fighting poverty. Therefore, globalization penetrated the academic environments, became national scope for some countries, while for USA it was some way of international recognition of its role of world leader towards prosperity and wellbeing. President Clinton emerged as an undeclared leader of globalization. For him, "Those who wish to roll back the forces of globalization because they fear its disruptive consequences, I believe are plainly wrong. Fifty years of experience show that greater economic integration and political cooperation are positive forces. Those who believe globalization is only about market economics, however, are wrong, too.... We must recognize first that globalization has made us all more free and more interdependent"<sup>7</sup>. After a few months from these words, the

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ragoff Kenneth, „The purchasing power parity puzzle”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, June, 1996, pp. 14-23.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Mundell R., „International trade and factor mobility”, 1957, *American review*, 47, June.

<sup>7</sup> Bill Clinton, in his Speech at World Economic Forum, 29 January 2000.

US President concluded “the train of globalization cannot be reversed... If we want America to stay on the right track, ... we have no choice but to try to lead the train”<sup>8</sup>, and from the moment USA labeled globalization as key to all political, economic and social problems after the Cold War, most of the other countries saw in globalization a positive and inevitable process, a modern ideology in the post-ideology era, because it foresaw a better future for all countries and social categories. Multinational companies from rich countries sustained globalization processes, the said companies becoming the vanguards of political and economic regulations, that had to be the competition framework, but in which USA had the global hegemony. For the moment, the American hegemony, followed closely by other industrialized states, faced some social legitimacy due to export of capital that ensured some economic progress of less developed countries, while the exports that multinationals controlled from these countries to the hegemonic ones offered citizens thereof quality products with lower prices compared to the ones locally produced. In any case, globalization could sustain the illusion of some hegemonic countries, as well as of some dominated ones, which though explained their submission through insignificant increase in their own economic activity, followed by just as insignificant increase in wellbeing. Everything was ratified in various global agreements that did not call hegemonic and dependent countries anymore, but countries that engaged in sustaining liberalization of trade, capital, and workforce. This globalization framework made some Asian countries, with China as leader, know a development pace never seen before, while USA and other great economic powers of the world became losing countries.

## **2. The failure of globalization process**

It was not long until the American society developed vehement reactions against the international consensus on globalization, consensus that they encouraged and led as recognized hegemon. Syndicates started to criticize globalization because many of their own jobs were transferred abroad. Moreover, workforce migration from poor countries to rich ones, including USA, proved to be a reality that opposed the trends followed by them in terms of salaries rise. Syndicates’ battle for a higher wage level was compromised by hiring foreign workers willing to work for less than own workers. Engaging in subordination of entire political life to market

---

<sup>8</sup> Bill Clinton, Speech delivered at Nebraska University, 8 December 2000.

regulations, USA found in time a paradox effect, i.e. the American State that put the political sovereignty first had to agree that national sovereignty became an anachronical reality, as the entire market ecosystem was globally regulated by multiple countries entities, to which USA had the same responsibility like any other country. Officials of USA internal politics started political initiatives with the goal that USA does not change its own laws to offer compensations for other countries losses, but to obtain some discriminative barriers for many products in the frame of global agreements, which led to stupor and complaints from poor countries. Some disagreements appeared in the trade with EU countries as well, which formulated accusations to USA, claiming that American businesses are favored on which ground compensations were demanded.

USA administrations sustained globalization as being a purely American concept, but they implied that whenever global agreements collide with what is understood to be American sovereignty, any American engagement is due for reinterpretation. The American administration signed the Kyoto Protocol, but did nothing for its implementation. It signed the global trade conventions, which it did not implement. Recently, the new American administration got out of all international treaties that involved USA, if there are stipulations therein which affect the principle of American sovereignty. *As such, globalization became a religion without a church.* United States is already trying to build protection fences at the borders in order to stop the workforce migration, it asks its largest globalizing companies to close the businesses in other countries and to deal exclusively with American people, it raises commercial barriers for foreign products, it claims the equilibrium of commercial balance, generates custom duties, and causes economic and political nationalism.

