

Conceptual Principles of the Theoretical Identification of Globalization's Time Frames*

TIMUR KALCHENKO**

ABSTRACT. This article examines and summarizes theoretical approaches in order to select and substantiate the main concepts for identifying the eras of global transformations. As has been pointed out, the main problem of a systematic theoretical-methodological analysis of globalization remains the uncertainty of the direction (diachronic or synchronic) of the economic stage of global development. Based on modern methodological research, the article attempts to define clearly the terms «internationalization», «regionalization», and «globalization».

KEY WORDS. Globalization, internationalization, proto-globalization, integration, mega-society, modernization, cyclicity, synchronism of development, transformation, multi-polarity.

Introduction

The key problem in determining the historical periods and time frames of globalization is that of a definitional-methodological type. It concerns the substantiation of a number of discussion points, among which the correlations between the terms «globalization» and «internationalization», between «globalization» and «integration», determining the forms and results of global transformations, and finally, the key question of the systemic essence of the term «globalization» are principal.

There are countless different approaches and theoretical configurations that offer tools for perceiving global problems, for revealing their essence, and, correspondingly, that establish certain time frames of globalization. These approaches can be narrowed down to four basic concepts that mirror the historical time periods of this phenomenon:

1) globalization as a change in the form of historical process (the concept of «archaic globalization»);

* This article was translated from its original in Ukrainian.

** *Timur Valeryevich Kalchenko* is a candidate of economic science and assistant professor at the Department of International Management, Kyiv National Economic University. From 1996 to 1997 he studied at the University of Toronto (Canada) where he carried out research on banking management, titled, «Strategic international operations of Ukrainian commercial banks;» he also studied in the MBA program (second year) and participated in a series of academic conferences. He is the author of several academic works.

- 2) globalization as a modern economic phenomenon (the concept of realists);
- 3) proto-globalization;
- 4) globalization as a timeless property that immanently belongs to the world community (the concept of E. Azroyants).

Description of the basic concepts and approaches to determining globalization's time periods

The first of the four concepts above is chiefly supported in the works of R. Robertson, M. Waters, G. Terborn, F. Brodel, L. Tarrow, A. Maslow, G. Digilensky, Y. Krasin, Y. Pakhomov, and others.

For example, R. Robertson and M. Waters consider globalization a long historical process, beginning in the 15th and 16th centuries, whereas G. Terborn defines at least six waves of globalization, the earliest one being the expansion of the world religions in the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D.

This Western scholars' point of view is recognised by some Russian researchers. G. Pomeranz, the Russian academic, argues against historical exclusiveness of the «globalization» occurrence (an opinion shared by G. Digilensky). «... In the 2nd millennium B.C. conquerors began to call themselves 'czars of the four parts of the world'. Since that time, we can talk about the start of globalization»¹, says Pomeranz. He walks the reader up «the stairs of globalization», through the stages of consolidation of «social units that were joined by a common faith and authority». The author considers monotheism and similar processes a form of globalization that took place in «other civilized dimensions». After that, says Pomeranz, the imperial-confessional form of globalization emerges, where every empire stood for its own plan for world order. The Muslim project gave way to colonial trade connections dominated by Christian Europe. The next form to appear was industrial globalization, accompanied by «a concert of nation-states», the accumulation of industrial wealth and material values. At last, according to Pomeranz, «knowledge that provided for direct profit came forward and took the lead, and knowledge that elevated the spirit faded in the rear.» In other words, some «internal decline» occurred, which, according to the author, is the reason for the emergence of today's form

¹ Pomeranz, G.S. Experience in the Philosophy of Solidarity // Voprosy Filosofii, 1991. — № 3. — P. 59.

of globalization, namely the electronic-financial form. According to this approach, globalization is a mere historical occurrence that constantly has accompanied the history of mankind and taken different shapes at different stages of the world's technical and social evolution.²

Other scholars go even further in their detailed elaboration of the forms of globalization. Hellenism, «the three Romes», Arabic caliphates, the Great Geographical Discoveries, etc., are attributed to globalization in their works. The American professor, W. Mingolo, on the contrary, considers globalization to be only the third step in a thousand-year transformation, the first being the collapse of the colonial system and the second the collapse of the socialist system.³

