

Globalization for Whom? The US and Europe: A Light House Project; Challenging the Ethics of Neoliberalism

Constandinos Tsiourtos*

RÉSUMÉ

Dans les sociétés démocratiques modernes les priorités ont été modifiées à travers l'évolution de la dynamique du capital et sous l'influence déterminante du capitalisme et sa version vicieuse la plus récente-le néolibéralisme-dans une grande partie du monde. Plus particulièrement l'aspect économique a corrompu ses fondations, et a établi son propre système de valeurs. Les relations économiques sont maintenant au centre d'attention tandis que les valeurs sociétales et la sauvegarde des libertés fondamentales sont devenues un outil utilisé comme prétexte par les pouvoirs qui les transgressent au même moment qu'ils proclament qu'ils les protègent. Le 'mouvement' de globalisation a été utilisé pour la prolifération du capital et pas des valeurs démocratiques. Des alliances telles NATO et le partenariat transatlantique entre l'Union Européenne et les Etats-Unis imposent leur propre agenda du jour au reste du monde et offrent leur propre version de «paix virtuelle».

Le concept de la Gauche pour un système mondial devrait être le premier pas vers une purification de la globalisation au lieu de la démoniser. Ce que la Gauche doit réaliser est un nouveau mouvement d'internationalism qui devrait être initié au sein du système des Nations Unies.

ABSTRACT

In modern democratic societies, priorities have been altered through the evolution of capital dynamics and under the catalytic impact of capitalism and its latter vicious version - the neoliberalism - to a big part of the world. In particular, the economic has corrupted those foundations, and established its own system of values. Economic relations are now in the centre of attention whilst societal values and safeguarding of fundamental freedoms have become a tool to be used as a pretext, for those powers that violate them the same time they proclaim to protect them. The globalization 'movement' was used mainly for the spread of the capital and not democratic values. Alliances such as NATO and the EU-US transatlantic partnership impose their own agenda to the rest of the world and offer their own version of "virtual peace".

* European Parliament Bureau-AKEL

The concept of the Left about a world system should be the first step towards purifying globalization than to demonize it. What the Left has to achieve is a new movement of Left internationalism and it should be initiated within the United Nations system.

Introduction

It was not long after the inception of the human race that humans developed the wish for living together¹. Human tendency to form groups, called societies, have always been a matter of collective responsibility to each other. To provide a sense of security to the many who respected the social contract of obeying the rules – now-a-days, we say, the rules of law – whilst enjoying the benefits. It was also the issue of the primitive economic relations that occurred within the social group. Hence, having the opportunity to share goods and services. The last issue, but not the least, was the need to share values. It's not an exaggeration to claim that societal ethics have been the core foundations of societies, upon which nation-states have been built. Fundamental freedoms were the biggest accomplishment of this process. The notion that societies and states exist to serve the citizen came to be a universal value. The greater notion was that the state exists to safeguard and preserve the freedoms of its citizens.

The vast majority of modern democratic societies keep the elements of the original societies, to a certain extent. Nevertheless, priorities have been altered through the evolution of capital dynamics and under the catalytic impact of capitalism and its latter vicious version, the neoliberalism, to a big part of the world. The economic globalization² that evolved since the early beginning of the 20th century and became a full scale operation the last two decades has corrupted those foundations, and established its own system of values³. Economic relations are now in the centre of attention whilst societal values and safeguarding of fundamental freedoms have become a tool to be used as a pretext, for those powers that violate them the same time they proclaim to protect.

The Dominance of the Market

Globalization of economy used many imaginative ways and pre-existing concepts to invade into people's lands and minds. In some cases new concepts were invented. One of the main arguments of the pro-globalization economists is that, *in these days, the whole world is sharing a view, that the*

world economy and the global institutions, such as the IMF and the World Bank – centric levers of globalization – can be better guarantors of the civil rights and prosperity than governments – or nations, which can be corrupted and seek rewards or be militaristic. By using sensitive issues such as people's rights and prosperity as a Trojan horse, the propaganda machine of globalization realized that it can be more effective at imposing economic guidelines. Still, it is no better than a brutal blackmail.

