

United States Marine Corps
Command and Staff College
Marine Corps University
2076 South Street
Marine Corps Development Command
Quantico, Virginia 22134-5068

MASTERS OF MILITARY STUDIES

TITLE:

Globalism--The New International System?

**SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF MILITARY STUDIES**

AUTHOR:

Major Philip C. Skuta, USMC

AY 2000-01

Mentor: Dr. John P. Cann

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Mentor: LtCol Gregory S. Akers, USMC

Approved: _____

Date: _____

Report Documentation Page		
Report Date 01 May 2001	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle Globalization-The New International System?	Contract Number	
	Grant Number	
	Program Element Number	
Author(s)	Project Number	
	Task Number	
	Work Unit Number	
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) United States Marine Corps Command and Staff College Marine Corps University 2076 South Street Marine Corps Combat Development Command Quantico, VA 22134-5068	Performing Organization Report Number	
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)	Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)	
	Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)	
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes		
Abstract Globalism is increasingly being accepted as a force within the international system, replacing the previously dominant Cold War perspective. Democratization, integration of capital, technology, information, open markets, permeable borders, multinational military forces, and redefined political organizations are a handful of the many forces of globalism at work today. This influence is omnipresent, from the cars we drive, to the cultures, armed forces, and enemies we must face. There is little doubt that the world is undergoing a significant period of change because of the accelerating pace of globalization. This period of rapid change is as significant as the period of change that occurred during the agricultural and industrial revolutions. What this change will mean remains to be seen. For now, however, the international system is uni-polar, with challenges to the U.S. Globalism is an element of the uni-polar international system, not a system unto itself. The military would do well to pay attention to changes in the international system brought about by globalism.		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified	Classification of this page unclassified	

Classification of Abstract unclassified	Limitation of Abstract UU
Number of Pages 42	

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

FORM APPROVED - - - OMB NO. 0704-0188

public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters services, directorate for information operations and reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis highway, suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the office of management and budget, paperwork reduction project (0704-0188) Washington, dc 20503

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (LEAVE BLANK)		2. REPORT DATE 1 MAY 2001		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED STUDENT RESEARCH PAPER	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE GLOBALIZATION--THE NEW INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM?				5. FUNDING NUMBERS N/A	
6. AUTHOR(S) MAJOR PHILIP C. SKUTA, USMC					
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) USMC COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE 2076 SOUTH STREET, MCCDC, QUANTICO, VA 22134-5068				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER NONE	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) SAME AS #7				10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER: NONE	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES NONE					
12A. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT NO RESTRICTIONS				12B. DISTRIBUTION CODE N/A	
13. ABSTRACT (MAXIMUM 200 WORDS) GLOBALISM IS INCREASINGLY BEING ACCEPTED AS A FORCE WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM, REPLACING THE PREVIOUSLY DOMINANT COLD WAR PERSPECTIVE. DEMOCRATIZATION, INTEGRATION OF CAPITAL, TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION, OPEN MARKETS, PERMEABLE BORDERS, MULTINATIONAL MILITARY FORCES, AND REDEFINED POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE A HANDFUL OF THE MANY FORCES OF GLOBALISM AT WORK TODAY. THIS INFLUENCE IS OMNIPRESENT, FROM THE CARS WE DRIVE, TO THE CULTURES, ARMED FORCES, AND ENEMIES WE MUST FACE. THERE IS LITTLE DOUBT THAT THE WORLD IS UNDERGOING A SIGNIFICANT PERIOD OF CHANGE BECAUSE OF THE ACCELERATING PACE OF GLOBALIZATION. THIS PERIOD OF RAPID CHANGE IS AS SIGNIFICANT AS THE PERIOD OF CHANGE THAT OCCURRED DURING THE AGRICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTIONS. WHAT THIS CHANGE WILL MEAN REMAINS TO BE SEEN. FOR NOW, HOWEVER, THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM IS UNI-POLAR, WITH CHALLENGES TO THE U.S. GLOBALISM IS AN ELEMENT OF THE UNI-POLAR INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM, NOT A SYSTEM UNTO ITSELF. THE MILITARY WOULD DO WELL TO PAY ATTENTION TO CHANGES IN THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM BROUGHT ABOUT BY GLOBALISM.					
14. SUBJECT TERMS (KEY WORDS ON WHICH TO PERFORM SEARCH) GLOBALISM; GLOBALIZATION; GLOBALIZE; INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM				15. NUMBER OF PAGES: 41	
				16. PRICE CODE: N/A	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED		18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE: UNCLASSIFIED		19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	
				20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	

DISCLAIMER

THE OPINIONS AND CONCLUSIONS EXPRESSED HEREIN ARE THOSE OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF EITHER THE MARINE COPRS COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE OR ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY. REFERENCES TO THIS STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOREGOING STATEMENT.

QUOTATION FROM, ABSTRACTION FROM, OR REPRODUCTION OF ALL OR ANY PART OF THIS DOCUMENT IS PERMITTED PROVIDED PROPER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IS MADE.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: Globalism--The New International System?

Author: Major Philip C. Skuta, USMC

Thesis: Globalism is increasingly being accepted as a force within the international system, replacing the previously dominant Cold War perspective. The military would do well to pay attention to changes in the international system brought about by globalism.

Discussion: The impact of globalization on the armed forces is an area in which little research exists. This paper will explain globalism, discuss a number of issues associated with it, and suggest what globalism means for the armed forces. The paper is divided into four sections. The first section defines globalism. The second examines elements of the globalism debate. The third section offers suggestions as to why it is important for military leaders to study globalism. The paper concludes with suggestions as to what globalism means for the U.S. military.

Research for this paper revealed several principle elements of the globalism debate. The principle issues are: the notion of advocacy, developing national strategy in the global era, renewed emphasis on asymmetric threats, and increasing cultural tensions. Other elements to the debate include: concept of fragmentation, the rapid pace and the shock of change brought about by globalism, and global education. Together, these elements provide evidence that globalism is genuine, and is influencing the post-Cold War international system.

Globalization is a significant issue for the military community to study for two reasons. First, the military audience is only beginning to comprehend the magnitude of societal transformation occurring because of globalization. The degree of societal transformation occurring because of globalization is as significant as that which occurred during the agricultural and industrial revolutions. Second, is the parallel and symbiotic relationship of private industry and the military as a force of change. President Eisenhower labeled this relationship "the military-industrial complex." The unique interrelationship of private industry and the military has produced changes that have influenced both industry and the military over the last 150 years. Studying this relationship could provide clues as to how the armed forces will be affected by globalism.

Conclusion: The original aim in researching this paper was to explore the impact of globalization on the armed forces. The conclusion reached is twofold. First, there is little doubt that the world is undergoing a significant period of change because of globalization. The world continues to move away from the Cold War system towards a wider perspective. What this will mean remains to be seen. For now, however, the international system is uni-polar, with challenges to the U.S.; globalism is an element of the uni-polar international system, not a system unto itself. Second, at this time, how the world will look once the change is complete seems to be murky at best. The military would be well served to keep a careful watch on these currents of change. As long as military leaders are aware of the changes taking place, the best one could ask is that the challenges and opportunities be carefully sifted before making sweeping changes in their institutions.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Disclaimer	i
Executive Summary.....	iii
Preface	iv
Abstract	v
Globalism--The New International System?	1
What is Globalism?.....	1
The Globalism Debate.....	6
Why the Military Should Study Globalization	21
Conclusions	31
Bibliography.....	33

Preface

My original aim in researching this paper was to explore the impacts of globalization on civil-military relationships. The topic of globalism and civil-military relations, however, proved elusive. With the assistance of my faculty mentors and others, I refined my research and attempted to focus instead on the influence of globalization on the U.S. armed forces.