Even O. Bilorus, while criticizing the proponents of «archaic globalization», distinguishes among the following phases of its particular acceleration:

- The first phase, the creation of empires based on trade interests, merger of the state and religion (Rome, Byzantium, China, Kiev-Rus');
- The second phase, the period of the Great Geographical Discoveries and creation of economic empires and first global corporations (the 15th century);
- The third phase, the industrial revolution (Europe, the 18th century) and formation of international markets;
- The fourth phase, the epoch of the world wars of the 20th century (1914–1918, 1939–1945, 1948–1989 (the economic Cold War));
- The fifth phase, the information revolution (starting from the second half of the 20th century).⁴

Such academic points of view are supported, though not directly, by Russian scholar Y. Krasin who shows his support in a new perspective, interpreting globalization as an antinomic process represented by contradictory integration tendencies. He notes, in particular, «...in the modern theories of globalization there is a vivid overestimation of the importance of world integration, and no less evident an underestimation of the pluralistic tendency».⁵

The argumentation of the proponents of the first concept is logical from the perspective of globalization as a process that transformed some regions of the world (although, we can perhaps agree, it is a one-sided and undeveloped thesis). According to F. Braudel, the scope of world expanses depends on the historical perceptions of the period. In the Mediterranean, for example, the important global

² Pomeranz, G.S. Experience in the Philosophy of Solidarity // *Voprosy Filosofii*, 1991. — № 3. — P. 61.

³ Pomeranz, G.S. Experience in the Philosophy of Solidarity // *Voprosy Filosofii*, 1991. — № 3. — P. 63.

⁴ Bilorus, O.G. The Economic System of Globalism. — Kyiv: KNEU, 2003 — P. 165.

⁵ Topical questions of globalization (round table) // *MEiMO*. — 1999. — №4. — P. 52.

events were those directly connected to this seaside region. But later on, the center moved to the northern Europe. For this reason, as F. Brodel explains, in every historical epoch global explorers, to the best of their ability, try to make use of the world within the known limits and, therefore, every time period of the world development is characterized by its own level of globalization.⁶

Besides, according to Pomeranz, a strong argument for «archaic global evolution» can be made whereby, at every level of globalization, powerful social units linked by a common faith and authority always played causal roles. In other words, these were the agents whose foreign policy could be an instrument for organizing a community out of social units «by diplomatic or military means». Whether this policy was conducted in a multi-polar world or in a world dominated by a single «center of power» was of no importance. Pomeranz also notes that the «level of globalization» at the beginning of the 21st century does not contradict the above argument: the world is being globalized by a dozen industrially developed countries, multinational companies and organizations created at their initiative, with the remaining countries either adapting to the new conditions or staying away from global transformations.⁷

The voices of Paul Hirst and Graham Thompson are added to the large chorus of supporters of the first concept. Hirst and Thompson believe that firstly, today's level of integration, interdependency, and openness «... of national economies is not unprecedented. On the contrary, during the Gold Standard days before World War I the level of independence was much lower for countries with stable economies than it is now... . Secondly, the idea of some new leverages emerging in the globalization era has no basis. All traditional leverages and tools have survived the centuries and are still active... . Thirdly, there are only a few facts about an increase in economic interdependency accompanying global transformations... .»⁸

Peter Taylor's point of view may be seen as transitional between the first and second concepts: «... It makes sense to define globalization as a 'necessary myth' or 'ideology'. However, at the same time it is necessary to carefully examine this phenomenon and not discard the material processes that are going on and cause a demand for such an event... .»⁹

⁶ Yakovets Y.V. Globalisation and Civilizations Interaction. — Moscow: Closed Company «Publishing House 'Ekonomika'», 2003. — P. 211.

⁷ Pomeranz, G.S. Experience in the Philosophy of Solidarity // *Voprosy Filosofii*, 1991, №3. — P. 63.

⁸ Hirst P., Thompson G. Globalization in question. Second edition — Great Britain — Polity, 1999. — P. 60—61.