From the moment USA insisted on globalization, in which only one country had to be accepted as being more equal than others, globalization started to generate an increasing anti-American trend, even in the countries that were historically close to USA. Suddenly, United States found out that, from a globalization leading role and feeling the choir of industrialized sustaining countries, while assuming the role of hegemonic country, nowadays is the only country that supports a globalization that no other

country agrees with. *The actual rejection of globalization, which at some point accepted a regulated framework, is mainly explained by accusations on moral grounds, like the “wolf in a sheep skin”.* As such, we ask ourselves if globalization by any chance is living its last days, especially considering some agreements that have the consent frame of globalization as foundation. When the leader forsakes what has initiated and organized, the ruled elements feel the behavioral waves for a long time after the initial eruptions. The fake morality, like “wolf in sheep skin” or “do as I say, not as I do”, perpetuated an equality where *only one was more equal than others* and generated the idea that USA wish to transform the entire world into a personal property through globalization. United States agreed on some rules to be established, as a generally accepted framework, but with one exception, USA itself. And, again we ask, why did the economic and cultural efforts to promote globalization as new ideology for increasing wellbeing receive a devastating blow from the actual state that declared the opportunity to *lead this train*. Globalization wished to be a recognizing act for American hegemony, both by countries coming from the communist east and by countries that formed the USA lead industrialized choir just some time before. This last group of countries are in the situation to find out that, through globalization, they were invited to change their status from joint efforts for a common cause to efforts to sustain USA’s cause. In the absence of an impeccable morality, the international community is forced to see in globalization a form of profitable states’ unification around a dominant state. That is why globalization started to be synonymous to Americanization, as a form of global colonization, through discretionary maneuvers of economic and financial vectors.

For the sake of international security, the global presence of USA was accepted as long as the global politics was dual, and USA was supported in leading one part. The germs of globalization appeared in that part of the world, by sustaining the free market principles, and generalized from the moment the Cold War ended. This time though, through globalization, USA started to shift from sharing everything with the countries it led, to share everything as they want, globalization being thus transformed into a maximizing vector for a privileged position. The result of such behavior consists in exacerbation of inequality, as well as sharpening of international tensions. And from the moment USA became more and



more aggressive globally, the western world tried to convince the international community not to mark the Occidentalized approach and the USA backed globalization as equals. More, as the USA supports the globalization in the American way, there are many isles that give up this ideology and join economic markets that are hostile to American model. European, Asian, African and even South American political elites publicly manifest reserves towards the USA – led globalization and propose markets regulated in the interests of their own nations, with a large opening to *a new globalization, with a higher degree of equity for all the world states*. The globalization led by USA received a deadly blow from USA itself, by imposing protectionist feelings. This was a process against a future that provokes fear, generated by a present that provokes moral resentments. On this background, USA defied the international community, unilaterally giving up on all globalization international deals that was part of, declaring the supersede of bilateral deals. This time, USA was not willing to promote an infusion of moral impulse in globalization processes but closed even the faucets that supported the accepted globalization. *United States became hostile to their own creation and are already perceived as the public enemy of globalization, because they demand other states what they are refusing for themselves. And since USA enjoys the benefits of globalization, it should engage in fixing the problems caused by globalization specific processes. The more USA ignores and defies the global problems of mankind, the more the international community – especially some groups of countries – becomes more irritated by the domination by rule of exception of USA.*

In full campaign of promoting globalization, USA had the interest of imposing an American democracy to the world, supported by its hegemonic power. The American democracy, though, wanted to first transform the other forms of democracy, some of which ensuring some form of normality on a national scale. The American power intervened in a hegemonic way in different parts of the world, changing some forms of local democracies with others which followed closely the interests resulting from USA democracy. Only that the dramatic interventions in the political systems of other countries had as result the worsening of social lives, i.e. Iraq, Syria, Libya, etc. From such hegemonic approaches a certain conclusion can be drawn: *a*

