COOPERATION AND CONFLICT IN A GLOBAL WORLD

Mariana Ana Bulmez

PhD Student, "Ovidius" University of Constanța

Abstract:For centuries, international relations have been dominated by "political realism," an approach present in the works of great thinkers, but also politicians such as Tucidide, Niccolo Machiavelli, Otto von Bismarck. Realism describes the world in terms of national, sovereign states, using its own means to maintain its independence and to defend its interests, an essential element in this equation being the military force.
States are no longer the only important decision-makers in international relations, and force is no longer the best approach to resolving conflicts with non-state actors, including terrorist organizations. The information revolution offers unlimited access for non-state actors to promote their ideology and advocates. Firefox, an Internet browser, reaches 25 million users in 99 days after its launch, and in the sixth month of its existence, it crossed the border of the fifty million users. Earlier in 2006, defense secretary Donald Rumsfeld said about the global war on terror that "in this war, some decisive battles will not be given in the mountains of Afghanistan, either on the streets of Iraq or in New York's conference halls, London, Cairo and elsewhere ".
Democratic principles, liberal culture and common transnational interests may be the link between the nation-state and universalism of the global system. Cooperating and co-opting all states in setting global strategies can solve the slippages in the relations between nation-state supporters and the followers of globalization. For example, establishing the agenda in the Group of 8, plus several guests, does not equate to the level of international relations and institutions with agenda setting in the Group of 20, members with equal status.

Keywords: globalization, state-nation, terrorism, separatism, cooperation

At the beginning of the 21st century, we find ourselves in a world where armed operations are no longer in the hands of governments or their agencies.[1] For centuries, the classic approach of international relations has been called "realism," the equivalent of which Otto von Bismarck called "realpolitik". Realism describes the world in terms of sovereign states, whose purpose is to maintain security, peace, balance of power, secure territorial status, the primary argument in this sense being the military force. States differ mainly as far as their capacities are concerned, and not necessarily from a functional point of view, and as a result they tend to counterbalance the power of the others.[2] The realistic theories of international relations argue that the balance of power prevents the emergence of a hegemonic element in world politics, and the dynamics of the swing manifest itself when using force, threatening force, and inducing fear of force.[3] Fareed Zakaria argues that "the distribution of power is changing" as "the number of governmental and non-governmental players increases, and the strength

---

[1] Hobsbawm, Eric, *Globalizare, democraţie şi terorism,* CARTIER, Chişinău, 2016, p.20
[2] Wendt, Alexander, *TEORIA SOCIALĂ A POLITICII INTERNAŢIONALE,* POLIROM, Iaşi, 2011, p.123
[3] Layne, Christopher(2011), *PACEA ILUZIILOR. Marea strategie americană din 1940 până în prezent,* POLIROM, Iaşi, 2011, p.11

and confidence of everyone grow, the hopes of common understanding and action diminish".[4] Contemporary states have been involved with each other for decades, even centuries, during which they have accumulated a considerable level of knowledge about the interests of the other states. Everyone knows something about the other's style of resolving disputes.[5] In this context, war has been an active and constant instrument of international relations. At the moment, states are no longer the only players on the scene of international relations. Material equipment for warfare is now widely available to private bodies and so are the means of financing non-state wars.

We live in a global world based on transnational private firms that do their best to be as little controlled as possible, by even the most powerful of governments. More often than not, the states are abandoning activities that are considered of strategic importance in the 20th century, such as postal services, police, prisons, even vital parts of the armed forces, entrusting them to private contractors, these contractors becoming later on the financial supporters of armed dissident right groups inside the states that concede their services.[6] State-owned enterprises coexist and compete with cross-border multinational corporations, such as IBM, which derives two-thirds of foreign-only revenue, and only a quarter of its 400,000 employees are in the US.[7]

Of course, the existence of corporations is not a novelty, and just like globalization, they have a long history. Transnational religious organizations have been around for hundreds of years. The British East India Company for example, which was founded in 1600, was granted the exclusive right of trade with India, imposed an economic monopoly in the area supported by local military and administrative forces, and in the nineteenth century, founded the Socialist International, the Red Cross, the pacifist movements, the International Law Association, etc. Prior to World War I, there were only 176 non-governmental international organizations, but recently the number of NGOs has reached about 26,000 in the last decade of the 20th century.[8] What differs today, and falls into the rivalry area, generating global tensions, is the fact that NGOs and transnational companies are rivaling with states. The $ 300 billion sales of ExxonMobil in 2004 were higher than the GDP of 200 of the 220 countries on the planet. According to this statistics, one can conclude that power is increasingly falling into the hands of multinational corporations, not to governments.[9]