⁹ Demystifying globalization. Edited by Colin Hay and David Marsh — Great Britain, University of Birmingham — Palgrave, 2000 — P. 65.

Among the most ardent advocates of the second concept are the Western scholars K. Omae, T. Lewitt, and F. Fukuyama; Russian scholars A. Weber, A. Neklessa, V. Kuznetsov, V. Yadov; and Ukrainian scholars D. Lukyanenko, O. Bilorus, A. Galchinsky, A. Geyets and others. They criticize the concept of «archaic globalization» and consider a definition of its past forms a clear anachronism. They explain that the anachronism exists because the continental shift of the world economy caused not only the consequences, but also, quite surprisingly, its own preconditions. A new subject of research was created by scholars shifting their focal point of studies to increasing volumes of international trade, activities of multinational companies and organizations, global communication networks and multicultural links. The intensity of such tendencies in world economic relations after the continental shift drew attention and caused a detailed reconstruction (in reality, a construction by analogy) of similar processes of the past, determined the phases and preconditions for globalization, and linked in one logic chain different events and tendencies of the past that were separated by decades and centuries and were of little importance in the life of people at that time.

Nevertheless, it should be taken into consideration that the structural units, that is empires (if we start the phases of globalization from the first millennium) were sporadic, declined and disappeared from the world map over the course of time, and that world economic relations played a secondary role, being natural and locally-concentrated.

According to A. Weber, due to its own intensity and expansion at both the macro and micro-social level, globalization presents a stark contrast compared to the previous processes. Therefore, the models created by theoreticians of globalizations are of no use for the analysis of tendencies in the distant past. Defining these tendencies as «globalizational» is anti-historical because the tendencies would be featured on an unrealistic scale in terms of intensity and coverage, which also makes the term «globalization» pointless.¹⁰ This conclusion can be simply defended by a logical rule that can be expressed in this way: «the more a term embodies, the less sense it actually contains». If we agree with Robertson, Waters, not to mention Terborn, and define globalization as any international, intercultural connections, geographical discoveries by Europeans starting from the 15th, or even the 3rd century A.D., then the term «globalization» includes everything we want and, at the same time,

¹⁰ Veber, A. B. Globalization and Stable Development: Problem fields and Possible Scenarios // Materials of the permanent interdisciplinary seminar of the Scientists' Club «Global World», issue 11. — Moscow, 2001. — P. 68.

nothing in particular. The identification of occurrences of different proportions and of a different quality as «globalization», says V. Kuznetsov, transforms this specific analytical term that explains the nature of current processes to a vague abstract definition of a trivial fact that individuals and the products of their activities move on the planet's surface.

As Anthony Giddens frankly points out, «... globalization as we now are facing is in many cases not only a new, but also a revolutionary event... . So, it is not a single process, but rather a complex interaction of many controversial processes or processes that even go in opposite directions».¹¹

Natural transformations, so evident in the last decades, are used as a strong argument for the second concept in the works of Sigmund Brown, who declares: «...Looking back into the past, we contemplate the question — to what degree were geophysical factors, natural or artificial borders of territorial units, the uniqueness of every people and cultural unity ... in essence, the mere conceptual derivatives or material manifestations of 'limited speed?' ... Paul Verio thinks that even if the declaration of Francis Fukuyama about 'the end of history' is premature, nevertheless today we can surely declare 'the end of geography'. Distances do not matter anymore, and the idea of geographical borders in today's real world is increasingly difficult to support...»¹²

The attempts of the proponents of the first concept to define the founding fathers of globalization theories are also criticized. For example, O. Ianni and M. Waters link the beginning of the globalization discussion to the works of I. Kant, K. Marx, and other classics of sociology. V. Yadov considers this approach anti-historical. Studying the socio-cultural changes of the 20th century, we can separate the subjects of theoretical research of the classics and today's scholars, defining them as «internationalization» and «globalization», respectively. According to advocates of the second concept, internationalization can be logically defined as the strengthening of economic and political ties at the level of national institutions (states, international, non-governmental organizations, but on a national scale), along with the continental spread of institutions of the industrial society. It was noticed to take place in the 19th century and became a subject of studies for the classical theories of development. A key word in studies of early industrial and industrial civilization (up to the 1960s) was the term «national»: national

¹¹ Giddens, A. *The Disappearing World: How Globalization Changes our Life* — Moscow: Publishing House «Ves Myr», 2004: 27—29.