*hegemonic power can export its democracy only if it brings its contribution to conservation of local and regional stability, only if respects the rights of other competitors and only if its democratic approaches are not suspicious of politic or economic demagogy. If these requirements are not met, and the democracy export cannot enjoy the social sympathy, the said export is rejected, even its internal political foundations being in jeopardy.* The pursuit of individual wellbeing is a social impulse on a global scale but has concrete dimensions in a local mix that enhances what is universal. We believe that if the general norms of morality and social justice are neglected, by discriminatory support of a minority against other, or even against majority, in an American hegemonic protection, the general social and political reaction is to reject such democracy, but also reject the state that exported in this way its own idea of democracy. In our opinion, the export of such democracy was thought as ensuring a united hegemonic power in the process of globalization.

As long as the globalization process was a major concern of American administrations, through dynamism and entrepreneurial innovation, the American businesses made a good impression to the consumers around the world. Companies like Microsoft, IBM, McDonald's, Coca Cola etc. are renown around the world. Only that these companies built their global success because the other countries saw in the USA the nation that defends the equality of chances. When its military hegemony started to impose its own form of democracy in Middle East, North Africa, etc., causing human dramas condemned by people anywhere and when the USA neglected the trade agreements which it was part of, the interests of the leading state appeared without morality and the American type of globalization started being questioned.

The products *Made in USA* penetrated all the markets because they created a type of social seduction. Its political power that had to have a global presence also had to be imposed, while many of their subjective and defying behaviors induced contradictory feelings. The anti-American feeling may consist in an effect of a betrayed affective expectation. The expectations of people after removal of Saddam Hussein were high, while the consequences were catastrophic. The expectations of people after removal of Gaddafi were equally high, but what followed in Libya frightened people everywhere. The humankind expectations in conflict

management in the Near East gave some hope, but the subjectivism towards Israel and Saudi Arabia maintains a constant state of tension. Change support through local riots made political slogans that named USA the champion the international stability through generalization of American revolution trivial. United States, from the champion of international stability based on common principles, became the champion of imposing international stability based on its own national interest. The seduction towards the American economic culture is at stake due to stormy resentments born just when they thought the world accepted the American exceptionality. The international stability is in danger because of the storm created by the champion thereof, while the American security depends now on its capacity to calm down the storm it created.

The democracy of consensus by imposing American exception is already history. Defying the democratic bonds by USA led to a revival of alliances that even generated the two world wars, led to writing or rewriting maps, based on which the germs of new block economic policy were planted. The American type of globalization is not based on consensus anymore, but rather on national interest. Internally, the Americans defend the laws of democracy, but externally USA has become the champion of imposing the American interests at any cost. America does not want to lead anymore, but to rule. America no longer accepts anyone as an equal.

### **3. State sovereignty and international security in the new geopolitical conditions**

Because globalization brought with itself the discussion of national sovereignty and international security, this can be defined as a radical redistribution of power from state (that remains limited by borders and national culture) to private sector, corporations, non-governmental organizations, individuals, criminal groups – anybody can organize for action in a borderless, however super-state, regulated environment. Only that globalization was diversified and imposed with the blessing of powerful states, in their interest, with engagement of countries from their area of influence.

Consequently, globalization constantly eroded states' sovereignty, with emphasis on the little ones, which sometimes compromised the internal judicial order by the will of the God *Profit*. Characterizations of this type were and continue to be multiple. Imposing globalization was only possible by power of states, particularly the hegemonic state – the United States – closely followed by its allies. Yet, this attempt, the critics say, present the globalization and new liberalism for what they really are – doctrines and speeches that serve the interests of dominant power groups from the global market. Economic globalization had big corporations behind, a state of facts in which one can say that globalization was not a vehicle of the hegemonic state, but the hegemonic state was and still is a vehicle of globalization, in the interests of its own corporations. In this context, at the beginning of the new millennium, references were made to having the USA assume the role of single global power in leading world business, its economic vectors needed to rely on its military ones, that is its powerful air, naval or terrestrial forces, like a military fist that has to keep the world in an American colored security.

