Problem of Globalizing of Democracy in the Context of Correlation of Local, Regional and Global Conditions

Share Your Story

Paper for the 23rd World Congress of Political Science organized by the International Political Science Association (IPSA), to be held from July 19 to July 24, 2014 in Montréal, Québec-Canada

Panel: Central Europe in the Global Context

Problem of Globalizing of Democracy in the Context of Correlation of Local, Regional and Global Conditions

Vasila Hajiyeva
Azerbaijan
Western University
E-mail: vasila_h@hotmail.com

Abstract
Common tendencies of the problem of democratization in various regions of the world are studied with complex systems approach. It is raised a question of searching for theoretical laws by generalizing of different directions and pictures in the different countries, as well as systematizing of problems and processes with approach to the problem through accounting the practice of separate states in the complex view. Not only domestic obstacles and opportunities could be learned, also outside factors would be brought to light if separation will be done not by countries, but by flatnesses - social policy, domestic policy, international system. Questions, estrangement and feasible problems of democratization process, their objective and subjective conditions are studied systematically in the frame of horizontal and vertical relations of local, regional and global flatnesses.

The following directions of problems of democratization process are investigated through their systematization:
1. Conflict situations and estrangement cases of the fundamental principles of democracy in the countries where democracy process is problematic;
2. The second direction problem of the democratic statehood and rule of law is that the democracy does not have the political power but is legitimate and its cultural and mental bases cover whole national level;
3. The other important direction is regional, global objective conditions of the state in the term of democratization process;
4. Dependence of democratization process from orders and laws of the international system, interests and behaviors of political actors, current international strategic processes.

Keywords: democratization, values, norms, global, system, order, security

Paper

Global System and Global Value
Acceleration of rates of the globe reduction and borders' rapprochement leads to the growth of economic, energetic, technological and information ties; strengthening of monopolization of economic relations at the international level; in other words, to the globalization; establishment of the unified system of operations and finally compels political and legal

actors in charge of the control over system processes to move towards their greater organization and creation of common attitudes. The fact that separate subjects playing a crucial role in the process are involved in it is an indispensable condition for the both parties (despite its negative role in the Georgian developments, Russia has not been expelled from international and regional organizations; at the same time efforts intensified to integrate South Caucasus and Azerbaijan into the said system). Thus, the political, legal and economic system creates favorable conditions for resolving some humanitarian and global problems in the sphere of demography, migration, food supply, ecology, international crimes, war and struggle against terrorism. In other words, formation of the global system, or otherwise, process of globalization lapses on the form of *raising rates of development of economic, technological and information relations → enlargement of political and legal organizations → cultural, humanitarian and ecological globalization*.

It is apparent that the globalization leading to the creation of global system is an objective phenomenon based on scientific-technological progress and economic processes. From this point of view, some authors consider the globalization to be not political but social-economic phenomenon. (Inozemtsev 2008). However, the consideration of the globalization within the framework of objective processes and from strategy of political goals standpoint shows that it is a dangerous phenomenon with unpredictable consequences, not blending with the unified system and leading to the creation of non-progressive and non-civilized structures (at present, structures of this type are represented at the international arena). Note that any structurization, particularly, political structure seeking to seize control over all organizations and processes, relies, without fail, on initial social-philosophical conception providing for not only political goals and principles but also moral and spiritual values. It is obvious that ideally the globalization would lead to no global chaos and crisis but effective, dynamic and sustainable structure.

The concept of global system should be based on political goals and ambitions capable of assessing both the current reality and regularities of historical processes, as well as potentialities of international political actors (regularly engaged in implementing the idea of global supremacy) put forward by the very history as precondition of the building of effective and long-term system. Otherwise, with the strengthening/weakening of the might of the state in historically shortest period (decades) the system may face the crisis or yet-unshaped structure will have to be renovated.

On the other hand, moral and spiritual criteria of the initial concept of global system should be able to socialize all leading and cultural regions across the world, be in demand by populations of these regions in order to shape and structurally concretize the global system.

One of the main reasons of ineffectiveness of basic values of modern system of the globalization is the aspiration to impart common to all mankind human nature to principles and procedures of state building in the form of certain humanistic idea and summarize then at the global level. (Bogdandu 2004). As far back as Aristotle pointed to scientific groundlessness of attempts to apply universal structure (for instance, democracy – V. H.) to various countries. Another erroneous approach is an attempt to manipulate with idealized principles of statehood, to turn them into instrument of ensuring own interests within inter-state relations by means of pressures or concessions. In other words, aspiration to raise idea, incapable of summarizing, to the level of international legal norms and use it as fright, leads to its subsequent discredit.

