THE WORLD BETWEEN THE GLOBALIZATION, DEMOCRATIZATION, AND DISINTEGRATIVE GLOBALISM

Abstract. The study problematizes the democratic consequences of globalization and conceptualizes attention to the fact that an adversary process of disintegration occurs in parallel with integration and globalization. It further distinguishes between globalization as an objective historical process and globalism as adverse domination. In order to reverse the resistance against globalization, active policies are required in opposite directions: strengthening democracy above the level of the nation-state and investing efforts in local economic development. Globalization can regulate through international agencies, although it cannot be sufficiently democratic. Globalization causes the weakness of national borders, restriction of state domination on information stream and traditional borders, and broadcast of democratic values by new communication instrumentals that stable democracy to favorite aim and too success method in people minds. However, globalization strengthens democratization, political, cultural, and social transformation. World citizenship necessarily presupposes creating a new political identity, and cosmopolitanism must show how this identity can be achieved without a democratic deficit or a bureaucratic-oligarchic plethora. It is essential to build a theory of globalization by understanding what is arising in various spheres separately. The world cannot be governed based on several abstract ideological principles such as liberalization, privatization, and monetarism - insofar as the hegemonism policies' philosophy. After a certain level of development, the Soviet Union could no longer be successfully managed from one center, converting even less powerful globally. The consequences of centralism are rough, inadequate, belated solutions that do not consider the specifics (historical, cultural, sociopolitical, economic, psychological) of regions (Balkans, Muslim World, Latin America) and any particular nation-state. Each of which must have a different development strategy. The events like Arab Spring should advance for democratization in non-democratic regions because freedom, equality, and justice are common values between people that are hidden in democracy nature.
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Introduction

Most of the existing literature on globalization has the purpose of warning and alarming us: something important new has entered the world-historical scene, which will radically change the living conditions of humanity, according to which we cannot be indifferent, but which we can hardly influence. Thus, globalization is presented as an inevitable historical process, similar to natural events. Globalization probably began in ancient times when the first Phoenician merchant ships sailed from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic in search of new "markets," it was taken over by Colombo and explorers of new worlds, colonialists. From the 15th to the 18th century, 78% of all discoveries were initiated for commercial reasons. Marx is a pro-analyst of modern globalization, and in 1848 he stated that capitalism is a rational system that tends to maximize surplus value, increase labor productivity and profit. As long as these interests exist, there will be a tendency to look for conditions that optimize Earth requirements, perhaps once outside. The most significant obstacle to that process is the borders of the countries that are being threatened again.

When describing globalization, we are overwhelmed by a considerable amount of facts from all areas of social reality: political, economic, cultural, media, technological, military. However, some weaknesses are evident when it comes to its analytical level: important conceptual distinctions are missing, for example, between globalization as an objective world integrative process and ideology which understands this process as the establishment of a global government that will rule the world from one center. More than anything, this literature lacks a critical dimension. It is not just a matter of the fact that it is often apologetic, that it treats globalization, without any discrimination, as not only inevitable but essentially a progressive process. The point is that even when it provides a dark picture of impersonal alienated giant corporations that shape human needs and project the meaning of human life for the entire planet, it has an unfortunate force to break down obstacles. Thus, break all resistance, protest. The literature ends with lamentations.
over our life by which the monumental element takes matter. In the book "The Paradox of Globalization," Danny Rodrick claims that we can choose between democracy, national sovereignty, and hyper-globalization, but we cannot have all three. "Hyperglobalization" clearly indicates the neoliberal ideal of a completely unregulated world economy. Democracy separate from the nation-state - from the only form of democracy "capable" of dealing with the world economy - suggests a global democracy that is impossible to achieve. Let us analyze democracy from several aspects, first, as a form of political cooperation of citizens to address personal and everyday interests, as participation in public political space or public culture, supporting multiculturalism, social equality, and equity, as a form of political responsibility of citizens and elites (citizen consent and responsiveness of elites), as a way of resolving human rights. None of the above aspects or functions of democracy can be successfully realized without the political community as a framework for such functioning of democracy. Globalization has influenced the democratic paradox, the contradiction in citizens' attitude towards democracy as an order, and the reaction of citizens towards the institutions and authorities of government. Globally, in all democratic countries, citizens greatly appreciate democracy as the best form of government. However, at the same time, many people express great dissatisfaction with the way democracy works in their countries and distrust of state institutions and state authorities.