I feel that globalization is a significant issue for the military community. Globalization will continue to influence the world in the 21st century. Research for the paper proves that globalization's influence on *everything* will be as significant as the influence of the agricultural and industrial revolutions. As long as military leaders are aware of the changes taking place because of globalism, the best one could ask is that the challenges and opportunities are carefully sifted before making sweeping transformations. Hopefully this paper will contribute to the awareness of the changes taking place because of globalism.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance from my mentors, Dr. John "Jack" P. Cann and LtCol Gregory Akers S. Akers, USMC, faculty advisors for Conference Group 7. Their advice, counsel, and guidance were essential. I also owe a great deal to Dr. Janeen Klinger of the Command and Staff College faculty. Dr. Klinger's elective, *The Causes of War and Peace*, as well as her suggestions on content, contributed towards expanding my awareness and understanding of globalism. Dr. Eliot A. Cohen of Georgetown University also helped by suggesting that I look at the information media as an example of globalism's influence on the U.S. military. Ms. Jane Leong provided invaluable editing assistance. Ms. Lucia Casaravilla of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) provided helpful research materials. Finally, I would like to thank the staff of the Marine Corps Research Center for providing administrative support.

Abstract

Globalism is increasingly being accepted as a force within the international system, replacing the previously dominant Cold War perspective. Democratization, integration of capital, technology, information, open markets, permeable borders, multinational military forces, and redefined political organizations are a handful of the many forces of globalism at work today. This influence is omnipresent, from the cars we drive, to the cultures, armed forces, and enemies we must face.

There is little doubt that the world is undergoing a significant period of change because of the accelerating pace of globalization. This period of rapid change is as significant as the period of change that occurred during the agricultural and industrial revolutions. What this change will mean remains to be seen. For now, however, the international system is uni-polar, with challenges to the U.S. Globalism is an element of the uni-polar international system, not a system unto itself. The military would do well to pay attention to changes in the international system brought about by globalism.

Globalization--The New International System?

A major topic of discussion today among national leaders, business, education, and other communities, is “globalism.” Globalism is increasingly being accepted as the dominant international system, replacing the Cold War system. The military would do well to pay attention to this change.

The impact of globalization on the armed forces is an area in which little research exists. This paper will explain globalism and discuss a number of issues associated with it. The first of the four sections of this paper defines globalism. The second examines elements of the globalism debate. The third offers suggestions as to why it is important for military leaders to study and understand globalism. The paper concludes with suggestions as to what globalism means for the U.S. military.

What is Globalism?

In his book, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Thomas L. Friedman offers a comprehensive definition of globalism, in which he artfully captures the elements of the globalism debate. Friedman’s thesis states that globalism is the new international system transforming world affairs. He argues that prior to the collapse of the Cold War system, the world could be characterized by division and symmetric threats--east v. west, communism v. capitalism, democracy v. dictatorship, and defined national borders. Similarly, these characteristics describe the structure of the Cold War world. The world was bi-polar and for the most part dominated by U.S. and U.S.S.R. competition. According to Friedman, globalism has replaced the Cold War international structure:

The globalization system is a bit different. It also has one overarching feature--integration. The world has become an increasingly interwoven place today, whether you are a company or a country, your threats and opportunities increasingly derive from whom you are connected to. This globalization system is also characterized by a single word: the Web. So in the broadest sense we have gone from a system built around division and walls to a system increasingly built around

integration and webs. In the Cold War we reached for the 'Hotline', which was a symbol that we were all divided but at least two people were in charge, the United States and the Soviet Union, and in the globalization system we reach for the internet, which is a symbol that we are all increasingly connected, and nobody is quite in charge.¹

Friedman also argues that globalization has its own culture and tends to be homogenizing. In previous eras, this sort of cultural homogenization happened on a regional scale--the Hellenization of the Near East and the Mediterranean world under the Greeks, the Turkification of Central Asia, North Africa, Europe and the Middle East by the Ottomans, or the Russification of Eastern and Central Europe and parts of Eurasia under the Soviets for instance.

The terminology of "global" and "globalization" became buzzwords during the 1990s. Random House defines "globalism" as, "the attitude or policy of placing the interests of the entire world above those of individual nations," and the word "globalize" as, "to extend to other or all parts of the globe; make worldwide: *efforts to globalize the auto industry.*"² This "globalizing journey," as Martin Wolf refers to it, is not a new one, and certainly did not start in the 1990s. Over the past five centuries, nations, organizations, and technology combined together, have progressively reduced barriers to international integration. Transatlantic communication, for example, has evolved from sail power to steam, to the telegraph, the telephone, the Concorde, and now to the internet.³ Other explanations and definitions of globalization that differ from Friedman's are mainly based on economics.

¹ Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, First Anchor Books Edition. (New York: Random House, 2000), 8.

² *The Learning Network Infoplease Dictionary*, <http://www.infoplease.com/ipd/A0458291.html>. Infoplease Dictionary Copyright © Family Education Network. Infoplease is based on The Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary content. Accessed December 12, 2000.

³ Martin Wolf, "Will the Nation-State Survive Globalization?" *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2001 Issue, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York, 179.

"Economic globalism" refers to the modern international economic system. The modern economic system is one in which firms, non-state organizations, and others, rather than nation states, are leading the movement towards global economic interdependence."⁴ Over twenty-five years ago, economists explained the globalization of capitalism, the rise of transnational corporations, and the related global division of labor, and global movements of capital easily enough.⁵ The roots of today's economic globalism, however, extend back further than twenty-five years.

The case can be made that the foundations of modern economic globalism were poured in the years following World War II, in which the U.S., other industrialized nations, and former allies led the expansion of worldwide economic activity. This fraternity of nations created an international economic system for trade, payments, and multilateral tariff reductions in an effort to manage international trade flows. The International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Trade Organization (WTO) are examples of such organizations created to manage economic forces after World War II. This system remains largely in place today, and it is this same system that has, among other things, placed economic globalism on the center stage.

The anti-WTO protests in Seattle and Prague in 1999-2000 point to how widespread and emotional the debates over economic globalism have become. For the average person, it was the first time that the debate over economic globalism was brought before a larger audience. Economic globalism has also been referred to as the spread of "Americanization." Americanization is spreading because the U.S. is the largest and most powerful economy.

⁴ Khalil A. Hamdani, Introduction, *The New Globalism and Developing Countries*, (Tokyo, Japan: United Nations University Press, 1997), 1-2.

⁵Braman, Sandra, Annabelle Sreberny-Mohammadi, and others, *Globalization, Communication, and Transnational Civil Society*, Cresskill, New Jersey, Hampton Press, 1996), 2.

Symptoms of Americanization are typified in the form of Big Macs in France on a micro-level, to Imacs and Mickey Mouse on a global scale.⁶

The classic case of Americanization spreading was Coca-Cola. During World War II, Coke gave the U.S. armed forces its beverage overseas, and with the deployment of U.S. forces Coke deployed too. In its wake grew the Coke bottling industry and a worldwide market. Coke was visionary. Everyone since has tried to emulate its marketing coup. Yet, there are many who feel the definition of economic globalism falls short in adequately explaining the larger forces impacting the international system today.

Policy makers of the leading economic nations see the forces of globalism influencing more than just global economic integration. Democratization, integration of capital, technology, information, open markets, permeable borders, multinational military forces, and redefined political organizations, for instance, are a handful of the many changes cited as evidence of the forces of globalism at work. This influence is becoming omnipresent, from the cars we drive, to the cultures, armed forces, and enemies we must face.

Friedman's definition of globalism differs from the economic definition in that it takes into account the complex global dynamics occurring today. There is a widely held school of thought that globalism remains an economic base-superstructure mode, and that any impacts of the forces of globalism, beyond economics, are by-products of the capitalistic world economy. As we shall see, this is a myopic view.

