

Created by Wanda Woodward 7/30/2014

Globalization and Power

Assignment I
Wanda Marie Woodward, Ph.D.

Professor: Marc Pilisuk, Ph.D.

Saybrook Graduate School

Copyright © 2007

Assignment I: What do I think are the major problems facing the world?

Globalization is being defined in a myriad of different ways as different people view the construct through a different prism. Rodrik defines it primarily in economic terms as the “international integration of markets for goods, services and capital” (as cited in Anderson, in press, p. 1), whereas Friedman perceives it through a hologram of shifting lens, “the integration of capital, technology and information across national borders, in a way that is creating a single global market and, to some degree, a global village” (as cited in Anderson, in press, p. 2). Still others such as the sociologist Malcolm Waters perceives it as a “social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements receded and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding” (as cited in Anderson, in press, p. 3). As a mental health professional who sees the world through the lens of the human psyche, I am particularly fond of sociologist’s Roland Robertson’s definition as “the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole” (as cited in Anderson, in press, p. 5). Anderson (in press) appropriately highlights the common and “widespread confusion about what globalization *is*” as people debate each other because they have such “profound different images of what’s happening” (p.1). Barnett and Cavanagh (1994), highlighting the multi-faceted and complex nature of globalization, compare it to the verbalizations of the Red Queen in Alice in Wonderland saying “it means precisely whatever the user says it means” (p. 14). Ursula Franklin (1996), in her 1995 Lois and John Dove Memorial Lecture in Toronto, refers to the “global commercial hegemony”, of the “struggle against the arrogance and ignorance of power, against impending destruction, occupation, and conquest” (p. 13). On the most basic level, she speaks of

globalization as “a war against people” (p. 13) and “from a historical perspective, we are in the middle of a market-driven war on the common good” (p. 15). Whatever the definition, it has become glaringly obvious that multinationals, and the senior executives who manage them, are—by far---the clear winners (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994; Henderson, 1991; Korten, 2001; Rifkin, 2004) holding a barrel full of carrots with egregiously excessive compensation packages that are in the multi-millions (sometimes hundreds of millions including stocks options), 20-30% average annual corporate boardroom wage increases (Toynbee, 2007), hidden “soft” benefits such as use of the corporate jets for personal matters and residential renovations costing tens of thousands of dollars and tax breaks and loopholes for the wealthy. Meanwhile, this is juxtaposed against the middle and lower classes who are left holding several sticks. The Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, an international organization of those developed countries which espouses the principles of democracy and a capitalistic economy (hardly a liberal organization) recently stated that the rise in wage inequality is rising sharply in 18 of the 20 developed nations that it monitors (cited in Toynbee, 2007). The middle and lower classes in the U.S. are increasingly experiencing stagnant wages (annual average is 2%), unemployment from millions of U.S. jobs being shipped overseas where corporations are exploiting labor by paying substandard wages, underemployment due to being forced to accept jobs that are far below an individual’s education and skill level, and skyrocketing debt to pay for essential expenses such as healthcare. In other words, decreasing income and increasing expenses is the financial mantra by which the middle and lower class live. Egregious exploitation of 90% or more of the human species is fast becoming a global norm. The denial by some politicians that

the middle class is slowly disappearing into the lower class ranks and the refusal of the mainstream media (which is owned by corporations) to inform the public on a mass scale as to the serious extent that this has been occurring make this all the more astounding and troubling. Only an informed citizenry can garner sufficient numbers to act in concert to change disturbing tides of corruption and deceit in the halls of corporate and political power.

The gap between the rich and the poor, while always large, is becoming alarmingly disparate to the point that America is moving rapidly closer to resembling France prior to the French Revolution and Britain prior to American Revolution with a few elite using their monied power to purchase political and legal access so as to maintain their hegemonic position, and to suppress and oppress the masses. Toynbee (2007), referring to the redistribution of wealth into a very few hands, comments that “the richest 0.1% are vanishing off the graph. At a recent seminar, a lecturer said that to represent top wealth faithfully, a bar chart would stretch out of the building”.

According to the Drum Major Institute (2006), a non-partisan, non-profit think tank, their 2006 Injustice Index finds that the ratio of the average U.S. CEO annual pay to *minimum* wage worker’s is 821:1 whereas twenty years ago the ratio was 40:1.

