

THE FUTURE OF THE EUROPEAN UNION IN THE FRAMEWORK OF GLOBALIZATION

Ebru Nergiz

Gelisim University, Turkey

Abstract

The future of the European Union is highly linked to globalization. The European Union is a definitely global actor. It unites half a billion people. It is the world's largest economic block, with a quarter of global GDP. Managing globalization and strengthening its rules is vital for the European Union. A fifth of Europe's wealth depends on its openness. In this section the future of the European Union will be examined in the framework of globalization. There are three key issues for the European Union in managing globalization. Firstly, economic globalization will be discussed. Secondly, its cultural dimension, which means a stronger dialogue of civilizations and nations will be evaluated. Finally, the need to protect global security in terms of climate change and sustainable sources of energy will be analyzed.

INTRODUCTION

The European Union (EU) is an economic and political partnership that represents a unique form of cooperation among its 27 member states. Globalization has given the European Union great opportunities. Most of the challenges that the European Union face, economic integration and migration, energy security and climate change, humanitarian crises, failing states and terrorism, are interdependent. The European Union not only may be construed as an active actor of globalization but also it appears to be threatened by globalization from time to time. The aim of this article is to investigate the European Union's performance in managing globalization by focusing on economic, cultural and environmental issues and to discuss the future of the European Union in the framework of globalization.

BACKGROUND

The European Union was established as one of the most important trade blocs in the World. In 1949, the Council of Europe was established "to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realizing the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their economic and social progress", stated in the Statute of the Council of Europe.

In 1957, the European Economic Community (EEC) emerged establishing "a large single market that would ensure the free movement of goods, people, capital and services with a wide measure of common economic policies" (Costin, 1996). The result was the European Economic Community (EEC), created in 1958, and initially increasing economic cooperation between six countries: Belgium, Germany,

France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. The EEC then came to be known as the European Community which then changed to what it is called today, the European Union.

The Treaty signed in 1957 established the European Economic Community (EEC) and abolished customs barriers within the Community and established a common customs tariff to be applied to goods from non-EEC countries. This objective was achieved on 1 July 1968. The Single Market of the European Union is the common area between the 27 EU countries where goods, services, capital and persons can circulate freely. The Single Market also ensures that European citizens are free to live, work, study and do business where they want in the EU.

The European Union is not the typical territorial construction comparable to any nation-state in existence today. It is a loose assembly of member states which pooled together a degree of their sovereignties so that interests that cannot be resolved by states alone are referred for resolution to the supranational level. It is a unique structure that essentially overarches the relationships among its constituent member states. In the socio-political-cultural-economic sense, it stimulates a vast array of interactions that occur within its space. Decisions taken in one location of the union can have an impact on other locales in the shared space because they are filtered and then diffused through the supraterritorial mechanisms imposed over the myriad of segments forming this mosaic-like structure (Salajan, 2001).

GLOBALIZATION

Globalization refers to all those processes by which the people of the world are incorporated into a single world society, global society (Albrow, 1990).

Giddens (1990) defines globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” Robertson’s definition includes both the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole and focuses on globalization as a “massive, two-fold process involving the interpenetration of the universalization of particularism and the particularization of universalism” (Robertson, 1992).

Globalization can also be defined as the increased flows of goods, services, capital, people and information across borders (Jacoby & Meunier, 2010). These issues are highly parallel to the European Union’s establishment purposes.

Globalization constitutes a multiplicity of linkages and interconnections that transcend the nation states and the societies which make up the modern World system. It defines a process through which events, decisions and activities in one part of the World can come to have a significant consequence for individuals and communities in quite distant parts of the globe (McGrew, 1990).

Globalization might be characterized functionally by an intrinsically related series of economic phenomena. These include the liberalization and deregulation of markets, privatization of assets, retreat of state functions, diffusion of technology, cross-national distribution of manufacturing production (foreign direct investment), and the integration of capital markets. In its narrowest formulation, the term refers to the worldwide spread of sales, production facilities, and manufacturing processes, all of which reconstitute the international division of labor. (Reich, 1998)

Globalization is a powerful real aspect of the new world system. It has various dimensions: economic, political, security, environmental, health, social, cultural, and others.

EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MANAGEMENT OF GLOBALIZATION

Managing globalization has been of primary concern for the European Union for many years. Globalization has been leading major European Union policies over the past twentyfive years. Older practical aspirations for European integration have often emphasized the management of intra-European tensions. A primary example is the Franco– German relationship, transformed in a series of postwar acts of reconciliation from militaristic competition to jointly beneficial economic co-management. Conceptually, European integration has been seen as an effort to manage the eroding powers of national states, to manage the creation of an integrated market, and to manage the ‘pooling’ of national sovereignty. Yet what all of these different ‘management’ approaches have in common is a focus on tensions and challenges with largely intra-European origins. The European Coal and Steel Community had external implications but mostly managed intra-European tensions. The 1980s move to the Single Market was primarily an intra-European exercise, which third countries deplored as ‘Fortress Europe’, though the Single Market brought the EC/EU leverage in broader global conversations.

More recently, the concept of ‘managed globalization’, articulated explicitly as the central doctrine of EU trade policy since 1999, suggests that order and control should be restored to the process of globalization by framing it with rules, obeying these rules, and empowering international organizations to make and implement these rules. This concept of managed globalization, originally and explicitly developed with respect to trade and finance, has become the underlying driver of a number of major policy initiatives undertaken by the EU in the past decades. Some policies of the European Union such as, euro, immigration, enlargement, the Neighborhood Policy, or even the Lisbon Process, all these policies have been designed, at least in part, to restore order and control in the face of challenges posed by globalization. (Tsoukalis 2010).

Europeans seek to manage globalization in a number of ways, but their primary tool in that effort is the maintenance and development of a strong European Union. Ironically, for years, especially in the 1980s, the EU was seen by many Europeans primarily as a cause of a form of globalization, forcing them to liberalize their economies and open their borders to foreign goods, services, and influences. By the 1990s, however, a single European market was widely accepted across the continent, and the EU increasingly became the tool with which Europeans shielded themselves from the downsides of global liberalization and integration. The EU single market allows its members to take advantage of many of the benefits of globalization on a more limited scale and among people with relatively similar social values and levels of economic development. The EU also allows Europeans to aggregate individual memberstates’ power to give the Union as a whole leverage in dealing with the United States and the rest of the world (Gordon, 2004). This allows them a much greater ability to manage and regulate aspects of globalization such as the environment, food safety, financial transactions and even world politics.

European Union has attempted to implement policies designed to manage globalization by using five main mechanisms: expanding policy scope, exercising regulatory influence, empowering international institutions, enlarging the territorial sphere of EU influence, and redistributing the costs of globalization (Jacoby &Meunier, 2010).

EU’s efforts to manage globalization details in four ways. First, management entails an effort to set regulatory standards in the international economy, including outside of Europe. Second, management includes an effort to empower international organizations. Third, it involves various strategies for

enlarging the territorial sphere of EU influence. Finally, management can entail efforts to redistribute the costs of globalization.

There are three key issues for the European Union in managing globalization. Firstly, economic globalization or globalization of the economic system in other words. Secondly, its cultural dimension, which means a stronger dialogue of civilizations and nations. Finally, the need to protect global security in terms of climate change and sustainable sources of energy.

GLOBALIZATION OF THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Economics dominates many discussions of globalization. Most globalization theorists focus on global economic forms and organizations (e.g., multinational firms) as replacing national and local economic activities, and the diversity of markets and goods that result from the introduction of global products and forms to localities.

Theorists such as Piore and Sable (1984), Wallerstein (1974, 1983), and Harvey (1990) focus on globalization as associated with capitalism. Capitalism's growth orientation, exploitation of labor, and technological and organizational dynamism lead to overaccumulation. Increasingly, this overaccumulation is managed by absorption through temporal or spatial displacement. Temporal displacement comprises exploring future uses and speeding turnover of goods, while spatial displacement involves finding new geographic or other spaces for production and consumption. Managing overaccumulation in these ways results in a trend away from Fordist production to what Piore and Sabel (1984) call flexible specialization, meaning decentralized technologies that can produce a range of products for different customers. Harvey (1990) sees an increasingly diverse mix of global economic systems, reflecting expanded market coordination, changing composition in the workforce, an extraordinary efflorescence and transformation in financial markets and a weakened but still powerful state.

In Wallerstein's analysis of the economic world system, national and local contribute to the global because they are part of it. Since Wallerstein's basic viewpoint is of a global system, globalization is his starting point; the results are his focus. He sees the global economic system as having reached a crisis, brought upon by the internal contradictions of capitalist civilization: dilemmas of accumulation, political legitimation, and the geocultural agenda (Wallerstein 1983). He foresees "explosions in all directions," economic/political/cultural disorder followed by a reordering of some type.