The challenge of defining and understanding globalization is two-fold. First is the need to recognize the change in the world today and how change is linked to globalization, and second, to develop adequate tools to conceptualize the dynamics of globalization. The

⁶ Thomas L. Friedman, Understanding Globalization, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Internet Site,

first is easier to prove, since there is mounting evidence that the forces of globalization are dramatically affecting the lives of people all over the world. The second may be more difficult, since few have been able to adequately explain a “theory” of globalization that is widely accepted. Since none exists, the process or concept of globalization is even more difficult to define. Some even argue it is too early to refer to globalism as a “theory,” especially for understanding post-Cold War international relations. A theory is a comprehensive system and framework for predicting behavior. Conversely, a concept is an idea that includes all that is characteristically associated with a term. There are competing views of theories attempting to explain the, “often abstract notions of globalization,” that suggest a “paradigmatic challenge” towards reconceptualizing nation-bounded models of social dynamics and change.⁷ With such conjecture, an examination of the forces that could potentially be shaping the future is challenging and difficult to ignore. The two-fold challenge of defining and understanding globalism, and what it represents, points to how lively and contentious the debate remains.⁸

In sum, today's era of globalization, which replaced the Cold War, is a dynamic, ongoing process occurring within a uni-polar international system, with challenges to the U.S. The forces of globalism are influencing this international system, and globalism has its own unique attributes. Globalism involves the inexorable integration of markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before. Globalization is enabling individuals, corporations, and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper, and cheaper than ever before, and in a way that is also producing a powerful backlash from

November 2000, <http://www.lexusandtheolivetree.com>. Accessed December 15, 2000.

⁷ Annabelle Sreberny-Mohammadi, “Globalization, Communication and Transnational Civil Society: Introduction,” *Globalization, Communication and Transnational Civil Society*, (Cresskill, New Jersey, Hampton Press, 1996), 19.

⁸ Sreberny-Mohammadi, “Globalization, Communication and Transnational Civil Society,” 2.

those brutalized or left behind by this new system. Globalization is the democratization, integration of capital, technology, information, open markets, permeable borders, multinational military forces, and redefined political organizations occurring throughout the world today. The driving idea behind globalization is free-market capitalism. It means the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every country in the world. Globalization's influence is felt everywhere, from the cars we drive, to the cultures, armed forces, and enemies we must face. It is not just economics, but includes much more integration, taking into account the complex global dynamics occurring today.

The Globalism Debate

There are many elements and issues of the globalism debate, some old and some new. The elements of the globalism debate are tempered by understanding change. As Geoffrey Blainey has noted, "Every era of rapid change is inclined to emphasize the new at the expense of what has not changed."⁹ The elements and issues of the debate, combined with actions of policy makers, provide evidence for the suggestion that globalism is increasingly being accepted as the new international order. And although there is pressure on the international system, there has been no resolute move towards globalism. The international system is uni-polar with challenges to the U.S. Identifying and discussing elements of the globalism debate help pinpoint linkages between the forces of globalism and its impacts. The elements of the globalism debate can also be used to conceptualize the dynamics of globalism.

Some of the major issues associated with the globalism debate are the notion of advocacy, impact on developing national strategy in the global era, the renewed emphasis on asymmetric threats, and increasing cultural tensions. Other elements of the debate include:

the concept of fragmentation, the rapid pace and the shock of change brought about by globalism, and global education.

The notion of advocacy pertains to leaders and policy makers in various fields adopting and sponsoring actions to further the concept or system of globalism. The proof that globalism has gained a number advocates over the last decade is illustrated by the actions of national leaders and those in business, education, and other communities in the U.S., Asia, and Europe. These leaders welcome globalism with great enthusiasm by advocating global programs and policies. Many of these leaders adopt an activist approach towards increasing the understanding of globalism. For example, in the U.S. over the last decade, it has become commonplace to agree that the inevitable future of the international system is the continued march towards *everything* on a global scale. The following will provide evidence as to how far sponsorship of the globalism system has become.

Many world leaders have enthusiastically embraced the system of globalism and are proactive in increasing the understanding of the new global order. The fall of the Berlin Wall only signaled the beginning of a new international order. By 1999 this new order prompted some to say that, “the world was only 10 years old.”¹⁰ Aside from speeches by leaders and policy makers, nations have taken policy steps towards structural, even generational change. Leaders implementing policy changes are influential in furthering globalism. They hold positions that can guarantee promotion of their views to a wide audience. These leaders are largely a diverse and eclectic group; they are international bankers, politicians, futurists, religious leaders, educators, scientists, and economic planners, among others. It is through various governmental programs, policies, international conferences, and religious meetings that they openly express their view: practically

⁹ Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War and Peace*, Third Edition (New York: The Free Press, 1988), 270.

everything affecting government and economies is increasingly uniting the world into a single *network*. For now, this single network is mostly economic. In the future, some advocates see globalism as the process by which the world will unite into a singular community.

Evidence of the actions by advocates of globalism can be seen in the policy decisions of the G8 nations during their annual economic summits. The group of G8 nations includes: the United States, the United Kingdom, Japan, Germany, France, Italy, Canada, and Russia (since 1998). Except for Russia, these nations represent the leading developed economies in the world. During the summits in the 1980s, the term globalization was not in the G8 leaders' vocabulary. Rather, the key concept during the 1980s was interdependence. The leaders had been dealing with interdependence for over twenty-five years, or earlier. In 1975 economists easily explained the interdependence of capitalism, transnational corporations, global labor, and movement of capital. Up until 1993, when the summit leaders met in Japan, they did not mention globalization. The first reference to globalization was at their Naples summit in 1994.

The recognition of the influence of globalization on the international system, and the response to that influence by the leading economic nations, dominated the summits of the 1990s. It is still at the top of the summit agendas, and the last summit in Okinawa perhaps proves the continued prominence of the globalization concept. In the 1990s, G8 leaders came to realize that globalization placed new demands on them at home, as well as internationally.

To harvest the benefits of globalization, these leaders saw the need for dynamic and competitive market economies, but that was not enough. They also saw the need to

¹⁰ Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, xvi.

intervene and implement rules for those markets to help the weak that fell behind and were ultimately marginalized by the forces of globalization. Above all, they had to counter public fears about globalization, where segments of populations worried about becoming vulnerable to external forces beyond their control. In many respects, the 1998 Birmingham summit marked a turning point in developing a more mature globalism system.

It was at this 1998 G8 summit, the first with the Russians as full members, that some call the first summit to concentrate on the challenges of globalization. Those challenges were in the areas of unemployment, crime and internal disorder, financial panic, and world poverty. None of these challenges are in the G8, except for Russia. These challenges are also not new subjects for the G8; these issues go back to the dawn of summitry. Globalization, however, requires the leaders to tackle them in a new way.¹¹ In Europe, policy action by advocates of globalism can be seen in the adoption of regional strategies to confront global challenges.

Actions and initiatives by the European Union (EU) provide evidence that a belief in the globalism system has gained momentum there. The EU embraces global economic strategies, such as the Euro, and is seriously discussing collective security strategies based on an understanding of the dynamics of globalism. The future competitiveness of the Euro on a global scale remains to be seen. In effect, the Euro is a contribution to furthering globalism since it seeks to unite and integrate European economies and monetary policy into one bloc. Further integration of EU economies and monetary policy is another step towards a unified European market that is competitive globally.

¹¹ Nicholas Bayne, "The G8 and the Globalization Challenge, New Directions in Global Governance?" Paper delivered at the Academic Symposium G8 2000. London School of Economics and Political Science, <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/bayne2000>. Accessed December 15, 2000.

Global and regional security strategies of the EU include both continued support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the support of the newly created Euro Corps.¹² Still largely in a conceptual phase, Euro Corps has significant challenges to overcome, if it can even overcome them, to be a factor in Europe or elsewhere. The challenges of the Euro and the establishment of the Euro Corps point out that the forces of globalism are increasingly influencing national security strategies.