According to Kevin Murphy of the University of Southern California, the average CEO pay rose 369 times that of the *average* worker in 2005 while it was 191 times in 1993 and 36 times in 1976 (Krugman, 2002). Paul Krugman (2002), an economist at MIT and regular columnist for *The New York Times*, reports more troubling statistics stating that in a 29 year period between 1970 and 1999, the average annual salary in America rose *ten percent (10%)* whereas, during the same period, according to *Fortune* magazine, the

average real annual compensation of the top CEOs in America rose *more than 1,000 times the pay of ordinary American workers* and, according to a 2001 Congressional Budget Office study, between 1979 and 1997, the after-tax incomes of the top 1 percent of American families *rose 157 percent (157%)*. According to the United Nations Development Report (UNDP, 1999), the net wealth of the ten wealthiest billionaires is \$133,000,000,000 (133 billion dollars), more than 1.5 times the total national income of the least developed countries. Doug Henwood (1998), in *Wall Street: How It Works and for Whom*, writes that the richest 5% of Americans own 95% of all stock shares and the top 1% of the population owns 25% of the productive capital and future profits of corporate America. In Henwood's (2003) *After the New Economy*, he exposes that the richest 10% of Americans possess over $\frac{3}{4}$ of all the wealth in America and the bottom 50% has almost none of the wealth, but notes that they do have substantial debt. UBS, an investment bank, has commented that the current period for corporations is "the golden era of profitability" with corporate profits climbing to the highest amount since the 1960s (Greenhouse & Leonhardt, 2006, p. A.1). Even though productivity levels have risen by double digits in the past decade, American workers' pay increases have risen by less than 2%. As Herbert (2006) describes it this way: "If your productivity increases by 18% and your pay goes up 1%, you've been dealt a hand full of jokers in which jokers aren't wild". Most productivity gains have gone straight into the pockets of corporate executives. The savings rate for middle and poor class is now negative and more Americans are filing for bankruptcy than they are for divorce (Herbert, 2006). Additionally, corporate taxes of industrial nations have fallen over the past two decades by an average of 15%, according to a study conducted by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. The study

is titled, “Having their cake and eating it too—the great corporate tax break,” reports that corporations and governments are increasingly collaborating with each other in order to push taxes onto individual taxpayers and force them to shoulder the burdens of taxes that corporations used to pay. At the current tax rate, corporations will be paying zero dollars for taxes in 50 years (Free Market News, 2006).

The middle and lower class are the clear losers although the media has failed to report adequately on this unjust travesty which has been an ongoing obsequious process for over fifteen years. The Drum Major Injustice Index (2006) reports that 30% of Americans feel chronically overworked. Rifkin (2004) tells us that between 1994 and 2004, three million U.S. jobs were lost due to foreign labor or technological advances. By corporations laying off Americans and hiring employees in foreign countries, Americans are forced to compete with labor that is compensated between 1,000% and 2,000% *less than* what Americans are accustomed to receiving. With regard to unskilled labor, corporations not only exploit this population by paying slave wages, but also deny them basic healthcare benefits and reject improvements to unhealthy and intolerable physical working conditions. Labor unions sometimes exist, but oftentimes do not, and corporations wield their enormous power to thwart and, in some cases, unlawfully prohibit union activity by bribing local judicial and police officials.

More than 1.2 billion people worldwide (1 in every five people) survive on less than \$1.00 per day and each year more than 10 million children die of preventable diseases in the world (UNDP, 2003). Krugman (2002) reports that the 13,000 wealthiest American families now have almost as much income as the 20 million poorest combined and that their incomes are *300 times* that of average American families. In America,