On the other hand, an undemocratic nation-state is compatible with hyper-globalization because it implies a national "sovereignty" that is willing to accept state governance solely following the market and corporate power. It follows from this that we can preserve democracy only if we limit political ambitions to the nation-state and use it to avoid globalization somehow. (Rodick, 2012) Besides, globalism expresses the ideological and very retrogressive concept of the struggle for world domination.

The term "globalization" today covers two very different meanings. One thing is scientific: as we have seen, objective social processes are gaining, to a greater extent, a comprehensive, global character. In that sense, globalization refers to the development of modern technology, communication, scientific research, unification
of economic and political institutions and models in a different world, the connection of different national and regional cultures and civilizations, general degradation of the natural environment. The second meaning is ideological, and it prevails today. In this sense, the term is used to denote the increasing control over the world economy by politics and culture by the governments and multinational corporations of today, the only superpower and its allies (Group G-7). They use the term "new world order" to justify and rationalize the dictatorial structure of relations between individual states and regions. Generally, globalization indicates time and location processes that people rather than consciously consolidate in a united global society. According to Castles definition, globalization indicates a new society and information centering and society experience structural transformation in power relation, product, and functions. (Castells, 2009)

Such different meanings should not be tied to the same term, as this would cause very unwanted, in fact, deliberately deliberate confusion. These are two different concepts that should be expressed using two different terms. Globalization, which refers to objective science, progresses the concept of world integration and "globalism," which expresses the ideological and very retrogressive concept of the struggle for world domination. It could be confusing, contradictory, and, at worst, a deliberate rationalization of the greatest evil of today's civilization. The theoretical roots of the ideology of globalism are multiple. First, methodologically, it is a fictitious primacy of the whole over the parts (holism). Although allegedly, the world is more important than individual states, it has global primacy over local ones, the interest of humanity over the interests of individual nations. We can state "fictitious primacy" because, as into each ideology, behind general phrases, find the very particular and egoistic interests of certain power elites in governments, economic corporations, and military intelligence organizations. The second theoretical root of globalism is in a particular conception of human nature, which is attributed to man through negative traits: selfishness, possessiveness, greed, aggression, the primacy of the heteronomous over the autonomous; it is proclaimed that they constitute the essence of the human being. Third, the struggle for an increasing quantity of material goods, power, and wealth (not for creative power,
not for free life in a justly organized human community) has been declared the only meaning and purpose of human life.

Finally, the fourth root of globalism is the thesis that every special sovereignty, even the sovereignty of nation-states, is historically outdated and that all human communities must submit to the world center of military, political, economic, and cultural power. The fifth historical root of globalism is market fundamentalism, i.e., a one-sided economic doctrine for which only market regulation (with a minimal role of the state) takes precedence, complete, as soon as possible forced privatization of all property, and complete liberalization of goods and capital. Finally, the sixth root of globalism is a cocktail of so-called liberal ideas obtained by careful and very conservative selection and interpretation of traditional liberalism. (Milic, 2013) The subject of history is, allegedly, an isolated, abstract, egoistic individual who has the freedom of speech, organization, and choice of its representatives, as well as the freedom of possession and trade. The state is a necessary evil whose only function is to prevent a war against all, so it should only care about respecting the law and maintaining public order and social order. It should deal as little as possible with economic regulation, social protection, culture, and education.

There are two opposing forces in the world - integration and disintegration. Therefore, globalization is an objective tendency of the historical process, regardless of any ideology. Modern technology is spreading worldwide; communication is being established between all parts of humanity, science is developing as a unique universal human product. Different cultures and civilizations enter into a dialogue that has never existed in the past. Political institutions of a global character are emerging - from the League of Nations, through the United Nations and various international economic and cultural organizations, to secret world centers of alienated power (the Foreign Affairs Council, the Trilateral Commission, and the Bilderberg Group). In these processes, globality is the limit value. There is a tendency towards globality, but this goal could potentially be achieved in the future - if the opposing forces did not act simultaneously.