What transnational companies and corporations do in an area of the globe can affect its activity thousands of away miles. This phenomenon of dispersion of global effect is identified by specialists as the transnational transfer of conflicts.[10] For example, the case of Coca-Cola, when in 1999 the French, Belgian and Luxembourg governments banned Coke sales on suspicion of contamination , that caused mass hysteria in the affected states. The company lost $ 103 million. In India, Coca-Cola was accused of water pollution and excessive water consumption.[11] The redundant global effect was the threat of a 5.2 million-strong student union from the UK to boycott Coca-Cola Company for its dubious practices in countries such as India.[12]

---

[4] Ibidem, p.19
[5] Wendt, Alexander, op.cit., p.128
[6] Ibidem, p.36
[7] Nye Jr.,Joseph S., *Viitorul puterii,* POLIROM, Iaşi, 2012,p.139
[8] Ibidem, p.140
[9] Curtin, Patricia A.& Gaither, Kenn T., *RELAŢII PUBLICE INTERNAŢIONALE. Negocierea culturii, a identităţii şi a puterii,* Curtea Veche, Bucureşti , 2008,p.292
[10] Ibidem, p.40
[11] Ibidem, p.39
[12] Ibidem, p.41

Conflicts within states, often maintained and sustained by non-state competitors, have become increasingly serious, and can continue indefinitely, with no reliable forecast of their consequences on the political and territorial developments of that particular State. For example, IRA actions in the UK or ETA in Spein, are bound to end up in secessionist movements in the more or less distant future. The Uppsala data bank recorded incidents of armed civil war between 2001 and 2004 in thirty-one sovereign states of the world.[13] The era of wars that end with unconditional surrender is over. At present, internal conflicts can become very violent, and governments cannot neglect or eliminate armed minorities.[14]During 2006, 498 terrorist actions took place within the EU: one in Austria, Belgium, Ireland, Portugal and Poland; in France 294, of which 283 were assigned to the separatists, the other 11 being of a different nature; in Spain 145, out of which 136 separatists, 8 left and one other orientation; in Greece 25 attributed to left anarchists; in Germany 13, out of which 10 left, 2 other, and one Islamic; in Italy 11 attributed to left anarchists; in the UK 5, of which 4 separatists and one of another kind.[15]

Globalization has advanced under almost all aspects - economic, technological, cultural, even linguistic - except for one: from a political and military point of view, territorial states remain the only effective authorities.[16] One can hardly speak of a single global authority that is sufficiently strong to control, for example, the arms race and international disarmament such as the UN or various technical and financial bodies such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and some international tribunals. However, these bodies do not have any effective power other than that which the agreements signed between states provide them with.[17] The UN does not have any independent power or authority. UN decisions depend on the collective decision of states and can be blocked by the absolute veto of five of them. "It is necessary for the new world orders to be protected," says historian Michael Howard. Every international order in each period assumes that someone or something functions as a protector of the system.[18] The UN can play a significant role in protecting the world order when there is consensus in the Security Council. The UN is seconded by regular meetings of NATO and EU leaders, the leaders of the Asia-Pacific countries in APEC and the East Asia Summit, the G7 and G8 developed countries and the main economies of the world in the G20[19] and the new actor on the international scene, the BRIC group.