¹² Brown, Z. *Globalization. Consequences for Man and Society*. — Moscow: Publishing g House «Ves Myr», 2004: 23—24.

market, national economy, national sovereignty, wars among national states and their unions, etc. That served to create economic, sociologic, cultural theories and concepts without bringing in the idea of global processes.

This definition, however, is not sufficient for a theoretical and practical generalization of the current processes. These processes are different from the previous phases of internationalization. In the first half of the 20th century, statistics register a sharp contrast between a slow fluency of the previous tendencies and a wave-like dynamic of the following. That contrast of quantitative parameters points to a transition from internationalization to globalization. The term «globalization» should also include, according to A. Neklessa, both the unprecedented intensification of internationalization processes to the degree of becoming immediate factors of social changes at the sub-national level, and the intensification of trans-national individual and group relations. Therefore, due to the difference in the subject, such classics of economic science as Marx and Kant are predecessors, not the founders, of globalization theory. Moreover, classical theories of social development principally differ from globalization theories by logical structure.

The third concept is in the context of the previous one and defines the two phases of globalization, proto-global and modern, the phase of liberal globalization.

The OECD classification does not contradict this approach, dividing globalization into the following three phases:

- Internationalization (from the middle of the 19th century) that corresponds to the development of export (proto-global phase of the world development)
- Trans-nationalization (especially since 1945), connected to an increase in foreign investment flow
- Globalization (since 1980s).

Identifying globalization with the development of international trade connections and the increase of national states' monetary interdependence, some researchers have come to the conclusion that from the 1870s until 1913 (the beginning of the proto-global phase) the level of economic interdependence among industrial countries according to many of those parameters was no lower than at the end of the 20th century.

In the proto-global phase, according to the proponents of the third concept, the world entered an active phase of mutual cooperation on the basis of the propagation of trade and investment relations on a global scale due to scientific and technical innovations. Britain, with its navy, industrial, and financial potential had become the guarantor for that first wave of globalization, taking control over the main routes

of commodities' transfer, providing stability for international payments with the help of the Bank of England and the Pound Sterling. The transatlantic cable in 1866 reduced the time of information exchanges between London and New York by a thousand. And the telephone made it possible to obtain information within minutes.

R. Cobden and G. Bright became ideologists of the first decades of globalization. They convincingly (in the eyes of many economists and industrialists) defended their thesis that free trade would inevitably lead to economic growth and, thanks to the unexpected prosperity based on interdependence, humanity would be rid of conflict. Generalizing the preceding research, J. Shumpeter proclaimed in his classical work «Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy» the idea of «creative destruction», i.e., the permanent substitution of more effective methods of production for less effective. Thus, the idea of the main feature of the time, namely traditions giving way to innovations, obtained recognition.

The idea of globalization's beneficial influence for alleviating pains of the «inclined toward conflicts» world has its strongest support in the book by N. Angel «The great illusion» (1909). In the book, five years prior to World War I, the author argued the impossibility of global conflicts due to economic interdependence having been established in the whole world: before 1914 Britain and Germany occupied the second place as trade partners of each other; and at that, the shares in foreign trade of Britain and Germany were 52% and 38% of their GNP, respectively. Angel declared that America, France, Germany, Britain were not inclined to start wars: «How can it be that modern life with an advantage of mighty industrial activities and, at the same time, a decrease in the importance of militarism will turn again to militarism, destroying the fruits of peace?»¹³

August 1914 showed all the groundlessness of the irrevocability for a global approach of the nations. World War I slowed the process of growth of economic, information, and communication interdependence. The benefits of globalization yielded to geopolitical calculations. The years between 1914 and 1945 were a time of factual self-sufficiency of the world's main producers.