A second issue associated with the globalism debate is in developing national strategy in the global era. Developing national strategy, economic, military, diplomatic, or other in the global era, presents both challenges and opportunities. Where the U.S. is concerned, national security policies in the 1990s reflected the emerging belief globalism was influencing the international order. The U.S. National Security Strategy is based on a belief that globalism was influencing the international order. This document attempts to show that globalism is now the dominant international system that has emerged following the Cold War. Some even call it, "...the central phenomenon of our time," one that, "plays to America's greatest strengths, to our creative and entrepreneurial spirit, and spreads our most cherished ideals of openness and freedom." It is recognized in the U.S. National Security Strategy that the world is, "at a time of rapid globalization, when events halfway around the earth can profoundly affect our safety and prosperity."¹³

The current U.S. National Security Strategy also begins to define what these opportunities and challenges may include in the global era:

¹² The EuroCorps is the European Union's (EU) much-discussed plan to create a pan-European military force of 60,000 men by 2003. The force, called the EuroCorps, is intended to engage in certain operations without the direct participation of the United States.

¹³ Samuel L. Berger, "American Leadership in the 21st Century," remarks delivered to the National Press Club January 7, 2000, White House Office of the Press Secretary.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/New/html/leadership.html>. Accessed December 13, 2000.

The twenty-first century will be an era of great promise. Globalization, the process of accelerating economic, technological, cultural, and political integration, is bringing citizens from all continents closer together, allowing them to share ideas, goods, and information in an instant... Globalization, however, also brings risks. Outlaw states... ethnic conflicts... weapons of mass destruction (WMD), terrorism, drug trafficking... international crime are global concerns that transcend national borders.¹⁴

Only part of the statement above is accurate. Among the flaws in the current U.S. National Security Strategy is the claim that some of the challenges cited as “new” existed before globalization. For instance, outlaw states, ethnic conflicts, WMD, terrorism, drug trafficking, and international crime all existed before globalization.

All of these threats, in one way or another, have existed for centuries. In effect, these threats are nothing new. What is new, however, is the rapid rate of change and increased lethality that these threats spread. The forces of globalism enable these threats to spread around the world rapidly and in the case of terrorists, for instance, get their message into every household via the evening news. The rapid pace of change creates the perception that these global threats are largely unchecked. This, however, is not really the case. There are many law enforcement and intelligence agencies in the U.S. and other nations vigilantly working to counter these threats.

While globalism is mentioned in the National Security Strategy, many feel that much remains to be accomplished, such as lay the foundation for which the U.S. power can be effective in the new global system. Namely, this means the development of an effective strategy. Some thinkers have gained influence with some U.S. policy makers and believe more can be done in this global era to devise strategy. The futurist, Alvin Toffler, suggests that in the era of globalism, “the greatest U.S. weakness is the absence of a global strategy.” Toffler ties this into how globalism is affecting the armed forces. “The biggest, strongest,

¹⁴ *A National Security Strategy for a New Century*, The White House, Washington, D.C. December 1999.

most expensive, best educated, best equipped military in the world, but it is strategically brainless.”¹⁵ This thinking follows the time-tested maxim that if, “you have no strategy, you are likely to become part of someone else’s strategy.”

Others echo Toffler’s view that determining a national strategy could prove to be difficult. These individuals believe that since ideas, concepts, and policy processes are all seemingly instantaneous and integrated, the challenge of developing a strategy is becoming increasingly difficult. The globalization of information technologies has a great deal to do with this. Ralph Peters, author and national security commentator, suggests that, “...of all the dangers globalization brings, none is so immediate, so destabilizing, and so irresistibly contagious as the onslaught of information, a plague of ideas.”¹⁶

A third issue in the globalism debate concerns asymmetric threats. Asymmetric threats have existed since the time of the Trojan horse. The term now commonly refers to those threats that have gained prevalence since the 1990s, and present non-traditional security threats to governments, defense, and national security structures. “These threats do not present the danger of a major conventional war but do present equal, and sometimes greater, dangers to the populations and governments of these states.”¹⁷

Globalism is fostering renewed emphasis on asymmetric threats that senior U.S. military and national security experts have acknowledged for several years. Many of these threats are brought into the world’s consciousness instantaneously by information

¹⁵ Alvin Toffler, “How Will Future Wars Be Fought?” interview with USA Today On-Line, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/comment/columnists/toffler/toff02.htm>, USA Today Opinion 1/28/00. Accessed December 7, 2000.

¹⁶ Ralph Peters, “The Plague of Ideas”, *Parameters*, Vol. XXX, No.4 Winter 2000-1, (U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, Pa), 5. Peters provides insight into the information revolution in this article and challenges traditional views to determine there is a new destabilizing transnational threat, an “onslaught of information – plague of ideas.” While the context of his article is limited to a discussion of only one aspect of globalization – the information revolution, it deserves mention to illustrate the growing debate exploring the challenges of globalization.

technologies. These technologies include the internet, information media, and others that enable the immediate transmission of information. “In a globalized world, we see, almost instantly, the killing and uprooting of innocent men, women and children thousands of miles away.”¹⁸ The revolution in computing, telecommunications and data-transfer capability is having an unprecedented impact on a large percentage of the world’s governments and almost everything those governments attempt to accomplish. The result is a strong influence on the international security agendas and on the nature of the threats in today’s world. Knowledge is now passed around the world “at the click of a mouse.”

Weapons of mass destruction (WMD), terrorism, network attacks, and actions of transnational non-state groups are examples of asymmetric threats re-emerging. These renewed threats are facilitated by the communications and transportation revolutions. Disease, drugs, and transnational crime are also examples of asymmetric threats that exist as global security challenges. Asymmetric threats are significant in that they require the integration and cooperation of civil and military organizations, domestically or internationally, to confront them.

These re-emerging asymmetric threats, as well as emerging non-traditional threats to security, such as rapid population growth, environmental decline, and poverty that breeds economic stagnation, are causing tensions within states. This tension sometimes leads to political instability, or even state collapse. The nearly 100 armed conflicts since the end of the Cold War have virtually all been intrastate affairs. Many begin with governments acting

¹⁷ Kevin O'Brien and Joseph Nusbaum, *Intelligence Gathering Asymmetric Threats*, Jane's Internet site <http://www.janes.com/>, Jane's Information Group. Accessed October 12, 2000.

¹⁸ Samuel L. Berger, “American Leadership in the 21st Century.”

against their own citizens, through extreme corruption, violence, incompetence, or complete breakdown, as in Somalia.¹⁹

Some feel that to confront these asymmetric threats it may require the creation of new organizations to face these global threats effectively. For instance, the integration of civilian and military expertise may be required to solve problems. Traditionally, coordination of civilian and military organizations has been the time-tested norm for solving problems not exclusively of a military nature. Civilian agencies may possess more expertise and knowledge to confront asymmetric threats; military skills are still required for security functions. In the future, these roles will most likely be re-examined as asymmetric threats are emphasized in security planning.

Responding to terrorists incidents is an example where the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), military, and other communities unite effectively in the global era. This type of integration was evident in the recent response to the U.S.S. Cole bombing, as well as the 1998 U.S. embassy bombings in Africa. Interagency cooperation and integration in the global era represents a powerful means to track down terrorists that perpetrate acts against U.S. interests. In the incidents mentioned above, the military provided timely security, logistics, medical, and other support, while other agencies proceeded to investigate and track terrorists.

Reorganizing the U.S. national security structure for homeland defense will to some degree emphasize the forces of globalism at work. For the military, this may minimally require leadership education, and perhaps new organizations and new skill sets for armed forces to cope with the security challenges of globalism. For instance, military leaders will need to be prepared to work with such diverse organizations, such as the FBI, Drug

¹⁹ Jessica T. Mathews, "Power Shift," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 1997 Issue, Council on

Enforcement Agency (DEA), the Moscow police, United Nations (U.N.) peacekeeping forces, U.S. National Guard, and others to confront integrated, global threats.