All liberal theorists believe globalization progress paralleled democratization. In a quarter of twenty century in most countries occur remarkably political
transformation. Fukuyama contemplated two fundamental principles for globalization. First, victory and global acceptance of liberal democracy model as an ultimate governing model and regulate social ties and second, end of conflicts and ideological history contradictions that have been important in current human history. On the whole, Huntington calls globalization the "third wave of democratization." However, Habsbawm (2008), in the book "Globalisation, democracy, and terrorism," described the compression of the new landscape of the 21st century. Globalization has brought societies together as never before, but politics is still confined to the nation-state, which will continue to be the main framework in which people live out their lives. The processes of globalization cannot contain the role of the nation-state, as the only realistically recognizable political community, in the application and development of democracy, although they will undoubtedly change and complicate how it functions. In considering democracy and its spread beyond the nation-state's borders, more liberals forces should keep in mind that people act rationally and in terms of values and that identity and interests are essential determinants of their political action. Nevertheless, it will be weaker than before, contending both with less loyal citizens at home and abroad, with other actors in the global space who will often undercut and outflank it. That will make democracy less workable and also less transferable. Moreover, it tends to the Middle East and Western imperialism. His thoughts on the difficulties of implanting democracy, with Iraq his apparent reference, are particularly discouraging. However, he does not examine the case that Iraq had a democratic tradition and a real national identity, which might have come to the fore given a better-managed intervention. On terrorism, Hobsbawm is dismissive of the idea that today's terrorism is an existential threat to established and powerful societies, concerned about the reaction of those societies. Terrorism has always been with us, and today's groups are not so different from those of the past, except that some are more internationalized and readier than they used to be to kill innocents on a large scale. (Habsbawm, 2008)

1. Globalization, democracy, and globalism

Integrative processes already performed in the past are canceled. All the great world empires created in the last three millennia have collapsed: Egyptian, Assyrian,
Babylonian, Persian, Roman, Hellenistic, Germanic, Mongolian, Turkish, Spanish, Austro-Hungarian, Russian, French, English, Nazi, Soviet. The American empire has not even been established yet, and the lines of disintegration are already visible. In the twentieth century, the tendency to break up large already established political integration units even prevailed. The number of independent states in the world is proliferating. From the 75 states that existed until the Second World War, the number has risen to 180. Only in Europe, out of seven, 25. Clear examples of disintegration are the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. The tremendous political alliances failed and were overcome: the Entente, the Tripartite Pact, the Popular Front, the Comintern, the Warsaw Pact. Many new nations have emerged; the former relatively homogeneous parts of the tremendous national integrations have turned into minorities demanding autonomy, a change in the political structure, the whole community, increasingly including secession. Globally, regionalization and decentralization of administration are seen instead of authoritarian government from one center. There was a fragmentation of large class groups. Numerous conflicting parts of the former bourgeois class, the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, the technostructure emerged. If classes are often ignored today as essential factors of social events, it is not because they no longer exist, but because the class structure of modern society is much more complex, diversified, and its dynamics no longer provide a clear basis for social prediction. (Milic, 2013)

The situation with the NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) signed in 1994 and celebrated as a path to new hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs in the United States is fascinating. The calculation was based on the assumption that America, partly from Canada and especially from Mexico, would make an inferior market for its products. However, it happened that Mexico, just like China, attracted a lot of factories and capital from the USA with cheap labor, which led its hawks to demand the annulment of that agreement, which Trump included in his presidential project. Trump, therefore, is not an unbridled gossip but an exponent of particular interests. The ongoing reconstruction of the contract has a marketing story for the audience about agreeing on a joint transition to renewable energy sources, and fierce
battles are overshadowed by curbing competition from Mexico and returning profits to American investments back instead of reinvesting in Mexico.

The globalization process is agreeable not only because it reflects on the need and possibility of building a new international political order, which would be successful in solving common international problems (security, multiculturalism education, economy, trade), and which could be based on democratic principles or as a new form of cosmopolitan democracy. Moreover, suppose we separate the challenges of globalization from political circles. In that case, we will face the fact that the prolonged economic crisis, intense migratory movements of the masses caused mainly by wars, huge social stratifications, and financial turbulence threatened the foundations of the system. possible) - and globalization is ideal for such a role. On the one hand, it is populist easiest to incite the masses against those who are poorer than themselves. On the other hand, attention is directed away from the real modifiers. Thus, the direction of enrichment at the expense of others. Nelson Mandela said: "Globalization is like a season - it comes without taking into account our opinion (...) it is good for us there is no doubt (...) however the rich and powerful have acquired another tool with it how to increase their power and wealth at the expense of the poor and weak, so we must prevent them in the name of universal freedom". It is a considerably concise assessment of globalization and its pros and cons. (Mitrovic, 2016) Then, we can problematize the effect of globalization on politics, i.e., on the possibility of building a new regional and international political order based on democracy and its procedures. Held's thesis is that democracy in various nation-states can no longer be successfully maintained and developed without establishing cosmopolitan democracy. So, "the idea of a community that legitimately governs itself and determines its future - the central idea of the democratic order itself - is very problematic today." (Held, 1998)