This is the part when people mistake globalization with internationalism, a movement that has been high-jacked. A notion of the left, which did not last to the attacks of nationalism but romantically is still a vision in ideologist's minds. Internationalism Vs Nationalism has been the clash then, back in the early years of the 20th century. Globalization machine is still facing the same opponent, but this time the problem can be resolved, as it is an issue within the same family, as it has been established by several scholars that nationalism is typically the hat of many right liberal political movements,⁴ that bring it up whenever is opportune. After the 1930s and the economic crisis, movements as such have survived the political stage, by pretending to be something else. Still, nationalist movements with no hidden liberal agenda exist and distinguish themselves from the neoliberal agenda.

The frustrating fact however is that such as for the right movements, many socialist political movements have been transformed essentially, alas, into something else. European socialism was to gain power in the 90s, with the support of the centre, in a big part of Europe. The most effective and constant liberal reformations were initiated during that era. From Spain, to France and England, the European socialists invented and applied the so-called "third way", the economy of the social market in veiled. That was the era of pregnancy for the extreme neoliberal policies that gave birth and full-fledged in this decade, within the European Union and Europe at large.

Yet, the current situation in Europe is not just affecting the European citizens but naturally has a greater impact to the rest of the world, except, as you would expect, the United States; those transformations took place in the United States in earlier years. This is conceivably the main reason of the social and economic situation in Europe today.

European Integration and the Vision for Globalization

As the capital in the United States kept growing, it started searching for new markets, new grounds to expand. Developing countries were an easy

victim and they served the capital by offering cheap labor in production. But what they needed now was consumers. Consumers in billions exist in countries like China and India but still - at the time - not as wealthy as the Europeans. European Union was the primary target but not an easy one, as they had to face the tradition of Social Europe that stood solid for decades.

The Marshall Plan was a first attempt to reach Europe, but that was in the early years after the Second World War and admittedly even the Americans had not yet fully realized or planned this with a clear agenda. One can even say that the Marshall Plan was to a certain extent a genuine act of solidarity within the spirit of the epoch and was indeed successful. It was long after, that they realized how useful it could be in order to understand the social and economic structures of Europe.

Europe had already progressed internally towards the goal of the so-called European Integration. The main pillar of that project, as planned by the Europeans, was the single market. This was a smaller scale of an open world market, which is globalization, thus the global integration of markets. It all started in Rome, with the EEC, when they did not yet have the final idea where this would lead or if they were ever going to achieve anything. But the concept was clear and was not free market in neoliberal terms. It was merely an interlinking of economies thus creating a common market and this is what many thought that would remain.

In 1993 the European leaders signed the Maastricht Treaty that established an accurate calendar to carry out European Monetary Union, split into three phases, defined the institutions that would manage monetary policy and established economic discipline requirements that the countries would have to fulfill if they wished to be included in the monetary union. Before that, the Schengen Treaty⁵ had abolished internal borders to a large part of the Union. Barriers for free movement of capitals, goods, services and people kept falling towards creating a Single Market.

At the start, the Americans feared that Single Market, but on the way they learned how convenient it could be. The creation of a strong European economy appeared as a threat, a challenge to the American world domination in economic and other terms. Soon, they realized that the real threats were coming from a different direction. China, India and the reviving Russia have been growing into economic giants that already contest the American Hegemony.

Americans approached the European Union and Europe at large as a friend and political ally and not as a competitor.⁶ On 3 December 1995 at

the EU-US Summit in Madrid, European Commission President Santer, Spanish Prime Minister González, as President of the European Council, and then US President Clinton signed the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA).⁷ This provided a new framework for a partnership of global significance, designed to lend a new quality to the Transatlantic relationship, moving it from one of consultation to one of joint action in four major fields: Promoting peace and stability, democracy and development around the world; responding to global challenges; contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations; building bridges across the Atlantic. The NTA is accompanied by a Joint EU-US Action Plan setting out no less than 150 specific actions to which the EU and US have committed themselves. These range from promoting political and economic reform in Ukraine to combating AIDS. From reducing barriers to Transatlantic trade and investment to promoting links between colleges and universities. It was an agenda which was ambitious, outward-looking and which affected all sectors of society from big business to the individual citizen.