Another issue in the globalism debate is the evidence that during the transition to globalism, cultural tensions are being rekindled, or even created. Some of these tensions are centuries old, but the forces of globalism have renewed these age-old problems. Cultural tensions exacerbated by the forces of globalism can be seen in the form of the "local versus the global" analogy. "Local versus the global" is a phrase advocates use when describing the challenges that lie ahead in the coming years, as the transition to globalism continues. The local versus the global is seen where the ancient world and the modern are colliding, as cultures confront globalism, such as in the Muslim and Christian world.

In Kosovo in 1999, for instance, this collision was clear during NATO's Operation Allied Force. Allied Force involved a clash of cultures. The NATO nations (all of the G8 as well) confronted some of the world's most primeval instincts of hatred in an effort to eliminate ethnic cleansing. Or, consider the sudden and seemingly endless change of events in the Middle East. This brings out the fact that local actions can turn the "smiley face of globalization," quickly into a frown, or worse. An increase or decrease in cultural tensions may be a measure of the continuing force of local politics on a global scale, and how the forces of globalism influence those tensions.²⁰

Advocates of globalism hope that ethnic tensions will melt away, as examples of globalism, such as the Internet and McDonald's hamburger stands, spread. Their hope is that the expansion of free markets might cure the world's ills. The U.S. and other G8

Foreign Relations, New York, New York, 51.

²⁰ Jim Hoagland, "No One In Charge," commenting on globalism in the Middle East. Washington Post, Opinion, The Washington Post Company, Washington, D.C., Sunday, October 22, 2000, B07. While not authoritative on the subject of globalism, Hoagland captures the "local versus the global" in the colloquial

nations have adopted the doctrines of interdependence, enlargement, and engagement to encourage the expansion of globalism in regions where ethnic tensions are present. U.S. engagement in the Balkans and former Soviet republics are examples of this. The hope of globalism advocates is that the force of politics would yield to the force of multinational corporations, the market, and thus result in a reduction in cultural tensions. This has not been the case, however.

What advocates of globalism fail to mention is that reducing cultural tensions will increasingly be difficult in a future dominated by globalism. The "web" structure of the world means there are too many competing voices; this has always been true, but with advances in information technologies this will prove even more of a challenge. Few voices will emerge as dominant powers. Friedman's summary of the current global state, "Who is in charge?" rings loud. There is no clear answer for a seemingly integrated, yet dissimilar group of national security planners, individual investors, and non-investors, all influenced by globalism. Globalization is usually hyped for the happy inevitability it brings. Ethnic tensions may well prove to be the ultimate test of the promise of globalism.

In sum, the evidence of advocacy, development of national strategy in the global era, renewed emphasis on asymmetric threats, and increasing cultural tensions are some of the principle elements of the globalism debate discussed to this point. Other issues to be discussed in the paper include: the concept of "fragmentation," the rapid pace and shock of change brought about by globalism, and education.

The concept of fragmentation suggests that globalization could divide the world into "haves and have-nots." Fragmentation refers to the nationalist, religious, ethnic, protectionist, or other groups that seek greater local autonomy and insulation. The concept

context. Hamdani, *The New Globalism and Developing Countries*, and Braman, *Globalization, Communication, and*

of fragmentation conflicts with the commercially driven vision of globalism of the leading political and economic nations. The leading nations largely favor a top-down version of globalization, with other nations following. Globalization has its own set of economic rules that revolve around opening, deregulating and privatizing your economy.²¹ If a nation does not open its economy to prevent fragmentation, proponents of globalism see it as a signal of wanting to be left behind in the new global system.

Fragmentation is being blamed for fueling frustrated expectations in developing nations, inequities, and heightened communal tensions as the world continues the transition away from the Cold War system. As much as the leading nations of the world desire to integrate more and more, there is also a cadre of nations and non-nations that are left behind during this period of transition. Fragmentation is also identified as a catalyst for the spread of organized crime and weapons of mass destruction.²² Fragmentation is considered a catalyst for crime and WMD, since these asymmetric threats can be developed in an isolated society (internationally isolated, not by information technology, however) and used by terrorists to instantly bring their case home via the information media. However, to counteract fragmentation, advocates argue for the need to maintain a robust global economy and greater international cooperation.

The hope is that a robust global economy and increased international cooperation can reduce fragmentation and its associated challenges, such as armed conflict, population growth, poverty, and water shortages. If unchecked, these problems could be global in scale

Transnational Civil Society, also explain the notion of local versus global in their works.

²¹ Thomas L. Friedman, Understanding Globalization, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Internet Site: <http://www.thelexusandtheolivetree.com>, Copyright ©1999-2000 Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc. Book Copyright ©1999-2000 Thomas Friedman, November 2000.

²² Vernon Loeb, "Global Threats Against U.S. Will Rise, Report Predicts," Washington Post, Monday, 18 December 2000, A03.

by 2015.²³ Proponents of globalism argue that the more you let market forces rule, and the more you open your economy to free trade and competition, the more efficient and flourishing your economy will be. The thinking is that this will alleviate the effects of fragmentation.

Some nations suffer from want of good leadership, and are thus left behind the international community. Additionally, fragmentation can hinder nations economically, technically, culturally, or by other means. Countries can also be left behind by their own choice, perhaps because they desire to be. Bad leadership proves this. The cases of Burma and the Congo are illustrations of nations lagging behind due to poor leadership. Consequently, fragmentation is a symptom of the notion that globalism is causing change.

Although economic predictions about the future vary, the evidence of fragmentation also makes it clear that not everyone is convinced of the benefits of top-down globalism. Not all of the G8 nations, for instance, are convinced that top-down globalism can solve the problems outlined above. Nor will economic predictions always be as rosy as in the present; inevitably, there will be change in rosy economic outlooks. Differing economic predictions about the future have created competing views on what globalism can and cannot do to solve fragmentation and its associated problems.

History is filled with similar conflicts surrounding periods of change. When the industrial revolution began in Europe over 150 years ago, it triggered years of conflict, largely political, with the agrarian elite trying to maintain its economic and political power against a rising group of commercial and industrial interests. That conflict was more or less peaceful. The pace of change associated with globalism, however, makes one wonder if economics alone can keep this new wave of change be peaceful.

²³ Global Threats Against U.S. Will Rise, A03.

The rapid pace and the shock of change brought about by globalism are dizzying. The case can be made that globalization is spreading at a rapid, uneven rate, but wherever it spreads, it has important social, cultural implications, as well as potential impacts on the armed forces, society, cultures, and everyday lives.

The cause for conflict today, proponents of globalism argue, is most likely the result of the pace of unprecedented transformation to the international system brought about by the forces of globalism. In contrast to the industrial revolution, “the process of globalization is more compressed” in measurement of time. Many feel its evolution will be rocky, marked by chronic financial volatility and a widening economic divide. The networked global economy, driven by rapid, largely unrestricted flows of information, ideas, cultural values, capital, goods and services could leave many societies in turmoil.²⁴

The magnitude of transformation occurring is unprecedented. Ten thousand years ago the agricultural revolution launched a slow wave of change. The industrial revolution triggered a second, faster wave of change. What we are living through now is “history’s third great wave of change, one that is arriving at hyper-speed and is global in extent.”²⁵ The U.S. economy, society, and culture are being affected by this hyper-speed, global change. Adapting to this transformation and coping with the unexpected is essential.

Moving the armed forces into the 21st century, away from the industrial, mass-army model of the past 150 years, promises to be challenging in this changing perspective of the global environment. Attempts in the last decade to examine the services roles and missions, force structures, organization, doctrine, and role in society illustrate this challenge. Perhaps by examining the dynamics of globalism and global organizations, there may be examples for

²⁴ Global Threats Against U.S. Will Rise, A03.

a framework the armed forces could use to meet the changing world and security challenges of the 21st century? Either way, the U.S. armed forces seem to be at a turning point, where an examination should include sifting and weighing the opportunities and dangers presented by the new globalism.

