



GLOBALISM AT A NON-ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE

Kathlyn Q. Barrozo
Class of 1991, University of Santo Tomas
B.S. Medical Technology

I am a non-economist. Being such, I have next-to-nothing on the concept of globalism, save for a little reading here and there. Otherwise, I admit to being a nincompoop on things about globalism.

If I were to be given a chance to give my two-cents' worth on the subject, I would have to refer to more expert opinions and writings. Based on my understanding of the various online sources that I have gone over, globalism is a continuous journey that faces uncertainty at different fronts. Its study also encompasses the various world movements that have happened in scattered parts of the globe that have still created influences and created changes in the entire world at large.

We have had two World Wars, and God forbid that we or our children or their children's children witness a third one. The eruption of a Third World War would hypothetically cause more massive destruction and even the destruction of the entire planet. What with the powerful and ever precise weapons that man has designed and continues to conceptualize, World War III would put the entire planet in an irreversibly damaged state. Which is why I, as a mother and one who professes to be a global citizen (wink! wink!), can never for one minute understand why man had to progress (or decline, as I prefer to look at it) from the dynamite to bioterrorism and nuclear weaponry. Have we no fear for our children's future? It's logical to state that such things are only created to provide security to nations. Security to what against what, exactly?

Anyway, Gian Piero de Bellis, in his work "Polyarchy: essays on statism" (<http://www.polyarchy.org/essays/english/globalism.html#end>) states that globalism faced a decline sometime at the beginning of the 20th century, when the rise of five phenomena gave way to the enforcement of nationalism. These five were protectionism, militarism, financialism, monopolism and imperialism. That sure was a lot of -isms, if you ask me.

The First World War marked the decline of globalism, giving way to statism. Statism espoused anti-liberal, anti-capitalistic and anti-humanistic stances, which in turn stamped out liberty and dignity and replaced them with internal protection and national security. Nations closed themselves to one another, giving way to more localized distribution instead of global-scale transfer.

Enter the era of the modern world. Now, we already have such concepts as outsourcing and telecommuting and remote party jobs. We have first world countries having their work done by third world country citizens because costs are definitely cheaper and the possible risks too inconsequential to even consider.

The advances in technology have been exchanged from nation to nation, effectively bridging the gaps that had existed many years ago. Yet, can we ever really understand each other completely? Can we become true global citizens to the very essence of the word?

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Do you consider yourself a global citizen? Why or why not?
2. How has globalism affected you as an individual?
3. Do you consider your country completely global or entirely nationalistic? Why or why not?
4. Is there one country in the world that, to you, has consistently been globalistic? Justify your answer.
5. What are the inherent risks of nationalism? Of globalism? Be as specific as needed.