That was the beginning of the “invasion” of the economic, social and legal standards of the United States into the European Union *acquis* and policies. The Americans felt that American capital investments in Europe were a risky business, as the social tradition of Europe was jeopardizing their success and restraining their profit margins to levels they were not used to. The Americans wanted a flexible working force, a non-temporary personnel, minimal social benefits to workers, personal contracts and not having to deal with workers’ unions, less State and more private institutions to deal with, less beauraucratic barriers and less State interventionism etc. The European Union, alas, consented to a great extend.⁸

After the 1995 agreement, we had the 1998 Summit in London that launched the Transatlantic Economic Partnership, complemented by a wide range of bilateral co-operative actions and a regular dialogue on multilateral trade policy issues, agreements to remove technical barriers to trade by mutual recognition of conformity assessment, and working together on customs procedures. In the Bonn Declaration, adopted at the 21 June 1999 EU-US Summit in Bonn, both sides committed themselves to a "full and equal partnership" in economic, political and security affairs. Since then, the annual Summits between the two powers examine their progress and set new goals but also new spheres of co-operation, not only in the economic field, but also the political one. They discuss their common approach to the conflicts that arise

all over the world, their co-operation against terrorism and their common action together under the umbrella of NATO, to launch humanitarian interventions to places of crisis. As of the April 30, 2007, EU/US Summit, there is now the Transatlantic Economic Integration Framework, which gave birth to the Transatlantic Economic Council (TEC), in other words the World's Economic Directorate. The TEC's open agenda is to observe and coordinate the economic integration of the two sides of the Atlantic.

Conclusively, the US plans to spread the known as “Washington Consensus” entered the right path. The so called “Washington Consensus” can be summarized in the following ten principles: Fiscal discipline, redirection of public expenditure priorities towards fields offering both high economic returns and the potential to improve income distribution, such as primary health care, primary education and infrastructure, tax reform (to lower marginal rates and broaden the tax base), interest rate liberalization, a competitive exchange rate, trade liberalization, liberalization of inflows of foreign direct investment, privatization, deregulation, secure property rights.

The adjustment of the European Union to globalization is a project that started long ago, even long before the 1st EU – US Summit back in 1990, and was launched in many stages. The last one was initiated with the original Lisbon process in 2000 and was revised in 2005. Lisbon provided the guidelines for many policies to come on the way, for which I will refer to later.

Let us now have a better look at how the leaders of the European Union institutions understand the globalization process today and what their vision is.

*“As I have said time and time again, globalization is not a zero sum game. The emerging economies' gain is not our pain. Globalization has created a win-win dynamic, allowing millions of previously impoverished people to get richer while the developed nations also benefit...the Lisbon strategy is Europe's response to globalization. And it is working...it is a strategy for good times and bad. It was right when the economic conditions were favorable. And it is also right now that they are less favourable”.*¹⁰

Jose Manuel Barroso was indeed sincere when he admitted the above. Barroso to a great extent has spoken the truth. Emerging economies had considerable gain, for the ruling capital. Globalization has created a win-win dynamic, for the capital elite of all the world's leading economies. Millions of people got richer, but dozens of millions got poorer; let's not forget that the world is almost 6 billions. Lisbon strategy is indeed a policy for good and

bad times, and was obviously very bad and unsuccessful in both times, according to the EU commission¹¹ and its advisors. Again he is right that Lisbon worked and provided results when economic conditions were favorable and less favorable. The European people would know better about that, as they paid for it and they continue paying; both the cost of implementation and the cost of its failure.

The Alliance of the Market-New institutions, New Values, Old Geopolitics

The US and the European Union appear determined to advance their economic integration to a new level with the progressive reduction or abolishment of regulative and other obstacles in direct reciprocal investment and the completion of financial markets but also the intensification of their political relations, according to the 2007 summit results. The estimate of the political leaders of two sides is that, the progress in the economic and financial fields can help in the improvement of general political relations between Europe and America, and can constitute a powerful foundation, useful at times of political turbulences around the globe.

The final objective of agreements in the US - EU summits, is clearly proclaimed, in the official documents of the Summit Declaration of 2006 "*the creation of a Common Market without obstacles aiming at the hegemony of world economy*". *This is why they created the Transatlantic Economic Council in 2007, which will operate as the economic directorate, coordinating the economic integration.*¹²

In 2008 the two forces aspire to make a step forward, completing the liberalization of Trade worldwide and erasing all the regulating obstacles. The EU, complying with the guiding lines of the Summit, advanced already in the completion of further single market and the lifting of internal obstacles. The directive of services in the internal market, known as "Bolkestein" was only the beginning. In the framework of the preparation of the terrain for the conquest from the enterprising world on both two sides of the Atlantic, the European Commission advances with devoteness towards the Americanization of the regulations governing the European economy and the enfeeblement of labor law.