Another element to consider in the globalism debate is education. Where education is concerned, there is evidence that reinforces the notion that globalism is gaining proponents that argue that it is the new international order. “Global education,” for instance, is being taught at the elementary, secondary, undergraduate, and graduate levels in the U.S. and elsewhere. In educational circles, the thinking is that students of the next generation will be able to understand the basic foundations of globalism, to prepare students for the global age. The hope is that this will enable future generations to deal effectively with problems inherent in globalization: population growth, environmental problems, cultural tensions, and terrorism, for instance.

For example, global education is being taught at the Greenbriar Academy in Durham, N.C. The third grade class at the Academy has been participating in a global e-mail campaign. To date the class has sent and received e-mails from over 300,000 people on all five continents; the class goal is to exchange e-mail with someone in every one of the 192 countries recognized by the U.N. The use of internet technology in elementary school is not new, however. The difference is that the Greenbriar project publicly stated goal is to have students gain a “wonder lust” for citizens and cultures of the world, and to not just consider

²⁵ Alvin Toffler, “What moral standards will we have?” interview with USA Today On-Line, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/comment/columnists/toffler/toff02.htm>, USA Today Opinion 1/28/00. Accessed December 7, 2000.

themselves Americans.²⁶ More to the point for the military audience, globalism has not gone unrecognized by senior level military leaders, as well as allies of the U.S.

Within the military education system, there is recognition and discussion of economic globalization and its relationship to national security. The discussion of globalization for the military audience, in economic terms, however, is limited. It is more appropriate to describe globalism with the broader definition of globalization in mind. The U.S. military has begun to argue, in an academic environment, that perhaps “U.S. leaders must do a better job explaining the benefits of globalization and addressing its costs than they have to date.”²⁷ Compare this level of exposure and education concerning globalism, with the above example of the numerous elementary, secondary, and universities that now routinely offering courses on global topics. Topics range from economics, information technology, government, conflict, the environment, to religion, and more.²⁸ How well the American military and defense industries embrace the complexities of globalism, however, remains to be seen.

To sum up the globalism debate, it is appropriate to say that the forces of globalism, such as democratization, integration of capital, technology, information, open markets, permeable borders, multinational military forces, and redefined political organizations, in the eyes of globalism proponents, tend to facilitate integration, promote openness, and encourage institutional reform. This notion is only partially valid. A realist assessment acknowledges that we are in a period of transition, but from the evidence pointed out above,

²⁶ National Public Radio broadcast, Thursday, February 22, 2001.

²⁷ Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, *Strategic Assessment 1999 Priorities for a Turbulent World*, Chapter Two, Economic Globalization: Stability or Conflict? U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1999, 36.

²⁸ The point here emphasizes that there are numerous educational institutions offering courses designed around the content of globalism; this translates into a generational exposure to the global perspective.

determining where all the aspects of globalism may be taking us is too difficult to predict at this time.

Some elements of globalism seem here to stay, however. The forces of globalism are influencing the international order. It has advocates, the U.S. and others have begun to incorporate it into strategy, and nations are beginning to recognize its challenges and dangers. These are a few reasons that hint at why it is important for military leaders to study and understand globalism.

Why the Military Should Study Globalization

Globalization is a significant process for the military community to study for two reasons. First, the military audience is only beginning to comprehend the magnitude of changes occurring because of globalization. A second reason is the symbiotic relationship between industry and the military.

The military and other communities are only beginning to comprehend the magnitude of change occurring as the world transitions to globalization. Senior leaders within the military education system recognize that we must do a better job explaining the benefits and costs of globalization. Acceptance of the globalization process at the most senior policy-making level in the Defense Department, however, has not been as quickly accepted as the political leadership of the G8 has acknowledged it, for instance. Nonetheless, senior U.S. policy leaders have indeed recognized that the world has changed because of globalism. “This so called post-Cold War World is a more integrated world and, as a result, weapons and technologies once available only to a few nations are proliferating and becoming pervasive. And not just to nations but to non-state entities.”²⁹

²⁹ George Melloan, quoting Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld in, “Assessing Security Threats Isn’t Just a War Game,” Global View, The Wall Street Journal, 20 February 2001.

In peacetime, studying globalization could yield benefits in future times of conflict. History holds numerous examples of successful adaptation to change. For example, in the 1970s, an increasing threat to the U.S. flow of oil from the Middle East, an inability by the U.S. to respond to the Iranian Hostage Crisis, and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan were a series of events that resulted in the creation of the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM). Additionally, new plans and forces, such as fast sealift ships, Maritime Pre-positioned Shipping, the Army's light divisions, and an enlarged airlift fleet were all created as a result of peacetime adaptation.

Changes in war, as well as in peacetime, inevitably yield the unexpected. Military professionals must always prepare for the unknown. Coping with the unexpected tends to cause great strains. Consequently, procedures must be changed, doctrine adapted, equipment modified, etc. However, history has also shown that it is this ability to adapt to the unexpected that has provided the U.S. and its allies with hidden strength. The armed forces must often take on chameleon-like qualities to adapt to change. The military must constantly adapt to new global, operational, political, economic, informational, international, and transnational realities. The process of adaptation can be seen in peacetime. In peacetime, nations attempt to update and transform their military establishments to support changing political objectives, for instance.

As military leaders realize the dynamics of transition, and the associated conflicts that result, there are suggestions as to how to manage that change. When a new wave of change brings a new type of economy, new technology, and a new way of life, it conflicts with those psyches that are hitched to the previous system. When a new wealth system and way of life arise, there are winners and losers. Those who can adapt will win; those who cannot adapt will lose. The changes brought about by globalism bring vast promise, potentially as vast

and as far reaching as the changes that occurred around the world as a result of the agricultural and industrial revolutions.

The process of adaptation and transformation is constant. If there are benefits from globalization, and if there are strengths the armed forces can use, then the study of globalization is warranted. As discussed above, the globalization system, unlike the set-piece Cold War system, is not static, but rather a much more dynamic ongoing process.

Globalization involves the integration of many things at once: markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before. This integration is enabling individuals, corporations, and nation-states to achieve global goals as never before. This integration is also producing a backlash from those brutalized or left behind by this new system.³⁰ Many nations that are left behind do not realize it or do not care. Afghanistan and Sudan, for instance, illustrate this. These countries have been accused of harboring Ulsama Bin Laden, as well as resenting globalism.

A second reason for studying globalism is illustrated in the symbiotic relationship between private industry and the military. This relationship between industry and the armed forces has been constant since the Industrial Revolution. President Eisenhower labeled this relationship the "military-industrial complex." This interrelationship has influenced changes to both industry and the military in the past, and will continue to affect one other.

Industry and the military have looked to one another for ideas and innovation since the late 16th century. The interaction of early entrepreneurs and the Dutch armies of the 17th century are exemplary highlights of this relationship. The changes that occurred from that

³⁰ Thomas L. Friedman, *Understanding Globalization, The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Internet Site: <http://www.thelexusandtheolivetree.com>, Copyright ©1999-2000 Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc. Book Copyright ©1999-2000 Thomas Friedman. Accessed November 18, 2000.

relationship suggest the armed forces may benefit by looking towards modern global organization models and organizational ideas.

In the book, *The Soldier and Social Change*, Jacques van Doorn details how early entrepreneurial enterprises modeled themselves after Dutch military organizations beginning in the 17th century. Van Doorn's thesis proposes that since the 18th century to the present, industrial and military organizations have had similar characteristics. The development of similar characteristics is inherent in the relationship of industry and the armed forces. Characteristics of this relationship include such things as hierarchical organization, professionalism of managers and officers, standardization of functions, recruiting practices, increased reliance on technology, and development of professional education.³¹

According to van Doorn, private industry and the military had a common point of departure for the development of similar characteristics--the promotion of effectiveness. Effectiveness was essential to achieve the common goals of both organizations within society: productivity, respectability, and combat power.³²

In an argument similar to van Doorn, Professor Maury D. Feld, in his book, *The Structure of Violence: Armed Forces as Social Systems*, suggests that the Dutch experience provides other aspects of the industry-armed forces relationship that also deserves mention. Feld proposes that toward the end of the 16th century, the Dutch developed a method whereby troops could be trained to combine maneuver with the production of a steady and controlled rate of fire. Feld argues that this was, “ perhaps the first major social activity organized by numbers. It was a model for the subsequent bureaucratic and industrial development of Europe.”