The 70-year period from the beginning of World War I until the end of the Cold War, according to A. Utkin, was a transitional period between the first and second globalizations. Only in the last decades of the 20th century, after the two world wars, the Great Depression, and innumerable social experiments resulting in a standoff of the systems, the liberal economic order, established in the 19th century, was restored in the world. The second birth (or revival) of globalization commenced at the end of the 1970s, on the grounds of the incredible revolutions in

¹³ Utkin, A. I. Globalisation: the Process and Perception. — Moscow: Logos, 2002. — P. 13.

information, telecommunication and digital technologies. The «death» of far distances became an important factor that changed the world between the two phases, or two periods of globalization. At the beginning of the 1980s the heads of the influential economic establishments, the Treasury Department, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, located in the capital of the United States, came to an agreement that the main obstacle for economic development were customs and other barriers to global trade. To tear down those barriers became a global goal. Thus, «the Washington consensus» had been formed, opening the doors to the liberal-type globalization.¹⁴

According to Immanuel Wallerstein, «...We enter the period of anarchic transition from the existing system in the world to some new structure. As always in times like this, nobody has any control over the situation, particularly such a fading leader-state like the United States ... It is absolutely unclear if we will come finally to a more or less egalitarian and democratic world order. However, the world we enter will become for the next decades a consequence of our concrete collective actions.»¹⁵

The fourth globalization concept «as some timeless property that immanently belong to the world community» is founded in philosophical terms in the works and lectures of E. Azroyants and M. Cheshkov, the Russian scholars.

The chief task of his concept, according to E. Azroyants, is the integration of the three previous concepts. The previous concepts have two key discrepancies, in his opinion. One is the determination of globalization's time frames, the other is the interpretation of the very term, which can be understood as a tendency, or a consequence (product) of a group of tendencies.

If globalization is a tendency, says E. Azroyants, this inevitably leads to the obtrusion of other tendencies with their own characteristics, and the final result of their interaction has to be expressed in some way. Today, the real significance of this result remains undetermined. On the other hand, when globalization is presented as the result of already existing tendencies, only those tendencies are pointed out. To eliminate the discrepancies, E. Azroyants believes, it is necessary to answer two questions: what is global (that is, the whole? its parts? structure?)? and what is the relationship between the terms «integration» and «globalization» (which one is covered by the other, or are they equivalent?)?¹⁶

¹⁴ Utkin, A. I. Globalisation: the Process and Perception. — Moscow: Logos, 2002. — P. 14.

¹⁵ Economy of knowledge: globalization challenges and Ukraine. Ed. by A.P. Galchinsky and others. — Kyiv, 2004: 214—215.

¹⁶ Azroyants, E. A. Globalization: Catastrophe or Way to Development? Modern Tendencies of the World Development and Political Ambitions. — Moscow: Publishing House «Novyi Vek», 2002. — P. 63.

The resulting argument, according to E. Azroyants, is that a historical process integrates, in its own forms and character, the spectrum of different tendencies that emerge, disappear, and mutually intertwine in an incredible way. Therefore, the process and tendency are correlated as a part and the whole, and the process, by its nature, is antinomic, whereas the tendency is homonomic.

Therefore, the historical process, represented as the development of a social system, is directed toward the achievement of its limited integrity. The purposeful function of the historical process should be called «globalization», according to the Russian scholar. The historical process's antinomy can be represented by two classes — integration tendencies and disintegration tendencies. The following can further represent these two classes:

Integration:

- Trans-nationalization
- Regionalization
- Imperialization
- Nationalization
- Ethno-socialization

Disintegration:

- Dissociation
- Ethno-sovereignty
- Restoration
- Asocialization
- Migration

Therefore, the globalization process over the course of time consists of certain phases, the characteristic forms of which subdivide them into historical types and steps. This subdivision is done with no intention of fullness and completeness, and among such historical types is tribal, clan, ethnic, ancient-imperial, monarchic, colonial, national, and international globalization. Globalization is a goal of the historical process, integration and disintegration are its dynamic-defining tendencies, and internationalization is the modern phase of globalization. This approach suggests to consider globalization not as a strategy that aims at homogeneity, but rather as the most important source of diversity, i.e., building of the whole out of different ingredients. Diversity here is a tendency, not a result. The result defines the vitality of the system and it cannot be identified with disorganization and chaos. Modern globalization and «globality» itself are fragmentary both by means of perception and by different manifestations of the civilization process. Every direction of the historical process and social-political activity has its own level, degree of advancement. Thus, E. Azroyants proposes a certain list of parameters for differentiating the globalization process by the direction

of activity. Within these parameters, it is possible to estimate the level of integration of a historical subject into the meta-area. Among the parameters he defines the following ones: natural, economic, political, technological, cultural, communicational and demographical.¹⁷

