III. Globalisation and the Future of Nation States

The Three Dimensions of Globalization

Professor Peeter Miiursepp
International University Audentes

Introduction - what do we normally Mean by Globalization?

Globalization is a term covering a wide range of political, economic and cultural trends. The term has become one of the most fashionable catchwords of contemporary political and academic debate. According to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, globalization often functions as little more than a synonym for one or more of the following phenomena: the pursuit of classical liberal (or "free market") policies in the world economy ("economic liberalization"), the growing dominance of western (or even American) forms of political, economic, and cultural life ("westernization" or "Americanization"), the proliferation of new infonnation technologies (the "Internet Revolution"), as well as the notion that humanity stands at the threshold of realizing one single unified community in which major sources of social conflict have vanished ("global integration") (Stanford 2006, p. 1).

From the year 2002 report by the International Monetary Fund we can read that: "Globalization, a term in common usage since the 1980s,... is an extension beyond national borders of the same market forces that have operated for centuries at all levels of human economic activity-village markets, urban industries, or financial centers... Global markets offer greater opportunity ... But markets do not necessarily ensure that the benefits of increased efficiency are shared by all. Countries must be prepared to embrace the policies needed, and in the case of the poorest countries may need the support of the international community as they do so (Globalization 2002, pp. 1-2).

The Three Ps of Globalization

There is a well-known thought experiment widely used in philosophy about six blind men describing an elephant. We may well encounter an analogous difficulty in case we try to explain globalization on the basis of one discipline. For the economist, globalization is the emergence of a global market, for the historian, an epoch dominated by global capitalism, for the sociologist, it underscores the celebration of diversity as well as the convergence of social preferences in matters of lifestyle and social values, for the political scientist, the gradual erosion of state sovereignty. Globalization looks for a multidisciplinary approach by definition.

According to Muqtedar Khan, globalization can be described as a three-dimensional concept: it is a phenomenon, it is a philosophy and it is a process (Khan 2003, p. 1). Alternatively to the disciplinary approach, economic globalization, political globalization and cultural globalization can be explored in the context of each 'P'.

As a phenomenon, globalization manifests the extremely intricate interconnectedness of human life across the planet. For example, we have always been sharing the same environment on our planet. However, we didn't become aware of this until the recently started debate about global warming.

The global interconnectedness is becoming the dominant character of our political, cultural, economic

and natural environments. "Driving SUVs in North America and cutting trees in Brazil can immediately raise the prospects of skin cancer in Australia - or affect the crops in India through climate changes *{ibid.,* p. 1).

Holding a global vision has become the necessary pre-requisite for effective policy and strategy. Governments and corporations cannot make successful interventions in the polity or the economy without anticipating and preparing for global consequences. For Muqtedar Khan, this is the philosophy of globalization. Needless to say, the treatment of the philosophy of globalization has to be taken much further. We need not reach the very depth of the Heideggerian approach concerning becoming ready for one God to come to rescue. However, it would not be too much to give some special attention to the thoughts of Martin Heidegger in the context of our topic. But let us first finish the general three Ps story initiated by Muqtedar Khan.

The world is rapidly integrating in all spheres. People have converging expectations concerning economy, politics and culture. There is a nice positive moment in globalization as a process. Obviously, citizens from all political persuasions can find elements they welcome. Those on the right favor the spread of free market and investment flows, those on the left support the emergence of a truly global culture. This is very positive in the light of the knowledge that we are actually participants in an inevitable and irreversible process.

Those on the left and in NGOs would prefer the world to have vehicles such as the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Those on the right would advocate the WTO.

"Thus, faith and interest in globalism drives globalization - and, in turn, globalization spreads globalism" *(ibid.,* p. 2). Globalization as aprocess seeks to eliminate political and geographical distances between peoples. The two key engines of the process are the technology revolution and politico-economic liberalization.

We should by no means underestimate the role of the Internet. The World Wide Web has created a virtual reality that has produced a revolutionary change in our everyday meaning of time and distance. It is very easy to communicate with people from very far away and coming from another culture in a computer chat room. However, we cannot conclude from this physical fact that people all around the world have suddenly come much closer to each other than ever before.