³¹ Jacques van Doorn, *The Soldier and Social Change*, (Beverly Hills, California: SAGE Publications, 1975), 10.

³² van Doorn, *The Soldier and Social Change*, 11.

It is also no accident that around this time, the military structure of authority was seen as directly translatable into a fundamental symbolic order, the price system, and that it was, in all probability, the pioneer in the graduated age scale. The first business schools were also created around this time, very similar in structure to military academies that existed at the time.³³ This model of bureaucratic and industrial development achieved effectiveness through organization.

One of the first things early industrial organizations did during the period of the industrial revolution, for instance, was to adapt the military organizational structure to early factories and enterprises. The result was an industrial hierarchy. To a large extent, this organization continued into the 20th century, until information technology companies such as Intel and others, broke the “IBM-type” hierarchal model of organization. The military hierarchy seemed suited for the division of labor, management, and ownership aspects of early industrial enterprises. This was manifested in factory organizations and relationships, most notably, the shop worker-foreman-supervisor-owner relationship.

Moving ahead some 150 years, globalism demands integration in enterprises. Global organizations are integrating processes, workers, and functions to an unprecedented degree. In many respects, modern military organizations have adapted to this tendency as well. This is demonstrated in ever increasing integration of multinational organizations and operations.

The influences globalization has had in the last decade on multinational military organizations, forces, and operations are significant. Under the globalism system, internationally dominating power decreasingly resides in a unified national territory (state, bloc), or in a single privileged subject (international ruling elites). Nor does it depend on a primary determinant (military/strategic), or lie at a basic level (state/national). Rarely now

³³ Maury D. Feld, *The Structure of Violence: Armed Forces as Social Systems*, (Beverly Hills, California:

do we see these four elements coinciding, as might have been the case during the “Pax Britannica” (up to 1914) or “Pax Americana” (the American Century after 1945). During the war against Iraq in 1990-1991, there emerged a distinct division of labor.³⁴

The Gulf War coalition pooled different kinds of power possessed by different entities, organizations, and nations. The U.S. supplied military equipment and trained personnel. Some Arab countries provided bases. The Emirs, the Japanese, and the Germans provided cash and material. The United Nations Security Council provided legitimation for the effort. While the war drew on nationalist sentiment in the U.S. and some other countries, its coalition model actually reflected the inability of the U.S. or any other single nation to function as a hegemonic power on its own.³⁵ The U.S. could have acted in concert with Saudi Arabia, but the coalition vehicle is used traditionally by great powers to keep global alignment in their favor.

The parallels almost a decade later between the Gulf War and NATO’s air strikes against Yugoslavia are clear. Both can be seen as a “global” war in many respects as seen in *The Kosovo After Action Review*, presented by Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen and General Henry H. Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Operation Allied Force could not have been conducted without the NATO alliance and without the infrastructure, transit and basing access, host-nation force contributions, and most importantly, political and diplomatic support provided by the allies and other members of the coalition.³⁶

SAGE Publications, 1977), 17.

³⁴ Peter Waterman, “A New World View: Globalization, Civil Society, and Solidarity,” *Globalization, Communication and Transnational Civil Society*, (Cresskill, New Jersey, Hampton Press, 1996), 45.

³⁵ Peter Waterman, “A New World View: Globalization, Civil Society, and Solidarity,” 45.

³⁶ Defense Link U.S. Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct1999/b10141999_bt478-99.html. Prepared joint statement on the Kosovo After Action Review presented by Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen and Gen. Henry H. Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, October 14, 1999. Accessed December 12, 2000.

The contributions of the NATO allies and partners-particularly the nations near the theater of conflict, like Hungary, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and others-were in large part a dividend of sustained U.S. and NATO “engagement” with those nations over the last several years. Many viewed this engagement, which included participation in Partnership for Peace activities, as a means to help stabilize institutions in these nations. This engagement was done in an effort so that these nations were better able to withstand the burden inflicted upon them by the humanitarian crisis, and the conduct of the operation itself. There is also a large economic dimension included in engagement. Engagement is also part of the U.S. National Security Strategy that recognizes globalism as the international system.

Professionalism of leaders is also an area where impacts of globalism are seen. The link between the professionalism of leaders and enterprises modeling themselves after military organizations beginning in the 17th century has also been studied. There are many aspects of the professionalism of military leaders in the global environment. Where professionalism of leaders is concerned, the issue revolves around whether or not the transference of military skills to civilian society, or vice versa, can take place. Global organizations increasingly value skills that are transferable. Military skills are adaptable, as well.

As an expert competing with others, military leaders tend to evaluate themselves in terms of the larger civilian society, an evaluation intensified by the willingness of that society to reward them on those terms. The transformation of America’s global position has had implications for the nature of officership and armed forces leadership. In Feld’s analysis of the interrelationship between private industry and the military, he suggests that generals, admirals, and senior enlisted are assumed to be interchangeable with CEOs and managers.

Such interchanges and transitions are relatively frequent. Leaders move from the military to industry in peacetime and from industry to the military in wartime. “The soldier is expected to demonstrate that he is an economically viable item. The rewards are modeled on those of private industry.”³⁷

The connection between contemporary military organizations and global industries is fairly evident where professionalism of leaders is concerned. A strong case can be made that global industries continue to seek out military professionals for employment. This has led the armed forces to adopt the role of “embodying” the industrial, business, principles, and skills of the larger society. The result is that the military has presented itself as the culmination of numerous autonomous lines of entrepreneurial development.³⁸

Reliance on technology is another association that military and industrial organizations have shared over the past 150 years. Globalization also has its own defining technologies: computerization, miniaturization, digitization, satellite communications, fiber optics, and the Internet. The defining technologies of globalism, and the skill sets required to use them, combined together, are proving to be powerful tools. One of the most prominent symbols the globalization system is a World Wide Web, “The Net,” which has the potential to unite more people than ever before.

Increased reliance on technology in the globalism era means, for instance, that information technologies disrupt hierarchies, spreading power among more people and groups. In drastically lowering the costs of communication, consultation, and coordination, these technologies also favor decentralized networks over other modes of organization. In a network, individuals or groups link for joint action without building a physical or formal institutional presence. Networks have no person at the top and no center. Instead, they

³⁷ Feld, *The Structure of Violence: Armed Forces as Social Systems*, 53.

have multiple nodes where collections of individuals or groups interact for different purposes. Business, citizen organizations, ethnic groups, and crime cartels have all readily adopted the network model. “Governments, on the other hand, are quintessential hierarchies, wedded to an organizational form incompatible with all that the new technologies make possible.”³⁹

Increased reliance on technology also means that the mass army is in danger of becoming extinct in the developed world. Forces using high, often craft-produced technology will most likely replace the mass army. The parallel of changes brought about by early industrial enterprises and military organizations is apparent. It is a logical and reasonable extension that today successful global organizations can be used as examples for military transformation. The quality of technology today, while it does not trump individual skill, is vastly more important than it ever has.

For instance, a superbly skilled crew in a Russian T-72 tank might be able to challenge a group of bumblers in an American M-1 Abrams, but they would find it tough to defeat a tank whose armor they could not penetrate with ammunition and that could see and shoot them when they could do neither. Technology also means that the qualitative element in war, particularly once supporting activities such as the gathering and processing of information, is considered stronger than mass numbers. That fact, combined with the decline of great power conflict in the globalism system, will most likely change military force structure.⁴⁰

³⁸ Feld, *The Structure of Violence: Armed Forces as Social Systems*, 53.