An alternative position to that of E. Azroyants can be seen in the views of Y. V. Shishkov, a proponent of a different globalization concept. He sees globalization as an occurrence which: firstly, emerges at a certain time, namely at the end of the 20th century; secondly, refers mostly to the economic sphere.¹⁸

In the opinion of this paper, despite the differences between the two approaches as for determination of globalization, these approaches have no insurmountable obstacles for getting closer to each other. On the one hand, Y.V. Shishkov considers globalization as a certain phase of the general process of world economic development; the phase has become a logical product of the entire history of economics. On the other hand, E.A. Azroyants, while characterizing the modern phase of evolution of the Mega-society, talks about the necessity «to define the features for evaluating the level of principal newness of changes going on in the system, and, in particular, in its structure».¹⁹ (Unlike it is generally accepted among economists, he calls this phase «internationalization», not «globalization»). Therefore, both E. Azroyants and Y. Shishkov accept the existence of universal virtues of human society, which lie not only in the constant intensification of relations and interdependencies, but also in the rise approximately since the 1980s of a qualitatively new phase of the development of world civilization, namely global.

Conclusions

The examined four concepts of globalization's time-space undoubtedly make sense, to a greater or lesser extent. Every one of them has its stronger and weaker sides, and can be criticized. The first concept of «archaic globalization» is one-sided (examines only one — either religious, or cultural, or geopolitical aspect of this process), and demonstrates the readiness to add global features to

¹⁷ Azroyants, E. A. Globalization: Catastrophe or Way to Development? Modern Tendencies of the World Development and Political Ambitions. — Moscow: Publishing House «Noviy Vek», 2002. — P. 65.

¹⁸ Shishkov, Y.V. Evolution of the World Community: Polarization or Increase of Homogeneity? // MEiMO, 1998, №9, p.19.

¹⁹ Azroyants, E. A. Globalization: Catastrophe or Way to Development? Modern Tendencies of the World Development and Political Ambitions. — Moscow: Publishing House «Noviy Vek», 2002. — P. 65.

any more or less significant historical event. The second concept categorically rejects the idea of possible cycle in the development of the world's economy. The third concept is partially beneath criticism due to certain discrepancies in its two-phase separation of global processes. Firstly, most of the economic events at the turn of the 20th century did not happen on a global scale. Secondly, the global problems were not considered to be so serious. Thirdly, it was states, not the peoples, that were coming closer as a result of these processes. The most logically grounded is the concept of E. Azroyants. But he demonstrates a somewhat untraditional approach to the categorical tools. This article believes that economic globalization is not a mere continuation and acceleration of the centuries-old process of internationalization, and not just its expansion. Economic globalization is a process of transition of the world economic space into a qualitatively new phase. An increase in the economic openness of countries, the liberalization of trade, international capital flow, all these terms are often called «globalization». The term is also used as a synonym for international integration. This terminological confusion leads to serious conceptual errors, for example, in defining the historical period when the origin of global processes took place, which, in turn, defines the essence of the term.

This article considers that in order to clearly establish the historical boundaries of globalization we should define the main associated categories; in other words, we should build a conceptual series of «internationalization-regionalization-united world-globalization» that delimits these similar, but methodologically different, concepts. The processes represented in this series have a common feature: they all determine the «going out and onto the international scene» process for a set of previously domestic affairs of a country. Differences between the processes lie in the conditions and time of origin of the corresponding events, in the essence of the events, their detailed social historical functions, in the scale, depth and intensity, in the set of subjects, and also in the long-and-short term results of these processes.