The revised agenda of Lisbon, the concepts of adaptability and flexicurity as they appear in Commission documents, relocation of enterprises, the working hours directive, increase of limits of retirement,

long life learning policy, increase of budgetary resources for the programs of competitiveness at 35% (budgetary frame 2007-2013), the liberalisation of air transportations, the liberalisation of public procurement, the Green Bible of the Commission on the removal of obstacles for investments, the Green Bible on the opening of services of public benefit to the private sector, the Naiades program for the liberalisation of shipping, the strengthening of relations and close collaboration of the EU with NATO in the regions of crises and conflicts, the agreed convergence of professional qualifications in the 2 sides of Atlantic, the legal convergence of accounting standards, the establishment of a European Aid organization according to the USAID regime and philosophy, the measures taken to combat terrorism whilst offending civil rights and violating personal data. All of the above are a direct result of the decisions taken on the transatlantic level.

If one fumbles all the texts of agreements of the last three years summits, will easily discover that the decisions in the texts of declarations and the road map agreed upon, match with the economic guidelines of the Council of the Union and the legislative proposals of the Commission (many are included in the annual legislative program of the Commission). Many of the provisions of the agreements have already been materialized and constitute today a Community *acquis*.

It is evident that the EU is preparing the field for a full integration of the two economies. But their action does not stop there. As they declare provocatively in the declaration of 2007, *the unstable countries and regions cause crises that threaten the world safety. Thus the EU and the USA supported by NATO but also the UN (it is reported last) will correspond to these crises, protecting the world from threats.*

Just to summarize what we have read above: the EU – US agreements, are aiming for the hegemony of the world economy; will protect the world from threats they conceive as such for which they will use humanitarian-intervention - type invasions with the support of NATO; they will achieve economic – and overall – and regulative integration between themselves which will serve as a “success story” for the rest of the world and the final achievement of a global single market. To this effect they manufactured the Transatlantic Economic Council as their directorate.

But let us look up closer at the “philosophy” behind this strategy: Globalization is in the centre of it. The new world we aim to achieve has a global economy and global rules and needs a global economic directorate, a

global gendarmerie and a global government.

What do we need the United Nations and the Security Council for? What do we need the WTO for? What do we need democracy for? And, what do we need international law for? It is cynical but true: to use, abolish or exploit. One of three verbs can match any question raised above.

As the transatlantic alliance progressed, it provided new fruits and values to the world. The partnership declarations refer to common values and common interests that constitute the base of the transatlantic relation. The package of the agreements constitutes a threat to the system of social, political and civil values of Europe, as well as its cultural diversity.¹³ The establishment of a transatlantic area of liberalization of transactions would lead to an alignment of European legal system with the American. It is consequently a US plan with the consent of the European Capital to transfer their own standards and “values” into the European Union and Europe at large, in economic and political level. The transformation of a new legal culture that will conceive the world with their own eyes. Their own perceptions for labor, the economy, the social protection, the way politics work, the relation of state and citizens and the protection of human and civil rights.

The economic environment that will be created with this partnership will be undeniably ideal for the business world. Keeping in mind the serious social problems that the American people faces with the enfeeblement of social vested from the most brutal capitalistic system in history and the complete predominance of right and capital in the US, somebody could easily express legitimate concerns for this collaboration and the degree to which it can extend itself. Perhaps eventually we witness the beginning of a new period in the EU - US relations that will not be limited in solely economic integration but the economic assimilation of one side to the other. If one judges from the level of internal homogenization of the two economies, can effortlessly come to conclusion for which side will be absorbed. Or still, whether the assimilation of economy opens the appetite of the American capital, that will wish to transfer the given social environment in which it got used to function, into Europe, touching upon sensitive strings for the Europeans as the social state and the labor relations.

The scenario for the rest of the world gets even scarier. Americans do not solely wish to dominate Europe but to use the legitimization that Europe has to offer – given its reputation compared to the Americans - to dominate the rest of the world. The Globalization of economy, is not just about dominating economies of states, but has a broader sense. The geopolitical

games played in the race of the major league players for energy is a big stake for the Americans as well as for the Europeans.

USA is today the undeniable and unique superpower. The extension of USA's hegemony depends mainly on the control of energy sources and the USA have already conceived since the first invasion in Irak, inasmuch as the control of energy can mean only one thing: the control of world economy, that is the final objective.