With globalization, states are collectively creating an alternate edifice of international norms and regulations through international bodies such as the UN and the WTO. The new environment of liberalization has made it easier to quickly move people, ideas, capital and goods across borders. In that sense, globalization is the heightened mobility of ideas, peoples, goods and capital across borders. "This enhanced mobility is the chief process of globalization and its engines are liberalization and technology" *(ibid).*

The Philosophy of Globalization - in the Wake of Martin Heidegger

Traditionally, philosophy is an inquiry into essences. If we apply more up-to-date terminology, we might reiterate this statement by saying that philosophy is about conceptual analysis. Anyway, the philosophy of globalization cannot be limited just to telling a story of globalization in general terms. We need to take a look into the essence of the concept. Above, we made the general point concerning globalization being a process, which takes us closer together and actually quite dramatically so. Right here already, we get in touch with the core of the problem. The problem can be stated as follows: by coming close together in the sense of everyday communication and common sense knowledge, are we really closer to each other?

The answer of Martin Heidegger would be a clear 'no'. However, what is the good reason, if any, to stick to general statements of quite dark, possibly nazi-minded, German philosopher who died before globalization really became as issue. Perhaps there is no good reason. Still, the best one seems to be uttered by Heidegger himself. Already in the year 1935, in his general course about the foundations of metaphysics, namely that philosophy is never 'in time'. Much of the technology facilitating globalization today was not available in Heidegger's lifetime. However, much of it was available already. It is widely known that technology in the sense of *techne* was something very fundamental for the German thinker, even more so than science in the sense of research. Therefore, we have good reasons enough to take the Heideggerian approach to technology as the basis for our P in the sense of philosophy.

Martin Heidegger and Questioning Concerning Technology

In his famous essay "The Question Concerning Technology" Martin Heidegger looks for the essence *Wesen* of technology. According to ancient doctrine, the essence of a thing is considered to be *what the thing is.*

Asking this question concerning technology we get two typical answers. One says: Technology is a means to an end. The other says: Technology is a human activity. For Heidegger these two definitions belong together. It is a human activity to posit ends and procure and utilize the means. "The manufacture and utilization of equipment, tools, and machines, the manufactured and used things themselves, and the needs and ends that they serve, all belong to what technology is." Thus, technology is an *instrumentum.*

"The current conception of technology, according to which it is a means and a human activity, can therefore be called the instrumental and anthropological definition of technology" writes Heidegger (1977). Technology is a means and human activity up to this day. If the jet aircraft and high-frequency apparatus are means to ends, then so is nanotechnology and producing GMO-s, which were still absent when Heidegger wrote his essay.

The Role of Causality

According to Heidegger, wherever instrumentality reigns, there reigns causality. Saying so, Heidegger points to the fourfold Aristotelian causality. We have been accustomed to representing cause as that which brings something about. In the connection of technology, to bring about means to obtain results. This standard is being set by the *causa efficiens,* just one among the four causes.

In order to grasp the essence of technology, we need to consider the four causes as belonging together as forming a unified entity. The end in question cannot be just the end in the sense of *causa efficiens,* but rather the end in the sense of *causa finalis,* telic finality, supported by the other three causes.

We need to remember that *causa, casus* belongs to the verb *cadere,* "to fall". This means that something falls out as a result in a way. The corresponding original Greek word is *aition.* That to which something else is indebted *(das, was ein anderes verschuldet)* (Heidegger 1977).

Therefore, the causality we are dealing with here is not the necessitating causality of exact natural science or analytical philosophy. What we can learn from the Aristotelian-Heideggerian approach is the overall connectedness and mutual dependence that presses contemporary technological solutions upon us. We are part of the process and cannot get out of it. However, by recognizing our condition we can still influence the process at crucial moments. We just need to understand that the moment is crucial and to see the perspectives of positive development.

The Purpose of Technology

The Greek word *telos* is all too often translated as "aim" or "purpose". Such translation, although correct in the direct sense, gives way to misinterpretations. For instance, for a sacrificial vessel, the *telos* is responsible for what as matter and what for as aspect are together coresponsible for the sacrificial vessel.