The third type of economic globalization theory sees the advent of global goods at local markets (Abu-Lughod 1997). Equally, global "bads" such as global environmental problems (Yearley 1996) and global risks produced by industrialization (Giddens 1991, Beck 1992, Sachs 2000) arrive at all national and local places. For example, localities experience the threat of nuclear fallout, sea level rise, air pollution, and industrial runoff although the localities themselves have not produced nuclear bombs nor emitted vast quantities of greenhouse gases nor initiated industrial plants.

EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MANAGEMENT ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION

The combination of technological progress, lower transport costs and policy liberalisation in the European Union and elsewhere has led to increasing trade and financial flows between countries. This has important consequences for the functioning of the EU economy. While globalisation brings huge benefits and opportunities, it also means that Europe has to face increased competition in all traded goods and services.

Rising international economic integration, or globalisation as it is commonly known, offers many opportunities. EU firms receive easier access to new and expanding markets and sources of finance and technology. EU consumers receive access to a larger variety of goods at lower prices. This opens the prospect of potential significant gains for the Union in terms of higher levels of productivity and real wages. The European Commission estimates that about one-fifth of the increase in EU-15 living standards over the past 50 years is attributable to integration of the world economy, in other words globalisation. That is why the European Commission has been firmly in favour of greater economic openness. The EU trade policy has been an important instrument to steer world trade liberalisation (http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/international/globalisation).

However, the public often associates globalisation with job losses and downward pressures on wages and working conditions. These issues are based on fears that increased competition from low-wage countries puts excessive pressure on local producers and workers and may result in the closure, or partial closure, of factories at home and their relocation abroad. While these concerns are not new and understandable, they seem to have been heightened by the rapid emergence of China and India on the world trading scene. In particular, the widespread use of information technologies increasingly erodes the boundaries between what can and cannot be traded.

Finding an adequate response to globalisation may be seen as part of the broader policy challenge for dynamic economies - i.e., to successfully cope with structural economic change. To reap the gains from globalisation it is necessary to undergo a process of adjustment as factors of production - such as capital - move from activities and firms that cannot withstand the increased competition pressure to those that thrive on it. However, while there is evidence that globalisation has not been associated with overall net employment losses, the adjustment of economic structures has costs resulting from resources being moved between firms and activities. The structural adjustment of more rigid labour, capital and product markets can be more costly and painful.

The policy challenge is to turn the potential benefits of globalisation into real gains while minimising the social costs. Measures to improve the functioning of EU markets and to boost innovation performance will help shorten the adjustment process, while targeted policy actions such as the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund will assist affected workers. Besides these internal issues, there are also significant external challenges facing the EU which require policy responses, including:

- encouraging global trade and maintaining Europe's position as the leading global trading bloc;
- managing migration as a source of workers, a response to ageing, and a benefit to development;
- maintaining the EU's position as a leading source and destination for foreign direct investment (FDI); and
- managing imbalances in the global economy in partnership with other countries and international institutions.

The Commission plays an important role in the design of a coherent policy strategy to face the challenges of globalisation. It closely analyses the evolution of main trends in world trade and FDI flows and the performance of the EU in this regard. It also regularly analyses the impact of globalisation on the EU's economic performance and provides policy advice on the basis of its analysis.

GLOBALIZATION OF CULTURE

The socio-cultural dimension of globalization entertains the idea of societal transformations and cultural interconnections that are brought about through the dispersion of social habits and culturally iconic traditions specific to some places to the rest of the world. For those who support this type of globalization, there are benefits to be gained from the diffusion of models of social practices or programs from those locations in which they are proven to be successful to other parts of the world that could benefit from them. For others, the concern is that this application of models cannot be performed without adaptation to local conditions, since cultural traditions may not be compatible with aspects of social models developed in culturally different environments. The debate is not as sharply polarized in partisanship terms as is the case with more concrete notions such as politics or economics, but being immersed in a naturally shapeless and fluid medium like culture or society, it is fraught with the difficulty of extricating and making sense of key elements from the entangled web of the socio-cultural mosaic. The discussion usually revolves around dissecting the meaning of powerful influences of cultural icons promoted, not coincidentally, through economic means. Commercial brands with instant recognition (Coca Cola, McDonalds, Nike, IBM are just some of the examples that easily come to mind) are perceived by many critics as the vehicles of the imposition of a western consumer culture on world locales without due consideration of the impact on local people's cultural traditions.