between 1950 and 1970, for every \$1.00 earned by the bottom 90%, those in the top 0.01% earned \$163. From 1990 to 2002, for every \$1.00 earned by the bottom 90%, those in the top 0.01% earned \$18,001 (Johnston, 2005). Korten (2001) reports in his book, *When Corporations Rule the World*, that the main consequence of capitalistic growth has been “that most of us are now working harder to maintain a declining quality of life” (p. 47). Even with glaring statistics such as these, our current president continues to attempt to distort what is reality by making fallacious commentaries about how the estate tax on the top wealthiest American families is too much of a burden to them and, if the American people will only continue to go to college, the middle and poor classes can surmount all their obstacles. As though getting a college education makes a difference when there are no jobs to be had or the jobs that do exist pay only one half or, at best, two thirds, of what a person is accustomed to being compensated. Any commentary that college education is important is inconsistent with a social and political context of a growing privileged few and of powerful multinationals who have all but bought Congress away from the American people leaving us not with a democracy “by, of and for the people,” but with an arrogant oligarchy or plutocracy that is “by, of and for the privileged.” The CEO of Ceridian, Ron Turner, cashed in \$489,531,000 worth of stock options during the two years prior to his October 2006 retirement (Yahoo, 2006). This excludes his base compensation, bonuses, and other perks. Many are aware of the retirement package for Lee Raymond, retiring CEO of ExxonMobil, estimated at \$400,000,000 (ABC news, 2006). Some may be aware of the 2004 lawsuit waged by New York Attorney General, Elliot Spitzer, against Richard Grasso, then Chairman of the NYSE, who accumulated \$140 million in pension savings that he cashed in. Spitzer

contended it was “unreasonable” and a violation of New York’s non-profit legislation (Thomas, 2006). Robert Nardelli, ousted CEO from Home Depot, saw pink and got gold, when he was given the pink slip and fired, yet was \$210 million richer for it (Herbert, 2007). When the average American gets discharged, they are lucky if they receive anything other than unemployment wages for up to 6 months, but certainly no amount even remotely close to what CEOs get with their golden parachutes. The real mystery is why Americans are not outraged and incensed by such egregious avarice, what Herbert (2007) calls “an insidious disease eating away at the structure of the society and undermining its future” (p. A.19). Bernake, the Federal Reserve Chairman, warned in August 2006 that “the unequal distribution of the economy’s spoils could derail the trade liberalization of recent decades” (Greenhouse & Leonhardt, 2006, p. A.1). Senator Carl Levin, Michigan Democrat, referring to the corruption of the top wealthiest Americans said, “the universe of offshore tax cheating has become so large that no one, not even the United States government, could go after it all” (Johnston, 2006, p. C.1).

Anderson (1999) writes that the drivers of globalization are technology and human mobility. However operationally defined, globalization, and the technology driving force behind it, impacts the planet in four major categories: 1. socially/culturally, 2. economically, 3. biologically, and 4. ecologically. Subcategories under the rubric of social and cultural shifts are the landscapes of the media, entertainment, education and religion. While technology may be the one defining causal factor of globalization, without the factor of overpopulation, the various symptoms of globalization would not be sufficient to present two vastly different potential outcomes of globalization. If instead of our current 6 billion world population (Swerdlow, 1998) the world had, for example, a

mere one million people, then global warming and a host of other issues would not be as problematic nor as dire. However, we would still be presented with the growing gap between the rich and the poor because, as John Kenneth Galbraith, the great economist and philosopher states, the “chaos of competitive avarice” (as cited in Krugman, 2002, p. 76) would still exist.

The accompanying problems of globalization are many with some apparent and others less visible, but with no less importance to all of humankind. The primary troubles facing humankind in the 21st century are:

1. overpopulation
2. deforestation
3. overharvesting
4. global warming
5. invasive species
6. overconsumption
7. growing inequality/gap between the rich and the poor
8. poverty
9. social unrest
10. corporate hegemony
11. weakening of governments by corporatacracy
12. nuclear proliferation

Absent overpopulation, however, overconsumption, deforestation, overharvesting and global warming would most likely not exist. On the other side of the coin of overpopulation, there must be mention of lack of sufficient mineral and natural resources to sustain an overpopulated and increasingly ecologically decimated earth which can be summed up as “overconsumption.” According to a Washington Post article in 1998, a majority of biologists (7 out of 10 scientists from the American Institute of Biological Sciences polled in a survey commissioned by the New York American Museum of Natural History) are convinced that a mass extinction is underway and that within 30 years, one fifth of all living species could become extinct (Warrick, 1998). The last mass