³⁹ Mathews, “Power Shift,” 52.

⁴⁰ Eliot A. Cohen, “Why the Gap Matters” *The National Interest*-Fall 2000. No. 61., National Affairs Inc., Washington, D.C.

Conclusion

This paper explains globalism and defines the debate associated with it. Research revealed several elements of the globalism debate that military leaders should note. The principle elements are the notion of advocacy, development of national strategy in the global era, renewed emphasis on asymmetric threats, and increasing cultural tensions. Other elements to the debate include the concept of fragmentation, the rapid pace and the shock of change brought about by globalism, and global education. These elements provide evidence that globalism is genuine and is influencing the post-Cold War international system.

Globalization is a significant issue for the military to study for two fundamental reasons. One is that the military audience is only beginning to comprehend the magnitude of societal transformation occurring because of the forces of globalization. Another reason is the parallels of the unique interrelationship of industry and the military.

The degree of societal transformation occurring because of the forces of globalization is as significant as that which occurred during the agricultural and industrial revolutions. The agricultural revolution launched a “wave” of change and the industrial revolution triggered a second, faster wave of change. Globalism is “history’s third great wave of change.” The U.S. economy, society, and culture are being affected by this hyper-speed, wave of global change. It is essential that the armed forces recognize this change. Perhaps the potential for adapting to it can be seen in the interrelationship between industry and the military over the last 150 years.

The unique interrelationship of industry and the military has produced changes that have influenced both in the past. It will most likely continue to influence both in the era of globalism. This interrelationship indicates that the armed forces could use elements of industry’s reorientation toward globalism to benefit itself.

The original aim in researching this paper was to explore globalization's impacts on the armed forces. The conclusion reached is twofold. First, there is little doubt that the world is undergoing a significant period of change because of globalization. The world continues to move away from the Cold War system towards something else. What that something else is remains to be seen. For now, however, the international system is uni-polar with challenges to the U.S.; globalism is an element of the uni-polar international system, not a system unto itself. Second, at this time, how a changed world will look is not yet obvious. It is too difficult to predict that point in the future when the transition to globalism will be complete. These predictions are murky since globalism was widely embraced in the 1990s, and now in the 2000s may be challenged by an emerging realist's perspective and problem-solving approach to international challenges. Somewhere in the ebb and flow of history there are answers. The military would be well served to keep a careful watch on these currents of change. As long as military leaders are aware of the changes taking place, the best one could ask is that the challenges and opportunities are carefully sifted before making sweeping transformations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayne, Nicholas. "The G8 and the Globalization Challenge," New Directions in Global Governance?, G8's Okinawa Summit, Paper delivered at the Academic Symposium G8 2000. London School of Economics and Political Science, web site <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/g7/scholar/bayne2000>. Accessed December 15, 2000.
- Berger, Samuel L. "American Leadership in the 21st Century," remarks delivered to the National Press Club January 7, 2000, White House Office of the Press Secretary. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/New/html/leadership.html>. Accessed December 13, 2000.
- Berger, Samuel R. "A Foreign Policy for the Global Age," Foreign Affairs, November/December 2000 Issue, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York.
- Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War and Peace*, Third Edition, New York: The Free Press, 1988.
- Braman, Sandra, Annabelle Sreberny-Mohammadi, and others, *Globalization, Communication and Transnational Civil Society*, Cresskill, New Jersey, Hampton Press, 1996.
- Cohen, Eliot A. "Why the Gap Matters" The National Interest-Fall 2000, No. 61, National Affairs Inc., Washington, D.C.
- Cohen, Eliot A. Email to Maj P.C. Skuta, in response to proposal of Globalism as a thesis topic, Cohen suggested, "... Probably the easiest way into it is by looking at the information media, which really are global (defense industries, by way of contrast, are not yet). The transparency of military operations to the media world wide surely has an effect on civil-military relations..." September 9, 2000.
- Defense Link U.S. Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.
http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct1999/b10141999_bt478-99.html. Prepared joint statement on the Kosovo After Action Review presented by Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen and Gen. Henry H. Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, October 14, 1999. Accessed December 12, 2000.
- Feld, Maury D., *The Structure of Violence: Armed Forces as Social Systems*, Beverly Hills, California: SAGE Publications, 1977.
- Friedman, Thomas L., *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, First Anchor Books Edition, New York, New York: Random House, 2000.
- Hamdani, Khalil A., *The New Globalism and Developing Countries*, Tokyo, Japan: United Nations University Press, 1997, 1-2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hoagland, Jim “No One In Charge,” Washington Post, Opinion, The Washington Post Company, Washington, D.C., Sunday, October 22, 2000, B07. While not authoritative on the subject of globalism, Hoagland captures the “local versus the global” in the context others have as well. Hamdani, The New Globalism and Developing Countries, and Braman, Globalization, Communication, and Transnational Civil Society, also explain the notion of local versus global in their works.
- Loeb, Vernon “Global Threats Against U.S. Will Rise, Report Predicts,” Washington Post, Monday, December 18, 2000, A03. Loeb summarizes a global threat assessment completed by the National Intelligence Council (NIC). The report also concludes that terrorist attacks against the United States through 2015 “will become increasingly sophisticated and designed to achieve mass casualties. We expect the trend toward greater lethality . . . to continue.” Nevertheless, the United States will remain “unparalleled” in its economic, technological, military and diplomatic influence by 2015, the report states, remaining in “the vanguard of the technological revolution from information to biotechnology and beyond.” The 68-page document, “Global Trends 2015: A Dialogue about the Future with Nongovernmental Experts,” represents an attempt by the U.S. intelligence community to look beyond its secret sources and involve academia and the private sector in forecasting world trends over the next decade and a half.
- Mathews, Jessica T., “Power Shift,” Foreign Affairs, January/February 1997 Issue, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York.
- Melloan, George, “Assessing Security Threats Isn’t Just a War Game,” Global View, The Wall Street Journal, 20 February 2001.
- National Public Radio, All Things Considered, “Global Education,” article broadcast 22 February 2001.
- O'Brien, Kevin, and Nusbaum, Joseph Intelligence Gathering Asymmetric Threats, Jane’s Internet site <http://www.janes.com/>, Jane's Information Group, accessed October 12, 2000.
- Peters, Ralph “The Plague of Ideas”, Parameters, Vol. XXX, No.4 Winter 2000-1, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle, Pa, 5. Peters provides insight into the information revolution in this article and challenges traditional views to determine there is a new destabilizing transnational threat, an “on slaught of information – plague of ideas.” While the context of his article is limited to a discussion of only one aspect of globalization – the information revolution, it deserves mention in the paper to illustrate the growing debate exploring the challenges of globalization.
- The Learning Network Infoplease Dictionary,
<http://www.infoplease.com/ipd/A0458291.html>. Infoplease Dictionary Copyright © Family Education Network. Infoplease is based on The Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary content. Accessed December 12, 2000.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The White House, *A National Security Strategy for a New Century*, The White House, Washington, D.C. December 1999.

Toffler, Alvin, “How Will Future Wars Be Fought?” interview with USA Today On-Line, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/comment/columnists/toffler/toff02.htm>, USA Today Opinion 1/28/00, Accessed December 7, 2000.

Toffler, Alvin, “What moral standards will we have?” interview with USA Today On-Line, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/comment/columnists/toffler/toff02.htm>, USA Today Opinion 1/28/00. Accessed December 7, 2000.

van Doorn, Jacques, *The Soldier and Social Change*, Beverly Hills, California: SAGE Publications, 1975.

Waterman, Peter, “A New World View: Globalization, Civil Society, and Solidarity”, *Globalization, Communication and Transnational Civil Society*, Cresskill, New Jersey, Hampton Press, 1996.

Wolf, Marin, “Will the Nation-State Survive Globalization?” *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2001 Issue, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York.