There are, as for economics and politics, three ways to relate global culture to local cultures. Firstly, global and local cultures may compete in specific places; separatist ethnic groups resisting "tourism" is one good example. Secondly, globalization may mean that all culture becomes global, a melding of local cultures. This implies cultural imperialism, American culture being the most frequent. In another form of global domination, global culture may mean the organization or structure of many cultures, so that the content differs but the commodification processes and systems remain similar for each culture; one manifestation of this theoretical perspective is the "culture follows structure" argument. Thirdly, global culture may simply be one additional culture, to be examined alongside national and local cultures, with no particular hierarchy involved; one can pick and choose from global, national, and local products (and identities). Robertson (1995) asserts the persistence of resistance to globalization by summarizing the arguments against cultural imperialism, citing four counter-factors: (1) "global" messages are notoriously subject to differing hearing and interpretations in various localities; (2) global organizations are tailoring their messages and products to different locales; (3) national symbolic resources are increasingly available to international markets; and (4) cultural flows from developing countries to industrialized countries are copious. Ritzer (2000) details resistance to American cultural imperialism in the form of the Slow Food movement which protests against opening new McDonald's restaurants. Smith (1990) discusses cultural imperialisms. The current model, he says, is eclectic, unity in diversity; we can expect a standard production-and-consumption system with watered-down "folk" content from many national and local cultures. Ritzer and Malone (2000) elaborate on the standard production-and-consumption system, part economics and part culture, that the United States exports in the forms of McDonaldisation, credit cards, Disney Worlds, "eatertainment" establishments, and shopping malls. Hall (1997) declares similarly to this analysis that the international language is English, and American culture is everywhere.

Robertson (1992) sketches the outlines of a global World that is highly diverse yet highly conscious of its holistic character. He stresses the simultaneity of the global and local. Modern transportation and communication enable people everywhere to see places around the world as easily as places next door to them—and to experience different cultures, environments and conditions (such as war and famine) via print and electronic media. The McLuhan phrase “global village” captures this sense of the world as a small place where most people are aware of their neighbors. Under globalization, says Robertson, people realize that the world holds more “others,” who are experienced as highly diverse yet virtually present. Hannerz (1990, 1997) argues that world culture “is marked by an organization of diversity rather than by a replication of uniformity” (Hannerz 1990). Late Western capitalism “exports culture to peripheral countries.” Global homogenization may happen by gradual saturation, although local cultures will reshape Western culture to their own needs. The cross-national network of social relationships is the organizing impulse that connects diverse local cultures. Abu-Lughod (1997), in response to Hannerz, rejects a simplistic core-to-periphery analysis. On the other hand, developed niches occur in many places around the globe, for example, Tunis, with its Gucci and couture sweatshops and its modern Census office. Watson (1997) details the ways in which local and national cultures domesticate the McDonald’s restaurants that arrive in various East Asian cities.

Seeing global and more local cultures as synthesis, Featherstone (1990) speaks of global culture “in terms of the diversity, variety and richness of popular and local discourses, codes and practices which resist and play-back systemicity and order.” Far from giving us a universally homogenous culture, globalization defines a space in which the world’s cultures rub elbows and generate new meanings and understandings. Featherstone and Lash (1995) delineate a world in which “international social, political and cultural (for example, the media) organizations are standing alongside and beginning to replace their national counterparts.”

EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MANAGEMENT OF CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION

The Commission has developed a new European agenda for culture, which attempts to respond to the challenges of globalisation. (http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/culture/129019_en.htm)

The cultural sector plays a key role in terms of its numerous social, economic and political implications. Consequently, culture has a fundamental part in the process of European integration.

On the basis of these considerations, and in light of the results of an online consultation of stakeholders in the cultural sector, the Commission proposes a new European agenda for culture that focuses on a limited number of objectives. To work towards these objectives, the Commission also suggests new mechanisms for cooperation with and among European Union countries, other levels of governance and civil society.

The objectives of the new European agenda for culture are built around three priorities:

1) Cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue

Openness and exchanges between different cultures should be promoted. Accordingly, the new agenda for culture seeks to encourage:

- Mobility of artists and workers in the cultural sector and the circulation of all forms of artistic expression;

- Strengthening intercultural competences and intercultural dialogue, by developing capacities included among the key competences for lifelong learning, such as cultural awareness and expression, and communication in foreign languages.