When globalization was annexed to corporations' liberty on the market, there was enough reason for the state power to dress as required by the market. Based on this, one can say that the communist ideology was defeated by the capitalist one that wore the cape of globalization, but just after celebration of victory, capitalist hegemony defeated the foundations of market freedom by supporting the providential exception. More powerful than states, the strategic partnerships, dressed up like international conventions, became vectors above state power. Democracy became a market product, being sold to the highest bidder. In this current, even the globalizing companies became true political vectors, financing on a case by case basis political parties, making or unmaking governments, influencing the legal and judicial regimes. The recent history proves the apparition of new states that started to exist as long as they were compliant with the globalization ideas directed by the globally recognized superpower, USA, and by countries in its close proximity, particularly from the EU. States like Czech Republic, Slovakia, as well as the states (*figure 1.*) resulted from dismantling Yugoslavia - Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Northern Macedonia – affirmed their independence being immediately recognized as such by EU and USA, some of them being even militarily supported. Most of these states entered under

*GLOBALIZATION FAILURE AND THE RISKS TO  
THE EUROPEAN AND GLOBAL SECURITY*

---

the influence of the states that blessed their independence, thus accepting to open all the doors to the market globalization principles. Only that some sovereign states, which were labelled as evil axis, e.g. Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, even Syria, by defying international laws, were dismantled by military force, the relative state order in these countries being replaced with a social anarchy hard to control.



*Figure 1. States derived from former Yugoslavia.<sup>9</sup>*

The current globalization, supported by great powers of the world, received a deadly blow from the moment the hegemonic state, USA, decided to no longer respect the global conventions it was part of, because the principles of these conventions did not comply anymore with its national

---

<sup>9</sup> The dismantling of Yugoslavia, *Wikipedia*, available at <https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Destr...>, accessed on 28.01.2020. *Vojvodina is an autonomous province from the Serbian Territory of Vojvodina nowadays inhabited ever since the Paleolithic age. At the end of 1st century B.C., Romans occupied and incorporated Vojvodina in Pannonia province. Sirmium, a Roman town situated in vicinity of Sremska Mitrovica today, became the administrative center of Inferior Pannonia. The Province was abandoned by Romans in 395 A.C. 5th-6th centuries, assimilating the native population (Tracs-Dacians, Illyrians, Celts).*

interests. The globalized world – based on free trade of capital, stocks, and labor – was dismayed, as the leading state started to behave as if it was a double standard. Countries that built their prosperity on actual globalization principles supported by USA, i.e. the EU, Canada, Japan, countries from South America, etc. are now in the situation of dealing with the relations generated after the adopted conventions and to think about new relations with the USA only.

In the Millennium Declaration of United Nations, adopted by General Assembly of United Nations in the 54<sup>th</sup> session, the fundamental principles that should form the basis of world legal order were reaffirmed, the said principles being sustained in the OSCE Summit in Istanbul, in 2000, but which unfortunately started being ignored, rendering the states in an impossible situation to have benchmarks in management of relationships thereof. As such, one can justifiably say that: *„Despite the official positions of UN and OSCE, in the latest years there is an attempt to reduce until denial the importance of respecting the principle of non-interference in the states' internal affairs; moreover, it is claimed that, in the current historic conditions, another principle may be imposed, that there is actually a right to interfere in the said internal affairs. As a matter of fact, this right could refer to the protection of human rights, that, under current circumstances, will fall out of state jurisdiction and into international one; from this the formulation of a right to interfere in the humanitarian problems”*<sup>10</sup>.