extinction occurred 65 million years ago when dinosaurs did not survive a meteor collision. According to the NASA Earth Observatory web site (2006), deforestation occurs through commercial logging, development of infrastructure such as the building of dams, agricultural uses such as grazing cattle and planting crops. It has been identified, along with fossil fuel use, as a major anthropogenic cause of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emissions (IPCC, 2007). Indeed, in the Working Group I Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) Report released February 2007, scientists have concluded with a “very high confidence” (meaning 9 out of 10 chance for accuracy) that it is very likely that global warming, including carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide emissions, has anthropogenic causes primarily from agriculture, land use changes and fossil fuel use, and that it is “very likely” (meaning >90% probability) this is unprecedented in the past 10,000 years (IPCC, 2007, pp. 4-5). Eight out of the last twelve years (1995-2006) have reported the warmest surface temperatures in recorded history (p. 5). The IPCC, which builds upon the 2001 TAR Assessment by the IPCC, points to increased droughts, heavy precipitation, floods, extreme wind patterns leading to increased tropical cyclone activity (hurricanes and typhoons), heat waves, rising in air and ocean temperatures, glacier melts, and rises in sea level. Further, the February 2007 IPCC Report states that both past and future anthropogenic causes of carbon dioxide emissions will continue to negatively impact the planet for another 1,000 years due to the time it takes for the gases to dissipate from the atmosphere (IPCC, 2007, p. 17).

According to World Wildlife Fund Director-General, James Leape, “if everyone around the world lived as those in America, we would need five planets to support us” referring to the 2006 Living Planet Report (MSNBC web page, 2006). The Report also noted that

in 2003, the world exceeded biocapacity by 25%. Another troubling statistic is that, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists, a leading science-based non-profit organization working for a healthier environment, America has 5% of the world's population, but emits 25% of the world's carbon dioxide (UCS, 2006). The Union of Concerned Scientists' web site also exposes the efforts of ExxonMobil which spent \$16 million between 1998 and 2005 hiring advocacy organizations that intentionally discredit the overwhelming evidence pointing to global warming (UCS, 2006).

The noted "Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change," issued in September 2006 by Sir Nicholas Stern, an economist for the British government, states that "the scientific evidence is now overwhelming: climate change is a serious global threat, and it demands an urgent global response" (Stern, 2006, p. 1). Stern cautions that global warming may become the greatest economic failure ever experienced in the world as hunger, water shortages, flooding and increased temperatures are imminent unless action is taken within the next two decades. If no action or insufficient action is taken, severe adverse economic and social results will occur that parallel the World Wars and the Depression in the 20th century. Only an international collaboration in which all parties agree on long-term goals can avert this impending risk to the entire species on the planet.

The World Wildlife Federation (WWF, 2007) reports that the use of toxic man-made chemical has increased from 1 million to 400 million tons between 1930 and 2000 and is seeping into the soil and into the food chain of all animals which, ultimately, ends up in the human body. Additionally, the WWF (2007) also lists anthropogenic causes of invasive species as a major threat to the biosphere. Intentional and unintentional release

of one species into another habitat has resulted in certain species of animals or plants consuming and eradicating the native species, thus, resulting in an unnatural biospheric arrangement, species devastation and/or near extinction. There are now thousands of invasive species listed by the WWF. Also listed as a major environmental hazard is overharvesting of fisheries in the world. The WWF (2007) reports that the global fishing fleet is 2.5 times larger than what the ocean can provide us and 52% of the world's fisheries have been fully exploited.

The Pew Center on Global Climate Change issued the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems And Global Climate Change report in August 2002, the Forest and Global Climate Change Report in February 2003, and the Coral Reefs and Global Climate Change Report in February 2004, all reports by scientific experts warning of the imminent adverse impact that global warming, overconsumption, overharvesting and overpopulation are causing these ecological systems and, ultimately, due to the interdependence of humanity and the biosphere, the impending demise of life on Earth.