Democratic values could not become common to all mankind. According to various objective and subjective reasons (illegitimate nature of power and aspiration of separate individual or group to forcibly remain at power: meeting of interests of great power in the region and reciprocal protection of this government by international political actors (Egypt); representation of national minorities in separate structures of power (Russian Federation);

representatives of the nationality which forms majority of the population but attributed to "minority" (Turkic population of Iran) on a territory of the country with its long-term history of statehood. However, application of this system in Eurasia, Middle East and Latin America seems to be no possible both at the given stage and in perspective. If the people is not source of power, if the people's will is not kept? There is no question of democracy. Of interest is the fact that state-adherents of globalization principles have to reconcile themselves with the fait accomplish to ensure their interests in the region and preserve international ties. In excusing contempt for democratic values, these forces endanger the global system based on this concept. On the other hand, for a number of countries, owing to their geographical location and regional position, demographic indices and problem relations with neighboring countries, the process of democratization threatens national security, territorial integrity, internal order and stability. For this reason the change of governments of these countries cannot regard as manifestation of democracy. Thus, the said values cannot acquire the status of common to all mankind.

Regional Bases of the Global Order
The present situation is characterized by the intensification of globalization and related rise in the potential of global threat. The threat is not confined to raising the conflicts at regional and global levels; it is related to the destruction of the system of international relations at other levels and is fraught with ability and potentials to stir up multi-level crises as well. Currently defined as "regional", the crisis is of global nature, to judge by its consequences. On the face of it, militarily the conflict is a phenomenon of great importance, while in fact, it is a manifestation of complex crisis notable for disorder and lack of system. Until the order is restored, there is no chance of conflict resolution, as evidenced by regional conflicts. In the meanwhile, conflicts on the territory of former Yugoslavia have successfully been resolved when adjusted for the order which reigns in modern Europe.

At present, the system of security, related norms and standards are effective in one region only, i.e. in the sub-system of international system. A remaining, greater part suffers from the lack of order and predominance of arbitrariness. There are no signs of order (or, rather, evolutional level of system), nor supremacy of norms and regulations; even worse, political criteria (a political will of great power and actor's legitimacy, loyalty) to ensure its initial, primitive system level are impotent. An eloquent testimony to this is events in Georgia and an atmosphere of unsteadiness in the region which has its effect on the Azerbaijan's foreign political line. Hence, no opportunity exists to build a sustainable system of security.

Civilized international standards are inoperative in South Caucasus and other regions, for great powers as official subjects of international system do not follow these standards. Each social association (society, state, international system) calls for compliance with the rule of law, while its ineffectiveness is accounted for incompliance with the above. (Koppel 2008). Should higher structures decline from observing the rules, and approach processes from their own interests and agreements standpoint, it would be unrealistic to pin hopes on advanced policy, judicious behavior and reliable cooperation with regional centers of power, such as Iran, Russia and the like, which failed to create civilized standards and regulations, and traditionally resort to force in attaining their goals. On the other hand, it is evident that no regulations and standards of forces which are out of the system of international relations and enjoy no authority in the region could be complied with.

At present, South Caucasus is a region where clearly manifest themselves developments and processes typical for the system of global security and disorder. The South Caucasian region is characterized by impetuous rise in disorder caused both by globalization tendencies and confrontation between international actors. It is no mere coincidence that the region is becoming very sensitive to the issues of global security in terms of insecurity, terror,

international legal crisis, nuclear, military or peace disputes. When adjusted for this region's susceptibility to internal conflicts and complex nature thereof, relations with global subjects, even historically ulterior enmity, incompatibility of geopolitical interests, it is obvious how complicated are threats to the global security. Hence, system and complex approaches are required to construe security and order issues. Together with research into relations between political, social, economic, demographic factors and processes, it would also be appropriate to explore the influence of current indices and standards of the global system, and the role of political actors within the framework of regional problems.

Nowadays, South Caucasus comes out as an active sub-system of global system. Just as problems and processes of horizontal relations of global system manifest themselves in the region, so the latter's problems and related conflicts do lead global processes contributing to the formation of consecutive processes in other regions. Testifying to the above are the August, 2008 Georgian events which led to global insecurity and legal, financial crisis.