2) Stimulating creativity within the framework of the Lisbon Strategy for growth and jobs

Cultural industries contribute to the dynamism of the European economy and to EU competitiveness. The cultural sector employs nearly five million people in the EU. In this respect, the Commission proposes the following objectives:

- Promoting creativity in education and incorporating this dimension into the lifelong learning measures;
- Strengthening the organisational capacities of the cultural sector, by focusing on entrepreneurship and the training of the cultural sector in managerial competences (innovative sources of financing, European dimension of commercial activities, etc.);
- Developing effective partnerships between the cultural sector and other sectors (ICTs, research, tourism, social partners, etc.) to reinforce the impact of investments in culture.

3) Culture as a vital element in international relations

In line with the Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, ratified by the EU and most of its countries, the new agenda for culture proposes to reinforce the cultural dimension as a vital element of EU external relations. This priority is accompanied by a number of measures to:

- Pursue political dialogue in the field of culture and promote cultural exchanges between the EU and non-EU countries;
- Promote access to global markets for cultural goods and services from developing countries through agreements that grant preferential treatment or trade-related assistance measures;
- Build on external relations to set up financial and technical support (preservation of cultural heritage, promotion of cultural activities across the world)
- Ensure that all projects funded by the EU take account of local culture;
- Step up EU involvement in the work of international organisations active in the field of culture and in the United Nations ‘Alliance of Civilisations’ process.

The cultural sector has already been the subject of several European level actions to promote culture, such as the “Culture”, “Europe for Citizens”, and MEDIA programmes.

The first experiences of the actions indicate that, in general, it is an effective tool for cooperating in the cultural field. However, it has not been used for long enough to draw any substantial conclusions. For the future, cooperation will have to be reinforced, with adapted working methods. The structured dialogue in the cultural sector is taking place through thematic platforms of European associations and the European Culture Forum. The thematic platforms have been especially beneficial for intensifying dialogue within the sector. Nevertheless, further efforts need to be made to achieve more focused dialogue with civil society in future.

ENVIRONMENTAL DIMENSION OF GLOBALIZATION

Environmental concerns have entered global consciousness thanks to the harsh efforts of the scientific community and advocacy groups, such as Greenpeace, in urging governments around the world to foster cleaner lands, waters and skies. This environmental dimension, while having deep ramifications in multiple aspects of life, particularly in the fundamental level of society's very existence, is intrinsically linked to the human activity in the economic realm (Keohane & Nye, 2000). Industrial activity, development and growth are principal "culprits" in such environmental ills as air and water pollution, soil degradation, oil spills or ozone depletion. But farming techniques, human consumption, traffic congestion or waste mismanagement are also factors with huge consequences for the environment. That is why sustainability in economic development programs, be it in agriculture or industry, is always associated with environmental protection, so that growth is not pursued at all costs without the implementation of measures to prevent hazardous spills or unnecessary pollution of any kind that can damage the planet's ecosystem.

EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL GLOBALIZATION

The European Union (EU) has played a key role in the global fight against climate change, increasingly establishing itself as a leader in international climate policy. The EU has made efforts to back its leadership position with advances in domestic climate and energy policies. Ambitious climate action at home proves crucial for the international credibility of the EU climate leadership claim. The failure of the Copenhagen climate summit in 2009 and the overarching economic and debt crisis, has weakened European climate leadership in recent years (Verolme, 2012).

At the 2011 climate conference in Durban, the EU managed to revive some of its leadership position in climate change negotiation. Continued EU leadership in international climate policy will depend on the EU's will and ability to lead by example and to reduce the credibility gap between international promises and domestic activities.

In 2015, Europe will again be looked upon to play a central role in cementing a new global climate deal. The Durban Platform and the Future of the Kyoto Protocol Europe has strongly argued for an internationally-binding rules-based climate agreement with global coverage.

Governments in Durban agreed to launch Kyoto's second commitment period, but crucial details were left unresolved, partly as a result of Polish intransigence over the future use of "hot air." The resulting gap in ambition needs to be closed before 2015 if a global peak in emissions well before 2020 is to be realized. It is clearly not enough to note these facts "with grave concern" in the Durban Platform decision. Concrete steps need to be taken to increase ambition before 2015. The EU should make concrete proposals, with its allies, to do so.

The political energy is shifting to a new round of talks: the promise of something new, bigger and better to supersede Kyoto. Suddenly, a future without the Kyoto Protocol has become conceivable. Experience shows the new rules are unlikely to become stricter. The negotiations in Durban on forest accounting or carbon capture and storage, for example, show how little interest countries have in preserving environmental integrity. They are more concerned with economic issues.