By the end of the 20th century, about 2600 million people had been flown by the world's airlines, which means almost a plane trip for every two inhabitants of the globe.[20] Analyzing this figure, we note the extraordinary global mobility of the population and hence the cosmopolitanism of the big cities in economically attractive countries. States such as the US, Canada and Australia had an influx of 3.6 million migrants only between 1998 and 2001, while Western Europe received 11 million foreigners over the same period. As Benedict Anderson notes, the crucial document of 21st century identity is not the birth certificate issued by the nation-state, but the international identity document - the passport.[21] However, no individual, irrespective of where he may come from or where he may go,

---

[13] Hobsbawm, Eric, op.cit. , p.49

[14] Ibidem, p.30

[15]https://www.europol.europa.eu/publication/TESAT/TESAT2007.pdf

[16] Hobsbawm, Eric, po.cit., p.25

[17] Ibidem, p.26

[18] Gray, Colin S., *RĂZBOIUL, PACEA ŞI RELAŢIILE INTERNAŢIONALE. O introducere în istoria strategică,* POLIROM, Iaşi, 2010, p.309

[19] Kissinger, Henry, *Ordinea mondială,* Rao, Bucureşti, 2014, p.298

[20] Ibidem, p.76

[21] Ibidem, p.78

gives up his national identity. Identity can be one of the most controversial terms of the new millennium, if we take into account the mixture of peoples and cultures at global level. For centuries, identity has been a built up concept, born as it is from such classifications as ethnicity, nationality, social class, gender, sexual and religious orientation. Identity is what places us within society, tells us "who we are and how we relate to the others in the world we live in."[22] For example, when new nations come into being, the first challenge is international recognition. In such cases as this, the national flag is considered to be a first identification mark, as in the case of South Africa, which adopted a new flag in 1994 after the abolition of apartheid.[23]

However, the long-term migrants of the 21st century are no longer completely separated from their homeland of origin due to advanced communications technology. In 1998 Google was born, and in 2003 it became the most influential online company.[24] At the end of 1998, the service called AOL Instant Messenger numbered 25 million downloads, less than 26 months from the start of the program, and for 2005, some commentators estimated a figure of 400 million users with dozens of thousands of downloads per day.[25] Skype, the most popular Internet telephony service in the world, had 25 million users only 19 months from launch, its record being overtaken by Firefox, which exceeded 25 million users in 99 days since launch, and in the sixth month of existence crossing the border of 50 million users.[26] Compared to radio stations, televisions and newspapers most often controlled by the state, governments of nation-states, the Internet creates unlimited communication through e-mail, through the personal internet page, blog, or twitter through social networking sites such as Facebook or Linkedin. A number of transnational corporations have enormous budgets, competent human resources, and control coding, so their power is often much higher than that of many governments. For example, in 2009, Microsoft, Apple and Google had annual profits of 58, 35 and $ 22 billion respectively and more than 150,000 employees in total. At the same time, Amazon, Google, Microsoft and many other companies are competing for the development of cloud computing technology and have "server farms".[27]

Information is a source of power and more and more people have access to it as computer and communication costs decrease. Similarly, the information revolution and globalization provide new resources for non-state actors. For example, before the Russian attack on Georgia in 2008, "any civilian, native Russian or other ethnicity aspiring to become a warrior in cyberspace could visit pro-Russia web pages to download the programs and instructions needed to launch an attack against Georgia's Internet services ".[28] There are practically no barriers to having access to world politics. The toughest attacks occur in the virtual space: cybercriminals hackers and offenders rack up billions of dollars in damages to governments and businesses. It is estimated that the "Love Bug" virus, launched by a hacker in the Philippines, has caused $ 15 billion in damages. Cyber crime groups have stolen over a trillion dollars in data and intellectual property in 2008. It was discovered that a cyber spy network, GhostNet, infected 1295 computers in 103 countries, 30% of which were important government targets.[29] Most experts believe that cyber attacks are important complementary tools and not an overwhelming weapon, such as nuclear weapons, in interstate wars. The danger is very high given that the Internet allows the operation of decentralized franchise networks to recruit followers, raise funds,

---

[22] Curtin, Patricia A.& Gaither, Kenn T., po.cit.,p.211-212

[23] Ibidem, p.218

[24] Scoble, Robert&Israel, Shel, *Conversaţii libere,* NEMIRA, Bucureşti, 2008, p.42