System approaches to the issue with due regard both for regional consequences and questions of global nature call for complex formulation of international problems. It is not possible to resolve regional problems within the framework of the said region or related projects only. (Craig 1998). Regions are none other than an organism of the global system. It is essential to create conditions for taking prophylactic measures and feeding the organism to improve its blood quality and thus cure it. Integrally related to organs, the organism should thoroughly examine and cure itself, so that organs could operate properly. For this reason horizontal ties and standards of the global system, when adjusted for problems of the regional system, may raise their effectiveness. It is also imperative to build regional systems of international legal questions and thus add integrity to the global system. It is imperative to establish a balance between strategic interests of states which provide them with the system of values. Provided there is no adequate approach to the international values at the strategic level and global disorder and threats arise, it is crucially important to set out standards and behavioral norms aimed at attaining global targets and global security. With that end in view, it would be important for the states above to advocate identical approaches to the new values, their ability to effectively contribute to the problem resolution.

Crisis in the Global System
Some researchers and experts are prone to consider the global crisis as historical consequence of the globalization. (Ahmedov 2008). In this case the globalization is perceived as loss of borders (economic, cultural, ideological, etc.), unification and universality. However, regardless of the extent of universality and unification of relations, deepening of inter-state relations and mutual connection between various regions worldwide, such integrity cannot ensure functioning of the global system as unified state, since differences and sovereignty of subjects remain intact. At the same time, the crisis in the political, legal and economic structures of the state cannot be explained by its integrity, unity of culture or economy. If the state crisis arises in all sub-cultures (political, economic and legal), hence, *the problem lies in the loss of conformity and harmony in the system of values, formal norms and standards of objective reality, as well as in the mentioned three sub-systems*. Under these circumstances there occurs shattering of scientific principles of the system. Weakening of ties between individual and group interests in the three spheres does not threaten the disintegration of the system; decisive here is the loss of legitimacy and alienation of fundamental values, for it makes impossible to build the political, legal and economic structures on the basis of the said system of values. Identical process occurs due to the global system. (French 2009). The problem is in discrepancy between the three subsystems above, since values prove to be lost, and the crisis develops in political, economic and legal spheres. From this it follows that the

building of the system on the basis of estranged and lost values and standards is having no prospects at all.

Depreciation of global dominant values, subsequent depreciation of the international law (by dominant political forces that push values into the background in favor of strategic, economic, religious-psychological, group and individual interests) leads to the political-legal and finally economic crisis. As a consequence, economic processes develop on the basis of serious, sustainable and long-term trust. In turn, the trust is not based on confrontation but current strategic and regional interests and values.

The crucial role of values is attributable to putting a question of subordination into the forefront regarding its protection, which, in turn, is possible in the course of competition with other values. Though the defeat of the rival in the "battlefield" and subsequent, at the initial stage, acceleration of globalization process around specific values is accompanied by a sharp rise in the development of global and dominant economics (throughout 20 years after the end of the cold war), the value, legally secured and unopposed, is becoming estranged and depreciated. Ideological vacuum poses threat to the real processes and becomes a source of serious and inevitable crisis (suffice to recall anti-democratic processes in some countries, including vulnerability of suppressed values on the part of dominant political forces, priority on economic collaboration and strategic regional partnership, application of double standards with respect to basic international legal principles, etc.).

It has to be kept in mind that the priority on current strategic economic interests (large economic structures and oligarchic groupings) to the detriment of ideological and legal principles results in strengthening of power of oligarchs and weakening and collapse of global structures. Monopolization of economy and policy by an oligarchic grouping (it is impossible to secure sustainability right of property without political monopolization) causes apathy and impotence in the economic life. As a whole, apathy in policy, economy and law leads to the loss of trust to international organizations, dominant political, legal and economic forces. The loss of legitimacy makes it necessary to use force for securing interests, for example, Russia in Georgia; USA in Iraq; Iran in the matter of nuclear weapons, etc. As a result, chaos arises and stability is broken.

Global economic crisis is not only international political-legal crisis, it comes out as continuation of political-economic crisis inside the world's leading states. (Nadvi 2008).Thus, the current economic crisis is a consequence of monopolization of political system by economic oligarchs of the countries.

Contributing to the economic crisis is the failure to universalize democratic principles, furthermore, their estrangement, and non-use of liberal values of the last decade to liberalize economy.

Enlargement of virtual financed unsecured by material resources, drop in the authority of economic relations and values, aggravation of economic contradictions between various strata of the population and lack of mainstay on cultural-intellectual potential; apathy and disbelief in the fairness of economic principles, in effectiveness of entrepreneurship and business prospects; growth of unemployment and reduction of production – these are factors that predetermined the crisis. On the one hand, it is the phenomenon of intra-state structure as major component of the international system within the structure of global relations (or in other way round as Wade says: "Rather global imbalances have had an important causal role not at the international level, in the form of currency recycling, but at the domestic level…" (Wade 2009); a leading role of the same actors in the global economic system (Palma 2009) and emergence of the identical situation on the basis of identical principles and norms, on the other, contributed to the economic crisis in its complex form and manifestations.