All these examples prove the enormous risks to European and global security, considering that *„The new American preventive self-defense is, without doubt, a tentative to overthrow the discipline in using force contained in the United Nations Charter, particularly in Art. 2, Paragraph 4, therein. Considering the imperative and really fundamental nature of this latest norm, which the entire international system is relying on, its compliance should be either passing to a new historical phase, marked by bringing war back to legitimacy and usage thereof as a tool for international relations, and by collapsing the principle of sovereign equality of the states, or to be considered as a global crime”*<sup>11</sup>. Inspired by a quote

---

<sup>10</sup> Constantin Vlad, *Relații internaționale politico-diplomatice contemporane*, Editura Fundația României de Măine, București, 2001, p. 89.

<sup>11</sup> Fabio Marcelli, „Gli contro il diritto internazionale l'illiceità della guerra preventiva”, în revista *Giano. Pace, ambiente, problemi globali*, no. 42/2002.

of the President of USA „ We will cooperate with other nations to deny, contain, and curtail our enemies' efforts to acquire dangerous technologies. And, as a matter of common sense and self-defense, America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed.”<sup>12</sup>, the strategy of preventive war that flows from the America's International Strategy, 2002, confirms the following important directions to act internationally „... direct and continuous action using all the elements of national and international power; immediate focus will be those terrorist organizations of global reach; destroying the threat before it reaches our borders; we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting preemptively; denying further sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists by convincing or compelling states to accept their sovereign responsibilities.”<sup>13</sup>.

### Conclusions

In our opinion, the old globalization failed. Some form of globalization is wanted, but that can be subjected to the interests of the hegemonic state, USA. In case of disobedience, any state, may that be a former ally, can be considered as joining the evil axis, supporting all the consequences: economic, financial, and military. A type of globalization that has as foundation the principle *you are either with me or against me* is a global warning that makes the transition from *our globalization* to *my globalization*.

One can easily observe that today, on the background of globalization failure, the differences between the states regarding peaceful regulation thereof tends to anarchy, leading to some forms of disorder in international relationships. Due to violation of principles, stated by international laws, by the powerful states and coming back to using force in solving the differences between thereof, lead to major changes of balance of

---

<sup>12</sup> Paul Hirst, *Război și putere în secolul 21. Statul, conflictul militar și sistemul internațional*, Editura Antet, București, 2001, pp.14-16.

<sup>13</sup> U.S. National Security Strategy, 2002 and 2010, available at <https://ro.scribd.com/document/223347336/Strategia-de-Securitate-SUA-2002-si-SUA-2010-2>, accessed on 03.03.2020.

power between states and changes in the general security architecture. The UN dissolution as well as other regional security organizations, that had and still have stated the mission to preserve world peace, respecting human rights, international cooperation and compliance with international laws, will lead to a rethinking of international relations among the world states and of global and regional security system.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Strategia de Securitate Națională a SUA, 2002 și SUA 2010, available at <https://ro.scribd.com/document/223347336/Strategia-de-Securitate-SUA-2002-si-SUA-2010-2>, accessed on 03.03.2020.
- BRZEZINSKI Z., *Marea dilemă: a domina sau a conduce*, Editura Scripta, București, 2005.
- CLINTON B., his Speech at World Economic Forum, January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2000.
- CLINTON B., Speech delivered at Nebraska University, December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2000.
- HIRST P., *Război și putere în secolul 21. Statul, conflictul military și sistemul internațional*, Editura Antet, București, 2001.
- GUILLERMO de la Dehera, *Învingători și învinși în globalizare*, Editura Historia, București, 2007.
- KENNETH R., “The purchasing power parity puzzle”, *Journal of Economic Literature*, June, 1996.
- MARCELLI F., “Gli contro il diritto internazionale illiceita della guerra preventive”, în revista *Giano. Pace, ambiente, problemi globali*, no. 42/2002.
- MUNDELL R., “International trade and factor mobility”, 1957, *American review*, 47, June.
- PORTER M., *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, free Press, New York, 1990.
- VLAD C., *Relații internaționale politico-diplomatice contemporane*, Editura Fundația României de Măine, București, 2001.