[25] Ibidem, p.47-48

[26] Ibidem, p.50-51

[27] Nye Jr.,Joseph S., op.cit., p.158

[28] Ibidem, p.160

[29] Ibidem, p.153

provide instruction manuals and conduct operations. In military terms, al Qaeda, is a dwarf compared to the American giant. The impact of its terrorist activities depended more on the dramatic effect of their actions, and on the exaggerated reactions they generated than on the size of their own forces. Shocking events are designed to attract attention, polarize, cause reactions from the target. In this respect, the 2004 record of a member of Al Qaeda, Abu Musab of Zarqawi, decapitating an American in Iraq, was downloaded millions of times on the internet and caused similar situations in groups of the same ideological orientation.[30] Due to the Internet, and the media, Al Qaeda was transformed from a small cell organization with limited territorial spread into a global network. Unfortunately, the technology offers destructive powers to individuals or groups of groups that previously represented a government monopoly, which increases the vulnerability of contemporary society to the attacks of non-state opponents, irrespective of their size, as long as they have unlimited resources at their disposal. In this context, many analysts speak of a privatization of war in the contemporary world.

According to a terrorist expert, the crucial place of radicalization "is neither Pakistan, nor Yemen, nor Afghanistan, (...) but the solitary experience of a virtual community: ummah from the Web."[31] As virtual communities grow, they will overcome territorial jurisdictions and develop their own patterns of governance. There is a risk that states, or even more dangerous, become much less important in people's lives, focusing on new forms of organization that correspond to their own interests "any person who recognizes the importance of values conveyed by a group and who decides to acquire or promote them has an interest in being part of that group. "[32]

Cyber war is one of the most serious threats today. In this regard, a FBI representative's statement was relevant at a conference on international war: "Give me ten hackers and I paralyze a state in 90 days." For example, at present, anyone can order satellite imagery from commercial companies or simply use Google Earth to see what's happening in other countries at a very low o price, or even free of charge.[33] According to President Obama's report on cybernetic domains in 2009, theft of intellectual property by other states and corporations has generated the highest immediate costs. Every year, intellectual property theft, registered in business, government, university networks is several times greater than the amount of information in the Library of Congress threatening US military effectiveness and US competitiveness in the global economy.[34]

We can use military capability in a tank battle, but not on the Internet. Poised for the view of Hannah Arendt, political theorist, "power between people occurs when they act together", and a state can exert global power only by engaging with other states and acting with them. But given that states are no longer the only major players in world affairs, political decision-makers need to take account of new realities in their security measures, given that "we face increasing risks, threats and challenges that affect people in a particular country, but which come mainly or totally from other countries (...) the financial crisis, organized crime, mass migrations, global warming, international epidemics and terrorism, to name just a few .One of the main causes of the difficulty is that the power diffuses both vertically and horizontally ... "[35]Unlike terrestrial, sea and air battles," the struggles waged in the cyberspace have three characteristics in common with the land battles - Even if smaller: the number of players, ease of access and the chance to hide. (...) Ground, domination is not an immediately achievable criterion." In the physical world, governments have the monopoly of widespread use of

---

[30] Nye Jr.,Joseph S., op.cit.,p.141
[31] Ibidem, p.159
[32] Baertschi, Bernard& Mulligan, Kevin, *Naţionalismele* ,NEMIRA, Bucureşti, 2010, p.94
[33] Nye Jr.,Joseph S., op.cit.,p.138
[34] Nye Jr.,Joseph S.,op.cit., p.166
[35] Ibidem, p.133

force, they know the tune of action, and the attack stops due to wear or exhaustion. In the virtual world, however, the participants are different, often anonymous, the distances disappear and "a single virtual interaction almost does not involve costs".[36]

Governments can exercise physical constraints on companies and individuals through legislation. For example, physical routers and servers, fiber-optic cables have geographic locations under government jurisdictions, and companies that provide and use the Internet must comply with the laws imposed by those governments. According to the Open Net Initiative, at least 40 states use very restrictive filters to prevent the exposure of suspicious materials.[37] Governments can take action to educate and protect citizens in the field of computers. For example, in 2009, following the Xinjiang riots, the Chinese government has been able to block 19 million people from a zone twice the size of Texas, to international phone calls and the Internet, with the exception of a few webpages controlled by the authorities. The damage to tourism and business was significant, but the Chinese government was more concerned with political stability. In 2010, when SWIFT, a private company that coordinates and maintains the history of interbank transfers, has moved some of its major US servers to Europe, it needed the EU's permission to surrender US Treasury data for anti-terrorist purposes. The European Parliament has imposed new restrictions on the confidentiality of data transfers.[38] Cybercrime can be reduced by similar approaches that complicate access to various systems. In 2000, the UN General Assembly passed a series of resolutions condemning internet crime and drawing attention to defense measures that governments can take.