The American National Intelligence Council begun its Project of the Global Future until 2020 with the joke of atomic physicist Niels Bohr, who shouts: "Predictions are difficult, especially when it comes to the future." (Rose, 2005) To the rhetorical question: "What could stop globalization?", The answers in the project are extensive but could be summarized. First, the possibility of global conflict
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(world war); second, a pandemic of some new and unknown disease like Covid-19; third, large-scale terrorist attacks with hundreds of thousands dead; fourth, a severe economic crisis that would hit China, India, and Brazil, i.e., emerging countries, and which developed countries would not be able to isolate in the local context. Several other adverse elements could make globalization more difficult but unlikely to stop it. There is the isolationism of significantly underdeveloped countries (Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia, South America), corrupt and authoritarian regimes, organized crime, terrorism, and infectious diseases. True, Brexit was not relevant at the time, but it would hardly have been included in even the less critical obstacles of globalization.

In today's world, the very top of the big bourgeoisie holds the fundamental levers of power and tries to use some dimensions of the process of globalization to increase its economic and political power. However, it is not capable of imposing its ideology of market fundamentalism on the world. Small resistance is offered by gradualists, Kensians, ideologues of the social market economy, reformed communists, socialists, and others. In the field of ideology, there has never been the kind of homogenization that Fukuyama theorized.

Fukuyama thought of convergence and political and economic ideology as an essential dimension of globalization. He says under globalization appear substantially consensus about democratic legitimacy and vindication and government model and dominant to rival ideologies like that fascism inheritable monarchy ad lately communism. He does not treat religious fundamentalism, distinctive Islamic as a bitter rival to liberal democracy, and express many reasons. For example, Islam is not acceptable for non-Muslims that form four-fifths of world people. In Fukuyama's view, the feasible outcome of liberal democracy in the globalization era is the decamp of totalitarianism and authoritarian ideologies that justify human dictatorship. Facts indicate that after September 11, people will be resistant against totalitarianism and dictatorship governments because of its nature in the violence of human values. (Fukuyama, 2006) Habsbawm (2008) warned against the dangers of intervention in the Muslim World but offered no answer to the question of what the stronger states should do about societies suffering under
oppressive regimes or under regimes that have ceased to be able to govern. However, Hobsbawm repeatedly argues that unless and until terrorists acquire nuclear weapons, it is nonsense to suggest that al-Qaida or similar movements present an existential danger. Instead, using an alleged existential danger to justify extreme policies is where the real threat to world stability lies. (Habsbawm, 2008)

Furthermore, the migration process is an essential factor of human and international security, and the lack of adequate normative dynamics neglects human rights accelerating new conflicts. The term migrant, and such homogenization in which a group of people tries to portray themselves as a mass with the same characteristics, goals are fertile ground for expanding hate speech, incitement, and various forms of generalization. (Hadžić, 2021)

Globalization can increase the need for even greater competition and, therefore, more significant effects of the system (political, economic, cultural) by strengthening competition between states. It is functional and causal order can lead to greater bureaucratization of the political system of its democratization. Such processes are already in place - the European Union (EU) citizens perceive such processes. Nation-states control less and less while often pretending they control more and more. Democracy enlarges itself up, but politicians wonder privately how long its eroded routines will continue to command allegiance. Mass parties and ideological movements survive largely as shells. Even the rebels who challenge established states are confused, pursuing unrealistic objectives while discarding rules that once limited political violence, an ominous combination - "We do not."

Furthermore, the satisfaction with democracy is determined by how citizens perceive and experience political representation (how their views and interests are represented in political decision-making processes). That satisfaction is determined by political status (majority or minority status) and type of democracy (majority or consensual), hence the political context in which people live, and we should not ignore the fact that precisely this political context is historically determined and enters the inventory of the definition of the term political community.