The modern interventional so-called "humanitarian" wars might not have all directly economic motives, but indirectly they lead to this effect. They were also the confirmation of the hegemony of the USA, mainly against the emerging forces, with the suppression of their energy autonomy. It was also the application of the classic recipe for the overshooting of the recession in the worldwide capitalistic economy, by destroying the surplus of productive forces and the intensification of weapons' production. It was the charge of the powerful American multinational companies-energy colossuses, producers of military material, companies of reconstruction - for the general reshaping of energy map with the enfeeblement of OPEC and the complete energy control at a world scale. At the same time, however, it is an operation of abolishment of possible obstacles worldwide, such as the national governments' controls in the markets.

Aside the USA, the European Union realizing that in the game of energy cannot be alone, since it does not have the interventional capabilities-at least not as solid-that the US have, or even because it suits them fine to have others doing its dirty work, has decided and chose its strategic partner. Observing a hypocritical attitude, presenting itself as an advocate of human rights while several leading member-States assist the Americans to violate them - illegal kidnappings and overflies of CIA, agreement of extradition of suspects (June 2005), mission of troops of European States to Iraq and Afghanistan - the European Union keeps the hands clean in Community level, while it occasionally exercises strict criticism to the Americans for the Guantanamo and the environment. The Transatlantic partnership is a strategic choice of the EU, allowing, on the one hand, the Americans to use Europe, knowing, on the other hand, it will also profit from this relation.¹⁴

The Civil Division-The Regional Division

The driving force behind the expansion of the contemporary world system, based on the rules of the market economy, is industrial and corporate

capitalism, and the system is related in some way to the division of the world into rich nations and poor nations, or into wealthy core, developed areas, and dependent peripheral, undeveloped, or non-industrialized areas. The system is not a creation for many but for few. It is profoundly established on the consuming habits of the wealthy that enjoy the fruits produced from the exploitation of many.

At the same time, the system exploits even the few. The wealthy population the system has manufactured is being exploited and blackmailed on a different level. If for the wealthy population the issue is to sustain their “way of life”, for the poor population, outside the sphere of the critical mass of the big consumers, the stake is to escape poverty or just continue their biological life, with what they have left. Thus, creating an informal contrast of interests between the privileged and the non-privileged, in which the privileged are self bounded – in a sense of gratefulness - in their precious wealthy world and are afraid to shake the still waters. This way the system is restricting the solidarity movement towards the non-privileged that used to be strong in the western world in previous decades, but can't motivate people as it used to anymore. The propaganda machine of neoliberalism has managed to establish an ill-generated conception about “We” and “They” as in “We against They”. The propaganda machine has grown so strong that the “We” do not seem to realize that their condition is not far from being “They”.

The above helps us to understand how many divisions have been provoked. It helps also to understand the profound reasons of terrorism, which is mainly due to the years of oppression of the non-privileged and their economic stagnation - without any intention to justify its brutality by no means. It helps us to understand how the system sustains injustice in the world so it can rule.

The “divide and rule” concept¹⁵ has been given a new meaning by the modern neoliberals. It is a divide amazingly strong as it targets people's strongest instinct: the one of survival.

On the other hand, we have the regional division. The conquest of new markets and the monopolization of natural resources make capitalism stronger. So too does the swelling of Third World proletariat populations, provoked by competition of the advanced agricultural businesses of the imperialist world, thus destroying the basis of farmers' agriculture. Thereby driving dispossessed farmers into poor urban suburbs. Deprived of the means of being able to make a living from the land, they turn into an almost inexhaustible supply of labor, available to Western Businesses for hire at

inhumanely degrading wages, to supply corporate giants with fat profits, which can then be loaned out, at interest, to the Third World countries for “growth and development” a pretty word used to dress up the building of infrastructure by Western engineering firms, to transport goods and raw material out of the country; in other words, to develop the Third World as a subsidiary economy based on the supply of raw material, as markets for capital investment and armies of the dispossessed with no option but to work at humiliation-level wages, or starve.

An example to demonstrate that non-privileged where they can not be found can be created and then subjugated.

Making the Best of Globalization-The Left Perspective

The production of wealth the last 50 years has been more than the world has ever known. The allocation of this wealth has been more uneven than the first half of the century and surely gets more uneven as the hyper accumulation of capital continues. The world resources, the national resources, ownership of the people, are being exploited by the multinational corporations. The people's economy is being granted to the private economy, just to be sold back to people piece by piece, thus creating a vicious circle of dependence.