The effort of governments and in-country organizations to peacefully resolve any kind of confrontation can be supported by the work of NGOs most often considered to be a collective consciousness. For example, Human Rights Watch exerted pressure on governments such as the Chinese one, investigating and reporting human rights violations to the global media. In 1992, when charges were filed that IKEA carpets were the result of child work, the leadership investigated the matter, and collaborated with Save the Children, a highly respected international nongovernmental organization, to solve it. As a result, IKEA has signed a partnership with UNICEF and the International Labor Organization to fight child labor, bringing $ 500,000 to UNICEF in 2000 to support education and poverty alleviation measures.[39]

Henry Miller has a point of view in view of the current world: "One's destiny is never a place, but a new way to see things."[40] The constructivist approach to international relations offers a greater understanding of state interests.[41]

Historian Michael Howard explains why world peace cannot be built by inventing or reforming institutions: "... the establishment of a global peace order depends on the creation of a world community ... The world order cannot simply be created by building some institutions and international organizations that do not naturally derive from the cultural predisposition and historical experience of their members. Their creation and functioning presupposes at least the existence of a transnational elite that not only shares the same cultural norms but can also make them acceptable within their own societies ..."[42] A number of international organizations act in the name of peace and respect for national identity in the era of globalization. Among these, Amnesty International promotes "freedom to fight for

---

[36] Ibidem, p.145
[37] Ibidem, p.151
[38] Ibidem, p.155
[39] Curtin, Patricia A.& Gaither, Kenn T., op.cit.,p.296
[40] Ibidem, p.317
[41] Ungureanu, Radu-Sebastian(2010), *Securitate, suveranitate şi instituţii internaţionale*, POLIROM, Iaşi, p.191
[42] Gray, Colin S., po.cit., p.317

freedom," winning the 1977 Nobel Peace Prize. Its weapons in the struggle for freedom were, awareness of human rights violations and pressure from public opinion. The International Crisis Group, established in 1995, is an international non-governmental organization whose action is to resolve and prevent conflicts.[43]

"The contemporary attempt to build a world order will require a coherent strategy of establishing the concept of order within the various regions, and then linking them to regional order ... Even if it creates the appearance of order, the dominant position from the point of view a country's military in a region risks creating a crisis in the rest of the world."[44]

New socio-political realities give states, new concerns and new fears, which can only be removed by international cooperation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baertschi, Bernard & Mulligan, Kevin (2010), *Naţionalismele,* NEMIRA, Bucureşti

Baradat, Leon P. (2012), *Ideologiile politice. Origini şi impact,* Editura POLIROM, Iaşi

Curtin, Patricia A, & Gaither, Kenn T.(2008), *Relaţii publice internaţionale,*Curtea Veche, Bucureşti

Hobsbawm, Eric (2016), *Globalizare, democraţie şi terrorism,* CARTIER, Chişinău

Kissinger, Henry (2015), *Ordinea mondială. Reflecţii asupra specificului naţiunilor şi a cursului istoriei,* RAO, Bucureşti

Layne, Christopher (2011), *Pacea iluziilor. Marea strategie americană din 1940 până în prezent,* Editura POLIROM, Iaşi

Nimu, Andrada, Pîrvulescu, Cristian, Todor, Arpad (2016), *Societatea civilă, democraţie şi constructive instituţională,* Editura POLIROM, Iaşi

Nye Jr., Joseph S. (2012), *Viitorul puterii,* Editura POLIROM, Iaşi

Scoble, Robert & Israel, Shel (2008), *Conversaţii libere,* NEMIRA, Bucureşti

Ungureanu, Radu-Sebastian (2010), *Securitate, suveranitate şi instituţii internaţional,* Editura POLIROM, Iaşi

Wendt, Alexander (2011), *Teoria socială a politicii internaţionale,* Editura POLIROM, Iaşi

---

[43] Carpinschi, Anton & Mărgărit, Diana, *Organizaţii internaţionale*, Ed.Polirom, Bucureşti, 2011

[44] Kissinger, Henry, op.cit., p.299