These portend to be the most pernicious enemies of existing and future life on the planet. However, even if the world population were, for example, only a mere 100,000 people, there is no guarantee that the social, economic and political problems on the remainder of the list above would not exist as harmful threats. Factoring in overpopulation and global warming, however, old methods and means are sure to put all life species on Earth in ultimate peril. With an ever flattening social and cultural landscape due to the technological advances marking what Friedman calls the "Flat Earth" (Friedman, 2000), this makes hierarchical economic systems such as capitalism obsolete as effective tools since capitalism is based upon the premise that there has to be

a sufficient number of people to purchase the ever constantly growing number of products and services being marketed and sold. It does not take a rocket scientist to understand that, in a capitalistic system, there must exist a large, robust middle class who is financially able to purchase the goods and services from those who own the capital. When the middle class disappears and there is only a handful of extreme wealth at the top and the mass population is poor, capitalism cannot exist for long. Of equal importance, neither can democracy. Either a totalitarian and fascist society manifests where the masses are oppressed and suppressed, with no democracy; or a revolution unfolds which forces a coup and ousts the corrupt in power, resulting in one of a number of alternatives. It is unlikely that economists would be uninformed of all these data mentioned and that they would be ignorant of the necessity of a large middle class in order for capitalism to exist. Given that, how can we explain economists who attempt to convince a gullible, uneducated and uninformed populace that “growth” is the answer to all world problems when it is growth that is actually the very factor which will bring about the demise of all life on the planet if it is left unbalanced and unchecked with a moral, social and ecological duty to the common good?

With a few hundred multinational enterprises controlling approximately 25% of the productive assets in the world (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994), these are becoming the imperial monarchies of the past. Barnet & Cavanagh (1994) refer to the “surplus of gifted, skilled, undervalued, and unwanted human beings” as the “Achilles heel” of the global system and that an astonishingly large and increasing number of people are not needed or wanted to make the goods or to provide the services that the paying customers of the world can afford”. Referring to it as a “world economy out of control,” Barnet and

Cavanagh (1994) refer to a corporate, economic and political system that is unresponsive and unaccountable to the ever growing numbers of people who have lost jobs and are being bypassed due to chronic overproduction and global competition and advances in automation and training which make it easier to cut labor costs by shipping jobs overseas. With corporate executives riding the gravy train of unprecedented executive compensation, they are arrogantly denying responsibility for social and ecological consequences of a world economy out of control from avarice. The Calvin Klein shirt for which an American pays used to be sewn with domestic labor. Today, there is surely some worker in China, Bangladesh, Vietnam or United Arab Emirates who is working for slave labor wages in a sweatshop which now allows the maker to produce that shirt for substantially less and likely up to as much as 80% or 90% less. Unfortunately, for many Americans who buy the shirt, they are now working for lower wages after experiencing a lay-off and having to accept a lower income, so that when making that purchase, the maker is reaping substantially greater profits, but the purchasing power of the American is substantially less. In other words, the average American is paying more for goods, but because the increase in the cost of goods far outweighs the increase in wages, fewer goods can be purchased, or credit is increasingly used to maintain the same lifestyle prior to the decreased income. Meanwhile, the profit margin for the corporation continues to increase, the corporate executive compensation increases at annual averages of double digits, but the average annual wage increase for Americans between 2000 and 2006 was 1% (Herbert, 2007) and the median family income between 2001 and 2004 rose only 1.5% (Hall, 2006). According to a 2006 study by the Center for American Progress, a political think tank, Americans are now spending 126.4% of their income to cover the

cost of living (CNN Money web site, 2006). Said another way, Americans are going into debt by about 26.4% to pay for daily consumption. Even a lay person with little background in economics could deduce that this cannot continue indefinitely. Indeed, George Soros, billionaire investor, stated before a 1998 Congressional inquiry that “the global capitalist system...is coming apart at the seams” (Soros, 2006). He argued that unless global financial markets are regulated internationally, the protectionist strategies of individual states vying to protect their own interests will lead to a global economic breakdown. Soros vehemently disagrees with the market fundamentalists such as those during the Reagan “politics of denial” era (Henderson, 1991) and Thatcher era who propound that a completely unregulated global market has an in-built tendency towards creating a stable supply and demand scenario and that the market is the best means to regulate human behavior. Soros states that “the capitalist system by itself shows no tendency toward equilibrium...the owners of capital seek to maximize their profits. Left to their own devices, they would continue to accumulate capital until the situation became unbalanced” (Soros, 2006). Korten, in *When Corporations Rule the World*, rightly tells us that the “freedom of the market is the freedom of those with money” (p. 89). He further states that:

institutions of a capitalist economy are designed to concentrate control of the means of production in the hands of the few to the exclusion of the many. A capitalist economy is characterized by concentrations of monopoly power, financial speculation, absentee ownership, deregulation, public subsidies, the externalization of costs, and central economic planning by mega-corporations...the publicly traded, limited liability corporation is capitalism’s institutional form of choice because it allows the virtually unlimited concentration of power with minimal public accountability or legal liability (p. 104).