Meaning that people today and in the future will be working to make excess profit to the capital and get the least possible share.

Let us give a new price to work. To redefine the price of work, asking for a fairer distribution of work and profit. The reduction of time of work and the fairer distribution of profit is a win-win system even for the capitalists. And the only possible way to achieve this is by globalization. Globalization by different terms.

Using globalization with a new-old meaning. An old meaning for the Left, a new meaning for the world. Globalization after all is not a bad word but the established concept is. The concept of the Left about a world system should be the first step towards purifying globalization than to demonize it.

No, I am not going back to the époque of Socialist Internationalism. But this is not to say that a new brand of Left Internationalism, based on the same core values, adjusted to the new world, cannot be emerged. This would be the first step towards a just world, but the final step.

What the Left has to achieve is a new movement of Left internationalism even if the social base to support that position does not readily exist. This

process can be sparked by the same causes nation-states did. The American and French Revolutions, which effectively invented our idea of the nation-states, were products of societies, seeking to defeat the causes of their oppression. Oppression can have different faces, but the historic causality proves that they all have the same unavoidable fate.

This new internationalism should take effect within the given socio-economic system if it is to succeed. It must also take effect by using existing institutions, as controversial this might sound. An effort to change the system of economy and society simultaneously will inevitably result to failure, as priorities will get mixed.

It must be initiated within the United Nations system as the only internationally acceptable global institution, comparatively less controlled by the Capital than others. The initiative could promote a new notion of solidarity among nation-states - as the central message of internationalism - it will be a fresh effort to universalize democratic values and promote human rights protection. This can lead to a formation of a group of Nations, an alliance, that will share the concept and promote it, hence creating a dynamic to spread to the rest of the world. It is never too early nor too late for this initiative to take place. The momentum has to be created and not expected.

Many questions can be raised for this notion. I can find a hundred reasons that would lead such an effort to failure, as the brain-washing machine of capitalism has established the belief it is uncontestable. Even themselves, capitalists ended up believing it. This is exactly their biggest disadvantage, the Achilles' heel of capitalism. The certainty that nothing can disturb the new world order. The graveyard of history is filled with empires that shared the same arrogant stance towards the power of the people.

The views and opinions expressed in this paper reflect the Author's point of view and not necessarily those of the institution he is employed from.

NOTES

1. Nevertheless people's social awareness was limited to the tribe.
2. For the purpose of this paper the term "Globalization" means the economic

liberalization as described by Bhagwati, Jagdish (2007). *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press. Either wise, it will be defined as other.

3. Each day that passes we witness the fiasco of the impetuous neoliberalism, the cutting edge of globalization. A system of values, founded upon the simulacrum of self-regulating of the so called economy of the market. Each day becomes more brutal and cynical in its methods, provoking the oppressed citizens which seem helpless to react. Simulacrum or simulacra, such as virtual reality: There are four stages that Jean Baudrillard distinguishes: the era of the original > to the counterfeit > to the produced, mechanical copy, and through > to the simulated "third order of simulacra", whereby the copy has replaced the original.
4. The term "liberal" has been given several definitions in US and Europe, and can be interpreted also with political or economic terms. For the purpose of this paper the definition is the one referring to the currently established liberal economics, meaning the concept of the free market.
5. The name "Schengen" originates from a small town in Luxembourg.
6. Nevertheless, the differences still exist between the two allies, as the economic conflict is vivid.
7. The EU-US summits initiated in 1990, but the 1995 agreement was the first one with significant value as it was accompanied by an action plan.
8. I refer to the formulated situation as it appears today.
9. A term that John Williamson used to refer to the lowest common denominator of policy advice being addressed by the Washington-based institutions, directed to Latin American countries as of 1989.
10. Speech by President of the European Commission Barroso, at the Brussels launch of "The Lisbon scorecard VIII: Is Europe ready for an economic storm"?, Brussels, 10 March 2008.
11. Commission's Lisbon evaluation report (2004), *Wim Kok report* (2004).
12. According to the declaration of 2007, its terms are:
 - a. Oversee the efforts outlined in this Framework, with the goal of accelerating progress;
 - b. Guide work between EU-U.S. Summits with a focus on achieving results, including setting goals for achieving the purposes of this Framework, developing metrics, setting deadlines and targets, and monitoring progress;
 - c. Adopt a work program, drawn initially from the existing work program under the 2005 U.S.-EC Economic Initiative, with the goal of achieving the objectives of this Framework, and shall adapt this work program and otherwise organize its activities in the manner best suited to achieving those objectives;

