

Globalisation



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

In these two articles globalization and the increase of globalism is described in two very different ways. Waltz arguing from a realist's perspective; that the politics of the state is ultimately affected within globalization. R. O. Keohane and J. S. Nye Jr express a liberal opinion, arguing the many different factors that affect the increase in globalism. 'Globalization: What's new? What's not? (And so what)', portrays the speed in which globalism has increased through many different factors; economically, military, environmentally and socially.

This is an idealist analytic approach, not set in stone. This leads on to the thickness of globalism, the increased compactness of networks, and the complicated web that intertwines countries/states in many different ways. A description of complex interdependence, portrays a world in which the ever increasing globalism could; they hypothesis, come into effect. In conclusion they explain that globalism is rapidly increasing, although sovereign states in the present and the future have the main structure, world politics is being affected by increasing globalism.

'Globalisation and American Power' describes globalisation as a complex network of connections within the economy of the world. The beginning of the article explains how the more economically developed the country the more closely connected to the rest of the world. He highlights his view that America sits on the top, for example their economy and military has grown dramatically, and since the Cold War no state balances their power. This growth has ensured peace, as war is becoming more expensive. K. N. Waltz stresses the importance of economics in globalisation, yet it is politics that has the over-riding factor.

With America at the top of globalisation, K. N. Waltz expresses that the growth of the North's external affairs (or the rich) has created a closer interdependence among the northern countries and therefore globalisation is not completely global. In conclusion; that America will not stay 'at the top' economically or with the power of their military, states will ultimately seek for a balance of power. R. O. Koehane and J. S. Ney Jr convey a broader view of globalism, relating globalization to many different aspects of interdependence; they argue this with a liberalistic approach.

According to Baylis, Smith and Owens liberalists have an image of the world working as one. So instead of the in balance of one state's control, we have transnational organisations, NGO's etc. which bind state's together and therefore increasing globalism. (J. B, S. S, P. O 2008) R. O. Koehane and J. S. Ney Jr use a hypothetical image; 'complex interdependence' suggesting that the increase of globalism could give rise to these three characteristics. Although they use various examples where this is evident there are many more where the hypothesis does not fit.

Kenneth N. Waltz provides a very different picture of Globalisation; he presents the idea that the US has a strong influence on the world's economy, and its political authority and power sets them above other states whilst also creating close interconnections with the rest of the world. This is very similar to a realist's approach of globalisation, and as Baylis, Smith and Owens convey; realists believe that globalisation is very much linked to the west and even closer to America. (J. B, S. S, P.

O 2008) There seems to be a running similarity between these two articles, for although 'Globalization and American Power' gives a realist opinion

whereas the ' Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And So What?)' article has a liberalist view, they both describe the state or sovereign state as being the main structure within the world, and political power being the ultimate strength. Yet R. O. keohane and J. S. Nye Jr have a slightly different overview, they argue that all the other factors, are gradually become stronger, and through the increase of globalism concept interdependence is become evident. Kenneth N.

Waltz has a more pessimistic description; he believes that there is a huge inequality between the politics of states, with America at the top, but that this will change. He believes that other states will take this power, as there will always be a struggle for power or at least the struggle for the balance of power In the book ' globalization in world politics', they state that the impact globalisation has on different states varies, weaker states receiving immediate effect and perhaps suffer more. R. O. keohane and J. S. Nye Jr use the example of the financial crisis in Thailand 1997, which had a global affect.

This shows the huge part economics plays in globalization. Kenneth N. Waltz on the other hand would almost contradict this; using war as an example, most of the cause of peace or war has been due to international-political conditions, i. e. before the cold war, the US and the USSR had no economic ties. As another example Kenneth N. Waltz argues that; blocs are not created by market forces or economic interests, but by governments. These examples go on; he states the importance of politics in globalization and importance of it stands high above any other factor. R. O. keohane and J.

S. Nye Jr convey an image of what the world is becoming, and what presence of politics and the effect it has, but their view goes further, hypothesising the image of the future, whilst acknowledging disruptions to this. Kenneth N. Waltz describes the world in the present, and the matter of fact view that ultimately we want to survive, and therefore the strongest states have the closest connections to the rest of the world. Meaning they have the most political power, but this is changing, and economics and military has great power in changing the politics of the world.