Korten further articulates that, while communism is the hegemony of the state,

capitalism manifests a hegemony of financial markets and the corporation. Unconcerned with civic or social responsibility, the corporation has the primary goal of maximizing profits and “creating artificial demand for unnecessary and even harmful products” (p. 103). Because the people who work in corporations develop a master/slave relationship whereby they have an unhealthy need to remain in the corporate milieu due to fear of job loss, rising debts and less purchasing power, they are fearful to speak out in opposition for fear of jeopardizing their jobs and their careers (Korten, 2001, p. 92).

From the 1950s through the 1990s, the neo-classical economists such as Milton Friedman have been touting “increased economic growth” as the savior of humankind. In other words, produce more and sell more. Because the wealthy stood to gain the most from “growth, growth, growth,” they conveniently failed to tell the mass population that this also means consume more, waste more, pollute more and destroy the ecological system more. Put simply, “more growth” means digging your own grave faster and faster---literally. The masses of Americans in the middle and poor classes have borne the brunt of this devastating experiment developed by, perpetrated by and marketed by the wealthy elite. Those who have borne the costs of this pathologically narcissistic corporatacracy have had their decision-making power stripped and many remain uninformed and unclear about what has happened and what is continuing to happen right under their noses because the media is now owned by major corporations who incessantly bombard the masses with interpretations of the crisis *based on perceptions of those who hold all the power*. In Nazi Germany, it was called “propaganda,” a means to mold, shape, and influence the masses to believe what those in power wanted them to believe. Similarly, the news and entertainment provided Americans is what the power holders, the

top wealthiest in America, want the masses to be exposed to. Some would call it “the fleecing of America” through corporate owned television, newspaper and radio stations. In 1989, Richard Douthwaite, an Irish economist who had once extolled the benefits of a “growth economy,” had this sobering analysis upon realization of the illusion of a “free growth market economy” where corporations are virtually unregulated by governments:

Problems arose when I attempted to identify what they (the benefits) were, especially as it quickly became apparent that almost every social indicator had worsened over the third of a century the experiment had taken. Chronic disease had increased, crime had gone up eight fold, unemployment soared and many more marriage were ending in divorce. Almost frantically I looked for gains to set against these losses which, in most cases I felt, had to be blamed on growth. [E]ventually...I gave up. The weight of evidence was overwhelming: the unquestioning quest for growth had been an unmitigated social and environmental disaster. Almost all of the extra resources the process had created had been used to keep the system functioning in an increasingly inefficient way. The new wealth had been squandered on producing pallets and corrugated cardboard, non-returnable bottles and ring-pull drink cans. It had built airports, supertankers and heavy goods lorries, motorways, flyovers and car parks with many floors. It had enabled the banking, insurance, stock brokering, tax collecting and accountancy sector to expand from 439,000 to 2,475,000 employees during the thirty-three years. It had financed the recruitment of over three million people to the ‘reserve army of the unemployed.’ Very little was left for more positive achievements when all these had taken their share (in Korten, 2001, p. 45).

Because there is such an intimacy between society and the individual as it pertains to interlinking influences and changes, who can say how much of the collective psyche has influenced globalization versus how much globalization has influenced the individual and collective psyche of humankind?

From a philosophical standpoint, globalization is about the many versus the few elite. From a socio-economic view, it is about the struggle between the classes, between the few privileged elite who are garnering increasingly larger amounts of the world’s wealth at the expense of the many who continue to experience job loss and decreasing purchasing power or, worse still, those who are living in abject poverty.