- d. Review at least semi-annually its progress in achieving the objectives of this Framework;
 - e. Facilitate joint action under this Framework to advance its purposes;
 - f. Review ongoing EU-U.S. economic engagement in order to maximize progress in existing transatlantic dialogues with a view to consider phasing out technical dialogues that have completed their work or are otherwise no longer necessary;
 - g. Meet at least once a year at such time as the co-chairs decide;
 - h. Oversee preparation of annual reports to the EU-U.S. Summit leaders on goals, metrics for meeting those goals, deadlines, achievements, and areas where more progress is needed;
 - i. Facilitate closer cooperation between the European Union and the United States and our legislators and stakeholders;
 - j. Convene a group comprised of individuals experienced in transatlantic issues drawing in particular from the heads of existing transatlantic dialogues to provide input and guidance to the EU-U. S. Summit on priorities for pursuing transatlantic economic integration; and
 - k. Include representatives of other governmental entities as the Council determines to be appropriate.
13. The development and spread of capitalism has, in general, not been conducive to the maintenance of diverse cultures.
14. The European integration process, is no more than a regional effort of harmonization of the European system to the American-led globalized single market. The European Treaties however did not have this direction from the beginning, back in 1950s.
15. The use of this strategy was a know practice of the Roman and British empires that were charged with playing one tribe against another to maintain control of their territories.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Edward N. Luttwak, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, *Turbo-Capitalism: Winners and Losers in the Global Economy*, Harpercollins, London, 1999.

Bela H. Banathy, *Guided Evolution in Society: A Systems View*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.

Miliband, Ralph, *Socialism for a Sceptical Age*, New York, Verso 1994.

Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1983.

Bhagwati, Jagdish, *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacres et Simulation*, Paris, Galilée, 1985.

Harold James, *The end of Globalization*, Harvard University Press, 2001.

Noam Chomsky, *The Culture of Terrorism*, Boston, Massachusetts: South End Press, 1988.

David McNally, *Another World is Possible: Globalization and Anti-Capitalism*, Winnipeg, Manitoba: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2002.

Maryanski Alexandra & Turner Jonathan, *The Social Cage, Human Nature and the Evolution of Society*, Stanford University Press, 1992.

Ronaldo Munck, *Globalisation and Labour: The New 'Great Transformation'*, Zed Books, London and New-York, 2002.

Carl Bildt, "Accelerating Globalisation – is Europe destined for decline?," *European View*, Vol 1 – Spring 2005.

Pankaj Ghemawat, "The world's biggest myth: some believe globalization is a force for good", *Foreign Policy*, 163, Nov-Dec 2007.

Anoushiravan Ehteshami, *Globalization and Geopolitics in the Middle East: Old Games, New Rules*, London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Petras, James, "Globalization: A Socialist Perspective", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 29: 1, 1999.

Fredric Jameson, "Globalization and Political Strategy", *New Left Review* 4, July-August 2000.

Perry Anderson, "Internationalism: A Breviary", *New Left Review* 14, March-April 2002.

Neil Thomas, "Global capitalism, the anti-globalisation movement and the third world", *Capital & Class* 92, Summer 2007.

Owen Worth and Carmen Kuhling, "Counter-hegemony, anti-globalization and culture in International Political Economy", *Capital & Class* 84, Winter 2004.

Simon Clarke, "The globalization of capital, crisis and class struggle", *Capital & Class*, Autumn 2001.

Communication from the Commission of 20 July 2005 - *Common Actions for Growth and Employment: The Community Lisbon Programme*, COM(2005) 330 final.

Communication from the Commission of 12 December 2006 to the Spring European Council: *A year of delivery-Part I: Implementing the renewed Lisbon strategy for growth and jobs*, COM(2006) 816 final.

Facing the challenge-The Lisbon strategy for growth and Employment, Report from the High Level Group chaired by Wim Kok, November 2004.

Commission Communication 2004, *Review of the EU economy. Exploring the economic underpinnings of the Lisbon strategy* (26 October 2004).

Declarations and agreements of EU – US summits, 1990-2007.

Speech by President of the European Commission Jose Manuel Barroso, at the Brussels launch of "The Lisbon scorecard VIII: Is Europe ready for an economic storm?", Brussels, 10 March 2008.