Humankind's great concern stems from the increasingly aggressive foreign policy, xenophobic sentiment, and the growing inclination of the autocratic populist
government to stop the transition of violence to democracy in the scientifically-technologically and culturally-spiritually objectively connected global community. Nevertheless, unfortunately, solutions based on opportunism and manipulation do not offer anything concrete to improve the socio-political-security-economic situation. (Hadžić, 2020) Huntington divides the three-stage transition from dictator and authoritarian governments to democratic governments. First wave: Democracy rising from France revolution waves. Second wave: Democracy began the second world war, and with the end of the war, western Germany, Italy, Japan, Austria, and South Korea moved onto democracy, and Turkey and Greece began at the end of 1940. Countries in Latin America have the same situation, but in the first decade of 1960, experience refers to a different variety of authoritarianism. The transition of the third wave to democracy began with the subversion of the Salazar and Kantano government in Portugal in 1974 and then continued in Greece, Spanish, African countries, southeast of Asia, southern Europe, and other countries. Third-wave: Including 15 years in southern Europe, Latin America, and Asia that treat democracy as an inevitable fate. (Huntington, 1993)

In what until recently was the so-called international community with one center in Washington has, on the occasion of the war in Iraq, a crack that will grow over time: the United States, England, and some European, primarily eastern countries, on the one hand, France, Germany, Russia, and other European countries, on the other sides. In the economy, where giant supranational corporations have increasing power globally, many large systems collapsing simultaneously, and medium-sized companies take their places. Modern informatics has made it possible to connect and coordinate companies scattered in space. However, at the same time, the increase in transport costs, the impact of antitrust laws, and in general, the desire to maintain competitiveness in a market economy have strengthened the disintegrative tendency.

The same opposing forces operate in the field of culture. On the one hand, communication in a single language has become possible throughout the world today; English has practically become a world language. On the other hand, culture and art are being created in an increasing number of national languages. The
connections of national cultures are being established, but the general human culture that grows out of that process is far from an abstract whole; on the contrary, it is increasingly diversified and polarized. The idea of the unity of science was last advocated by the philosophers of the Vienna Circle in the 1930s; then, it was believed that a single empirical-analytical method unites all sciences. That idea was abandoned a long time ago. Many different, mutually incompatible methods (phenomenological, structuralist, hermeneutic) and weakly related specialties have been developed, especially in the social sciences. Mathematicians of one specialty no longer know about other specialties; philosophers of one direction can no longer even communicate with philosophers of other directions, although in recent decades, there have been attempts to build bridges between them.

The philosophy of postmodernism rejects any attempt to build a system (any "big story," as they would express it in their language). It is allergic to any attempt to establish and base human ideas on some basic principles. On the contrary, it seeks to deconstruct great ideas and principles. It does not insist on the unity of human knowledge but differences, fragmentation, and broken parts of former wholes. As if anticipating the extraordinary pretensions of the spirit of globalization, it has already taken a radically opposite. Therefore, again one-sided and exclusive position. We find this drastically anti-globalist one-sided analytical spirit everywhere in modern art, in informal and atonal music, in the novel "flow of consciousness," in abstract expressionism, and other schools in anti-figural painting and sculpture. (Milic, 2013)

Thus, globalization, with a strong tendency to strengthen integration processes in all areas of society and all parts of the world, could lead to much more rational solutions in world history in the last few decades, especially after 1990. On the one hand, it could be overcome by bureaucratic socialism of the Soviet type, on the other hand, by the anarchic liberal capitalism that caused the Great Depression of the early 1930s and which from 1945 to 1980 seemed abandoned. In principle, therefore, it could happen that a diverse society (with a mixture of elements of capitalism and socialism) or (which is slightly different) relatively regulated and democratic capitalism with a high degree of social protection prevailed in the world. Of course,
there were objective preconditions for such a more rational development, but the human factor failed.

These two models (in different specific forms) could coexist for a long time, compete, get closer or move away from each other with their diversity. Unfortunately, history has gone the other way. Real socialism in Eastern Europe has experienced a complete collapse. China has found a way out of the deep crisis, in which it fell into the wrong leadership of Mao Zedong, but for an extended period, to recover and develop internally, it had to take a passive stance in world events. It so happened that the United States became the world's only superpower. (Noonan, 2007) After the Roosevelt era, the new Charter of Human Rights, and the "Great Society" of Kennedy Johnson, the most militant forces of plundering capitalism came to power once suppressed. They imposed a rapid transition on Eastern Europe and Russia, the so-called "shock therapy," and the rest of the world is trying to make happy with the "New World Order" and submitting to the dictates of the world government.