It was Marx who said that the seeds of destruction of capitalism are sewn into its very fabric (Marx, 1964/1848). Globalization is an ever increasing evolutionary force that is propelled largely by technological and scientific advances and which is primarily about the balancing of tensions between six (6) primary interfaces:

1. money versus spirit (greed versus transcendent values)
2. machine versus humankind (technology versus intrinsic)
3. hierarchy versus equality (inequality versus social justice)

Ultimately, the success or failure of globalization will decide the entire fate of all species on the planet including human, animal and plant. When understood through this lens, it all narrows down to an issue of justice. If the success of globalization is defined in narcissistic, Machiavellian terms, then the entire planet is doomed. However, if the success of globalization can be measured by the Buddha's Middle Path and, hence, by avoiding extremes, then humankind can avoid annihilation. Henderson (1991, p. 81) argues that all nations must forfeit the illusion that capitalistic market forces, propelled by the psyche of narcissistic self-interest and the obsession for control and power, and continued growth will save us. Instead, Henderson compels us to turn toward a complete shift in values, toward "win-win rules" with massive investments in "greening" our human technologies, as well as ecosystem restoration and population control. These will hold the promise in saving the planet from peril. As Henderson states, competition from capitalism is antithetical as a strategy when the world is overpopulated and there are growing numbers of unemployed and underemployed who can no longer afford to purchase the growing number of goods and services.

Rifkin (1995) sums it up fairly well when he compares two choices for humankind. One choice is that humankind collaborates to share the technological productivity gains so that the gap between the rich and the poor does not exceed reason, in order to eliminate poverty and so that investments are made with an equal priority of focus on our fragile ecological system. Rifkin presciently speaks of the end of work as we have known it as more and more people are unemployed and have shortened work weeks. Conversely, if these gains are “used primarily to enhance corporate profits, to the exclusive benefit of stockholders, top corporate managers, and the emerging elite of high-tech knowledge workers, chances are that the growing gap between the haves and the have-nots will lead to social and political upheaval on a global scale” (Rifkin, 1995, p. 13). Since Rifkin published this statement, social upheavals all over the globe have erupted including places such as Nepal, Thailand, South Africa, Lebanon, Israel, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, France, Great Britain and the United States, to name a few.

The only salvation is for humankind to transcend the dominant patriarchal competitive consciousness and replace it with a feminine relational, collaborative consciousness. Hegemonic superpowers have outlived their usefulness and, in order for humankind to evolve to the next level of consciousness, cooperation, sharing of knowledge, technology and resources, compassion and goodwill will be the mark of success for all life, from the mineral and plant kingdoms up to the animal and human kingdoms. The aggression, sexual drive and competitiveness of masculinity are the very traits which provided the necessary adaptability for humankind to evolve for the past ten millennia. For that, we thank the male gender since his consciousness has been causal in allowing us to adapt to, and survive, harsh natural environments. However, as Seager

(1993) tells us, “it is perilously evident that ‘salvation’ will not come through the masculinist structures that have brought us to the brink of environmental collapse”. The patriarchal consciousness which saved us yesterday will be the death knell consciousness for us today and tomorrow. We must transcend these past evolutionary adaptive qualities of masculine aggression, competition and autonomy and adopt feminine qualities of collaboration, cooperation, interdependence, compassion and wisdom. We fail to heed this wisdom at our own peril.

References

- ABC News (2006, April 14) *Oil: Exxon Chairman's \$400 million parachute*.
Retrieved December 30, 2006, from
<http://abcnews.go.com/GMA/print?id=1841989>
- Anderson, W. (1999, January). *The age of open systems: An introduction to globalization*. Presented at the Saybrook Residential Seminar, San Francisco, CA.
- Anderson, W. (in press). The two globalizations: Notes on a confused dialogue.
Futures.
- Barnet, R.J. & Cavanagh, J. (1994). *Global dreams: Imperial corporations and the new world order*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- CNN Money. (n.d.). *Middle-class families in worse shape than ever, study finds*.
Retrieved October 1, 2006, from
<http://www.cnnmoney.printhis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?action=cpt&title=U.S.+middle+class%20>
- Drum Major Institute (2006). Retrieved February 15, 2007, from
<http://www.drummajorinstitute.org/injusticeindex.php>
- Franklin, U. (1996). Peace, technology and the role of ordinary people. *Peace Magazine: Science for Peace*, 12(1), 13-15.
- Free Market News (2006, July 21). Retrieved 7/21/06, from
<http://www.freemarketnews.com/WorldNews-Print.asp?nid=17242>
- Friedman, T. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the 21st century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Hall, K. (2006, November 2). *The rich are getting much richer, much faster than everyone else*. McClatchy Newspapers. Retrieved November 4, 2006, from <http://www.realcities.com/mld/kwashington/15912820.htm>

Henderson, H. (1991). *Paradigms in progress: Life beyond economics*. Indianapolis, IN: Knowledge Systems, Inc.