Internationalization is, in principle, universal by its subjects and space. The space it encompasses does not necessarily influence every, or most, participant(s) of the world economy. In some cases, internationalization was of a global caliber, although this process is the most frequent and effective on a local scale, and/or while accompanying some other kinds and directions of development. Internationalization as a phenomenon must have appeared early in history, simultaneously with the emergence of new well-defined social-territorial structures. The main function of internationalization is to provide for stable international connections in a real functioning world economic system.

This article argues that internationalization is a gradual intersection of technological and cultural standards that does not affect state sovereignty. Rather, state borders become semi-transparent.

Regionalization is often looked at as a characteristic feature of the world economy at the end of the 20th century. But it was also present as a factor in the creation and organization of the state, even in the Middle Ages. That confirms the thesis that history is a cycle of «building» and destroying states and other subjects of the world economy. Regionalization is one of the forms of «inclusion», its essence lies in forming new, larger integral units (social-territorial systems), unions, confederations, etc., on the basis of and due to the development of intensive and deep international contacts at the time.

The united and integrated world is not, most likely, a fruit of the 20th century. In some other forms it existed before. Unity and integrity of the world is not a quality that can be momentarily achieved. There may be different phases and levels of development on the way. Besides, contemporaries may not be able to see the already-created unity and integrity in their world for a long time; or in the opposite case, they may perceive their world as united and integrated, which has little to do with reality. A united and integrated world is the property of not only the world, but also civilization. This property is also a feature of their (the world and civilization) spiritual and/or material extroversion. A world like this, as well as regionalization, is possible, but not the final result of the development of internationalization processes in historical epochs. This result periodically resembles the results obtained in other coils of the spiral of history.

Internationalization is a historical-evolutional preparation for globalization, in a tactical sense — a direct and immediate front process of the latter. Globalization would not occur without large, long-term, and universal preceding processes of internationalization, the processes that prepare the material, cognitive, and political ground for globalization. The internationalization of different activities, relations, exchange processes and development exists as long as international relations themselves exist, whereas globalization emerged as an event in the second half of the 20th century. The subject of globalization is the whole spectrum of the subjects of the modern world economy, politics, and international life (the same is true for internationalization).

The difference between globalization and internationalization lies in the fact that globalization provokes the leveling of state borders, undermines the foundation for national sovereignty, lays the foundation for some kind of new, global community. Sharing many com-

mon features, globalization and internationalization nevertheless are qualitatively different processes. They can be considered as stages, one succeeding another. However, taking into consideration our knowledge about globalization, it is a principally new level of economic development. Countries influenced by internationalization can be seen as if they were in a different phase compared to countries of «globalization» type. Of course, there are no insurmountable obstacles between globalization and internationalization. If we focus our attention on the qualitative difference and not the first stage, then we can agree with the famous scholar V. Ramses who declares that «globalization looks more like a category — competitor of internationalization, more like an antithesis of some kind than its logical continuation, evolution. Although clear indications of the process of globalization...can take place in the course of internationalization, which is notable in the strengthening of interdependency between some countries».²⁰

However, all this is only the «tip» of the globalization process. Globalization is founded by the unity of the highest stage of capitalism, the techno-sphere as the highest material achievement of the capitalistic evolution, and the processes of functional stratification of the states that began in the 20th century.

«Bringing the world together», into one union, however contradictory, problematic, conflicting, and highly explosive it may be, will inevitably result in the establishment of a principally new type of relations (in addition to the already existing domestic and international), namely internal-global. For these relations, international relations are the fabric, whereas the vertical connections of internal-global relations will be formed around the most business-active states, their unions, integrations, and international organizations.

For this reason, the world of the first third of the 21st century may not be adequately described and perceived using the traditional and most influential models of foreign policy like «political realism» or geopolitics. This world requires the inclusion of all countries into an informal hierarchy of international (and, therefore, internal-global) entities that is only starting to form, and the inclusion of all countries into a more official (also starting to form) vertical of global governmental and international legal relations. The world does not require the search of an optimal balance of external forces for a given state.