Today, the Heideggerian example of the sacrificial vessel may not be too impressive. We should rather be concerned about nanotechnology or the application of GMO-s. Let us analyze, whether the explanation based on the four cause approach still holds in the case of nanotechnology. Matter is clearly involved here. There is no technology that is not based on some kind of material foundation, at least some kind of field or wavelike influence is always present. The situation is more complicated in the case of the formal cause. The silver sacrificial vessel, a saw mill in Schwarzwald or even a hydroelectric power station have a real form in the material sense. Today, we can encounter technological solutions, where no visible form as such is present. However, the form as a bearer and guide for the process is still present in any process. While we can probably have doubts about the initial Aristotelian idea, Heidegger clearly has just this in mind. There is really no problem concerning *causa efficiens.* In any ongoing process, the efficient cause is necessarily always present.

In the case of *causa finalis* we can add another dimension, which was probably not considered by Heidegger, but was present for Aristotle. The *telos* is not the end in any sense in the Ancient Greek tradition.

It is an end, but a new beginning at the same time. For Aristotle, the result of the impact of the final cause is rather an ongoing process than a static condition. The same attitude has been picked up by some contemporary methodologists of science. The best example here is the self-organization theory of Ilya Prigogine. The Prigoginian approach is in full accord with the four cause theory of the Stagirite. It may well be that it could serve as the principal methodology for globalization as well. However, this analysis has to be postponed at this point.

Modern Technology as Ge-stell

Heidegger's treatment of technology is most strongly based on the somewhat mystic meaning of Ge-stell (Enframing). In order to think ourselves into the essence of technology, we have to understand that technology can only be set into the nature. The opposite should never happen. By resetting the nature with the aim of fitting it into our own technological creation is the ultimate reason of the problem concerning technology. According to Heidegger (1977): "The revealing that rules throughout modern technology has the character of setting-upon, in the sense of a challenging-forth". "The revealing reveals itself its own manifoldly interlocking paths, through regulating their course. This regulating itself is, for its part, everywhere secured. Regulating and securing even become the chief characteristics of the challenging revealing" (Heidegger 1977).

Here, Heidegger uses the verb *stellen* in different forms, creating a real family of meanings. Such playing around with the German language is almost impossible to translate. In English translations, normally "set" is used.

In order to unconceal the essence of modern technology, one has to understand the challenging setting-upon. This concept was brightly illustrated by Heidegger by means of his famous example built around the river Rhine: constructing a power station instead of building a wooden bridge or ordering a tour group for inspection.

In our days, the setting of nature into our technological needs has been developed further. The result is the feeling that objective reality around us can be organized along the direct rules of our understanding and needs, a very dangerous idea that may be amplified by the progress of globalization.

Epilogue

Unfortunately, there has been very little progress in the human understanding since Heideggerian times concerning the issue of technology. We are still under the spell of traditional human rationality, the belief that we as human beings are able to organize reality in the way that seems useful for us. We have not been able to learn the lessons Heidegger has tried to teach us. He may be blamed for his obscure manner of teaching of course. However, our learning ability has been even more deficient.

Even today, attempting to apply the most modern technological solutions, we normally fail to think according the lines of self-organization, accounting for Being as unchangeable by the will of us humans and Man as Da-sein, as a shepherd of Being. Without obtaining these abilities we have no hope of understanding the essence of the ICT available to us today. Moreover, if we cannot make sense of the means that bring us close together, we will not be any closer in the end.

Globalization is on its way. We have to improve fast in order to be ready for rational and effective participation.

References

Globalization: Threat or Opportunity 2002, *What is Globalization*?, [12.03.2008], http://www.princeton.edu/~ssrc/globwebb.html.

Heidegger, M. 1977, „The Question Concerning Technology", W. Lovitt, The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays, Harper Torchbooks, pp. 3-35.

Khan, M. 2003, *Teaching Globalization,* Global Policy Forum, [12.03.2008], http://www.globalpolicy.org/.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2006, *Globalization,* [12.03.2008], http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/.