Henwood, D. (2003). *After the new economy*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Henwood, D. (1998). *Wall Street: How it works and for whom*. New York, NY: Verso.

Herbert, B. (2007, January 8). Working harder for the man. *The New York Times*, p. A19.

Johnston, D.C. (2005, June 5). Richest are leaving even the rich far behind. *The New York Times*, p. 1.1.

Krugman, P. (2002, October 20). For richer: How the permissive capitalism of the boom destroyed American equality, *New York Times Magazine*, 62.

Marx, K. (1964). *The communist manifesto*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. (original work published in 1848).

MSNBC. (n.d.). *Humans will need two earths, report claims*. Retrieved October 25, 2006, from

<http://www.msnbc.com/id/15398149/print/1/displaymode/1098/>

National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (n.d.). NASA Earth Observatory.

Retrieved on February 11, 2007, from

<http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Library/Deforestation>

Pew Center on Global Climate Change. (2002, August). Coastal and marine ecosystems and global climate change: Potential effects on U.S. resources. Arlington, VA:

- Cowan, J.H., Hare, S.R., Kennedy, V.S., Kleypas, J.A., & Twilley, R.R.
- Pew Center on Global Climate Change. (2003, February). Forests and global climate change: Potential effects on U.S. forest resources. Arlington, VA: Sedjo, R., Shugart, H. & Sohngen, B.
- Pew Center on Global Climate Change. (2004, February). Coral reefs and global climate change: Potential contributions of climate change to stresses on coral reef ecosystems. Arlington, VA: Buddemeir, R.W., Kleypas, J.A. & Aronson, R.B.
- Rifkin, J. (1995). *The end of work: The decline of the global labor force and the dawn of the post-market era*. New York, NY: Putnam's Sons.
- Sorken A. & Dash, E. (2007, January 8). Private firms lure chief executives with top pay. *The New York Times*, p. A1.
- Soros, G. (1998). *The crisis of global capitalism*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs.
- Stern, N. (2006). *Stern review: The economics of climate change*. United Kingdom: Her Majesty's Treasury.
- Swerdlow, J.L. (1998, October). Population. *National Geographic*, 1-2.
- Thomas, L. (2006, June 25). The winding road to that huge payday. *The New York Times*, Section 3, pp. 1, 8.
- Toynbee, P. (2007, June 26). Brown can't talk like he does and ignore this debauchery: The Babylonian excesses of the rich have to be tackled fast if we are to stop our society from being wrenched apart. *The Guardian*, Retrieved 6/26/07 from, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,2111553,00.html>
- Union of Concerned Scientists. (2006). *Science of global warming: Each country's share of global CO2 emissions*. Retrieved 3/22/06, from

Created by Wanda Woodward 7/30/2014

http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/science/each-countrys-share-of-co2-emissions.html

United Nations. (1999). *United Nations Development Report*. Retrieved December 18, 2006, from http://www.worldsocialism.org/articles/who_owns_the_world.php

United Nations. (2003). *United Nations Development Report*. Retrieved December 18, 2006, from http://www.worldsocialism.org/articles/who_owns_the_world.php

Warrick, J. (1998, April 21). Mass extinction underway, majority of biologists say. *The Washington Post*, p. A04.

World Wildlife Fund. (2007). *Environmental Own Goals*. Retrieved February 11, 2007, from

http://www.panda.org/news_facts/education/own_goals/overfishing/index.cfm

Yahoo. (n.d.). Sale of stock options over two year period by Ron Turner, former CEO of Ceridian. Retrieved January 12, 2007, from

<http://finance.yahoo.com/q/it?s=CEN>