Therefore, it looks like we have found a clear answer to the question of historical boundaries of globalization. The answer is that the

²⁰ Azroyants, E. A. Globalization: Catastrophe or Way to Development? Modern Tendencies of the World Development and Political Ambitions. — Moscow: Publishing House «Noviy Vek», 2002. — P. 38.

beginning of globalization should be found in the events of the last decades of the 20th century. There is, however, one small problem.

It is customary to explain the stages of economic development before globalization as diachronic, i.e., change of stages and events, separated in space by state borders. Since the beginning of the epoch of globalization, this view gave way to a synchronic look at the world history. The synchronic way registers events simultaneously, not separating them in space and time. Globalization superseded modernization. Modernization was a theoretical stage of history. Globalization focuses on integration on a real-time scale. The technological revolution in communication that abolishes historical time and, to a degree, historical space is essential to globalization. Theoretically speaking, any country now, disregarding the specifics of its own history, may use the economic benefits that will be available to it in case of liberalization in certain industrial sectors.

Globalization and modernization are teleological: they both reject the idea of historical cycles and are based upon the theory that the future does not re-enact the past, and that now a new era is being formed. However, the question of historical teleology or cycles still remains open. So, it can be stated that globalization began in the 19th century and reached its critical level in 1914, during the period of the highest colonial expansion, if we take into account the part of aggregated GNP in international trade of the leading world powers, and also the percentage of the world population under foreign control. If history is really more cyclical than teleological, then we can expect that the globalization tendency will go in reverse — possibly, as a result of an armed conflict, ecological catastrophe, or demographic crisis. Therefore, until the problem of diachronic or synchronic stages of development has been sufficiently explained, it may be too premature to bring the discussion about the time of origin of globalization tendencies to a conclusion.

References

1. Azroyants, E. A. Globalisation: Catastrophe or Way to Development? Modern Tendencies in the World Development and Political Ambitions. — Moscow: Publishing House «Novyi Vek», — 2002. — 416pp.
2. Bek, U. What is Globalisation? — Moscow. — 2001. — 480pp.
3. Bilorus, O. G. The Economic System of Globalism. — Kyiv: KNEU, 2003. — 357pp.
4. Bilorus, O. G., Lukyanenko, D.G. and others. Globalisation and Development Security. — Kyiv: KNEU, 2001. — 733pp.
5. Bilorus, O. G., Lukyanenko, D.G. and others. Global Transformations and Development Strategies. — Kyiv: VIPOL, 1998. — 415 pp.

6. Bobkov, F. D. and others. The Modern Global Capitalism. — Moscow: OLMA-PRESS, 2003. — 351 pp.
7. Neklessa, A.nI. The Epilogue of History // Vostok, 1998, №5: 5—30.
8. Panarin, A. S. Global Political Forecasting. — Moscow: Algorithm, 2002 — 352 pp.
9. Pakhomov, Y. N. Roads and Crossroads of the Modern Civilization — Kyiv. — 1998. — 226 pp.
10. Pomeranz, G. S. Experience in the Philosophy of Solidarity // Voprosy Filosofii, 1991, №3: 57-66.
11. Turayev, V. A. Mankind's Global Challenge. — Moscow: Logos, 2002. — 192 pp.
12. Utkin, A. I. Globalisation: the Process and Perception. — Moscow: Logos, 2002 — 254 pp.
13. Fukuyama, F. The End of History? // USA — Economy, Politics, Ideology.1990. №5: 39-54.
14. Shishkov, Y. V. The Evolution of the World Community: Polarization or Increase of Homogeneity? // MEiMO, 1998, №9: 11-23.
15. Shumpeter, J. Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. — Moscow: Nauka. — 1995. — 380 pp.
16. Yakovets, Y. V. Globalisation and Civilizations Interaction. — Moscow: Closed Company «Publishing House «Ekonomika»», 2003. — 411 pp.
17. Colin Hay, David Marsh. Demystifying Globalization. — London: Palgrave — 2000. — 191 pp.
18. Huntington, S. Ph.The Clash of Civilizations?// Foreign Affairs.1993.Vol.72.№3: 22-49.
19. Kenichi Omae. The End of the Nation State. — New York, 1995.

The article was made available to the editorial board on 01.02.2005