This kind of globalism is exceptionally harmful both for the victim countries (which punish or ostensibly help them), and for the allied countries, and finally for the very center of world power, the United States of America. When it comes to countries that are the object of globalist politics, the content of that policy had catastrophic consequences for them, whether they were obedient (for example, Russia) or persistently disobedient (for example, Yugoslavia). Only those countries that found some middle ground between open confrontation and capitulation did relatively well. They pretended to cooperate (and cooperated in everything in their interest), but they went their way (for example, China and Poland). After the capitulation to the forces of globalism in 1999 and 2000, in the former Yugoslavia, i.e., Serbia and Montenegro, after obediently following the IMF's policy, recorded a steady decline in production and living standards, rising unemployment, indebtedness, and material difficulty. (Milic, 2013)

The economic demands of the world center (primarily the IMF, the World Bank, and the US Treasury) were elementary and one-sided: liberalization, privatization, monetary stability. The primary political demand of the US
Government was the so-called democratization, bringing to power people who would obey all the demands of globalists. Thus, for example, Yeltsin ordered the opening of artillery fire on the White Palace (alleged assembly), but this was assessed as a "defense of democracy." Liberalization meant the complete opening of the so-called country—free flow of money, capital, cultural goods. Of course, such a thing has never existed in the West. Freedom of import and export always has, and in the United States, itself implied measures to protect the domestic economy and national values. The privatization of state and public enterprises had to be carried out as quickly and thoroughly as possible, and it had to be forced. It has always been gradual and partial in a specific, previously prepared legal context in the leading Western countries. It should be noted that the United States, which has had significant public and public sectors since the New Deal, has privatized a single helium factory in Texas worth only two million dollars over the past decade. Finally, monetary stability meant minimal inflation, a policy of high-interest rates, defense at all costs of the national currency, and holding large state reserves in foreign banks (even when investments for internal development and liquidity support of companies and banks were necessary). (The Alliance for American Manufacturing, 2009) The Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the US Treasury had the first opportunity to implement such a policy in Russia and Eastern Europe after the collapse of "real socialism" in 1990-1991 years. Radical liberalization immediately led to a decline in domestic production, the depreciation of the ruble, and inflation. As a result, savings dried out, and the middle class terminated. In addition, high-interest rates made it impossible to obtain loans, which damaged domestic production. (Milic, 2013)

**Conclusion**

Globalization unquestionably affects the political order, but that impact is more or less limited. Its influence is limited by how the effects of government and authority are mediated, i.e., the political contexts of individual countries and forms and strength of democracy. Globalization does not have to be sensitively publicly exposed or reproduced and propaganda narrated. There is an alternative to globalization and globalism. Globalization can regulate through international
agencies, which, although it cannot be sufficiently democratic, is subject to far
greater democratic pressure than is the case today. International bodies such as the
World Trade Organization (WTO) or the International Monetary Fund do not have
directly elected parliaments, but this does not preclude public debate on the policies
pursued by national governments in those organizations. In order to reverse the
resistance against globalization, active policies are needed in two opposite
directions: strengthening democracy above the level of the nation-state and investing
efforts in local economic development. At the same time, globalization causes the
weakness of national borders, restriction of state domination on information stream
and traditional borders, and broadcast of democratic values by new communication
instrumentals that stable democracy to favorite aim and too success method in
people minds. However, the globalization strengthens democratization and political,
cultural, and social transformation. Moreover, the theory of cosmopolitan
democracy must thoughtfully administer the legitimacy of the cosmopolitan political
community, not only with the dilemma of the legitimacy of the cosmopolitan
democratic political order. In current political conglomerations (macro-regions), i.e.,
in the new “political communities,” there are intense disputes between natural
bureaucratization processes and expectations of democratization. World citizenship
necessarily presupposes creating a new political identity, and cosmopolitanism must
show how this identity can be achieved without a democratic deficit or a
"bureaucratic-oligarchic plethora. It is essential to build a theory of globalization by
understanding what is arising in various spheres separately.

Democracy is an inevitable fate for authoritarian countries. However, the
events like Arab Spring should advance for democratization in non-democratic
regions because freedom, equality, and justice are common values between people
that are hidden in democracy nature.

The world cannot be governed based on several abstract ideological principles
such as liberalization, privatization, and monetarism - insofar as the hegemonism
policies' philosophy. After a certain level of development, the Soviet Union could
no longer be successfully managed from one center, converting even less powerful
globally. The consequences of centralism are rough, inadequate, belated solutions
that do not consider the specifics (historical, cultural, sociopolitical, economic, psychological) of regions (Balkans, Muslim World, Latin America) and any particular nation-state. Each of which must have a different development strategy.
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