If the political system of the state and the international political relations are used as instrument in the hands of leading actors and macroeconomic and international economic

processes are controlled by oligarchic groupings, it is obvious that the crisis initially arises within the framework of political system.

Monopolistic activity of oligarchic grouping and accumulation of virtual finances without appropriate material support, the weakening of production and strengthening of inflation naturally results in crisis situation.

It should be noted that the global political crisis is developing in two directions: 1.sustainable position of international organizations. The lack of reforms may reduce their chances to survival, while their re-organization may be faced with great difficulties, and the world will plunge into chaos; 2. Growth of influence and increase of pressures from great powers demanding legally secured control over the situation in the world and pushing their supporters in the Security Council and other organizations which may raise rivalry between them to a level fraught with grave consequences. That said, the new organization should rely on norms and principles capable of keeping control over subsequent processes and maintaining appropriate order worldwide even in spite of the fact that this control may pursue certain political purposes.

Account has to be taken of specific weight of political actors involved in the process, and of their place in the process. Otherwise, applied norms and standards are invalid legally. It is essential to focus on standards that meet goals and tasks in compliance with obligations assumed.

The fact that the crisis embraced the whole of the global structure and put in the forefront norms and standards of each sub-system (political, economic and legal) necessitates the establishment of a new or reconstruction of the existing philosophical-ideological system with appropriate organizational structures and international legal basis. The point is about the new ideological system and development of specific methods based on the synthesis of Christian-democratic values of the European Union (Strenski 2004) and Islamic, as well as regional principles. Topical for the issue is an idea of the development of unified philosophical concept. Later on, this philosophy should draw up political principles, structure; values be transformed into norms; legal substantiation and organization (Simma and Paulus 1998) of the system be identified.

Not procedures of democracy (Sabic 2008) but cultural-spiritual and intellectual criteria, humanism, tolerance, universal values and modernity are general and supreme values. (Banda 2003). Main criterion with respect to sub-systems- states is civil, legitimate, social and secular nature of power. Forming the basis of power is criterion of its progressiveness. Analysis of values cannot be carried out in the form of technical procedure that gives way to formalism, distortions falsifications and manipulations.

References
Ahmedov, A. 2008. Global finance crisis and globalization. *Scientific News. V.4(44)*. P.58-69. Baku. (In Russian)

Banda, F. 2003. Global Standards: Local Values. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family. V. 17(1*. P.1-27.

Bogdandu, A. 2004. Globalization and Europe: How to Square Democracy, Globalization, and International Law. *European Journal of International Law. V. 15(5):885-906.*

Craig, G. Community Development in a Global Context. *Community Development Journal* 33:2-17. 1998.

French, D. 2009. Global Justice and the (Ir)relevance of Indeterminacy. Chinese Journal of International Law, doi:10.1093/chinesejil/jmp022.

Inozemtsev, V. L. 2008. Contemporary globalization, its world perception//*Century of globalization. Studies into modern global processes. Scientific-theoretical journal, № 1*, «Teacher», Moscow (in Russian)

Khalilov, S.S. 2004. *East and West: On the Path to Common-to-All Ideal. Philosophical Essays.* Baku, "University of Azerbaijan" Publishing House. 624 p. (in Azeri)

Koppell, J.G.S. 2008. Global Governance Organizations: Legitimacy and Authority in Conflict. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory. V. 18(2)*:177-203.

Nadvi, Kh. 2008. Global standards, global governance and the organization of global value chains. *Journal of Economic Geography. V. 8(3)*:323-343.

Palma, G. 2009. The revenge of the market on the rentiers: why neo-liberal reports on the end of history turned out to be premature, *Cambridge Journal of Economics,* vol. 33. P.829-866.

Sabic, Z. 2008. Building Democratic and Responsible Global Governance: The Role of International Parliamentary Institutions. *Parliamentary Affairs. V. 61(2).* P. 255-271.

Simma, B. and Paulus, A.L. 1998. The 'International Community': Facing the Challenge of Globalization. *European Journal of International Law. V. 9(2):266-277.*

Strenski, I. 2004. The Religion in Globalization*. Journal of the American Academy of Religion .V. 72(3)*:631-652

Wade, R. 2009. From Global Imbalances to Global Reorganisations. *Cambridge Journal of Economics. V. 33.* P.539-562.