CONCLUSION

The record of the past 35 years certainly provides more evidence of an EU that is adapting to rather than resisting globalization. As late as 1980 the major European economies were still highly regulated, capital movements were restricted, and hundreds of non-tariff barriers, such as physical barriers at borders, immigration controls, licensing requirements, health and safety regulations, and restrictions on trade in services, prevented true economic integration even within the EU. Other trade distorting measures included heavy state subsidies and obstacles to cross-border mergers and acquisitions. From 1981-83, the French government even experimented with a socialist economic experiment—a massive program of nationalizations and state-led growth that threatened economic integration within the EU and economic openness. Since that period, however, Europe's economies have liberalized extensively, and economic openness within Europe has progressed greatly. The "1992" program to complete the single European market did away with the nontariff barriers to trade and capital flows, and governments across the Union proceeded with the privatizations and elimination of trade barriers necessary to open their economies up to world trade. To be sure, much progress remained to be made, but by the early 1990s the EU was far more open to internal movements of goods, capital, services, and people than even a decade before.

Backwards, the "Europeanization" of the 1980s was a preface to the "globalization" of the 1990s. Even its opponents were the same—left wing socialists opposed to the workings of the free market and the inequalities it creates, environmental groups concerned about the effects of industrialization, and right-wing nationalists opposed to the erosion of national sovereignty. These groups all fought against the European integration process of the late 1980s and the Maastricht Treaty that, in 1991, consolidated that process. When they lost that debate, the anti-globalization activists turned their energy toward resisting globalization and its manifestations in the late 1990s—the World Trade Organization, the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, the World Economic Forum, and the spread of American culture. In other words, whereas in the 1980s the EU was mainly seen as a force behind globalization and liberalization, by the 1990s it had become a tool for managing those processes.

The EU allows its member states to take advantage of many of the benefits of globalization, such as specialization; free circulation of goods, services, money and people, on a more limited scale and among relatively like-minded countries at similar levels of economic development by providing a large, single market. Europeans find it easier to accept European integration than global integration because of the Europeans' similar value systems and common commitment to generous social and environmental provisions. Since most of the trade of individual EU member states takes place within the European Union, these provisions reassure Europeans that economic openness will mostly take place in a managed and regulated context. Europeans also count on the EU to protect them from the inequalities that globalization can create. The EU's generous provision of "structural funds"—economic aid to regions whose GDP per capita is below 75% of the EU average—and a social safety net make the Union safer for globalization.

The EU is also the most advanced effort in the world to introduce a measure of democratic supervision into the process of globalization. Unlike other efforts to supervise globalization, such as the United Nations and the World Trade organization, the EU has a directly elected parliament that legislates for the EU alongside the 27 member-state governments, who often decide issues by majority. Other international organizations operate on a purely intergovernmental basis. EU provides a model for democratic rule-making, at the supranational level, that will become more, not less, necessary as we proceed into the 21st century. Indeed, the failure to deal with climate change is a good example of the weaknesses of present intergovernmental models of global governance. If the different regions of the world had unions like the EU that could negotiate seriously and with genuine political legitimacy, as the

EU can, the failures of Copenhagen and other climate change summits would not have happened. Managing globalization entails a dual and often contradictory logic. On the one hand, many players seek to define the rules of globalization, specifying more clearly what is allowed and when. On the other hand, they also would like to coordinate their responses on what practices are out of bounds.

The EU has enabled the penetration of globalization into Europe, notably by constructing the European single market and opening up protected economies to substantial competition. As a result, critics of globalization are also often critics of European integration. Yet, as noted, the EU also appears as the best bulwark against globalization, since its scale makes it more effective and credible in the face of competitive practices and products that it deems illegitimate.

Apparently, the kind of liberalization on offer varies across a number of dimensions explored by our contributors. For one thing, variation in levels of managed globalization is likely affected by the amount of power delegated to the EU. Meanwhile, one of the EU's most effective areas for managing globalization – asserting its preferences on environmental policy – is area where its leadership has only recently come to the fore and where delegation to the EU remains moderate.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Future research on the European Union's performance in managing globalization can focus on different perspectives of the subject such as the political dimension of globalization, agriculture, energy policy, research and development policies. As other scholars take up research in these areas, they might be particularly interested in a number of research questions such as: 'How can the EU really manage globalization, which requires liberalization, as long as it is essentially protectionist in important areas such as agricultural policy?' or 'How do instances of different mechanisms for managing globalization affect one another – perhaps mutually reinforcing or perhaps undermining one another?'

REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, J. (1997). Going beyond the global babble. *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by A. D. King. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Albrow, M. & King, E. (1990). *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*. London. Sage
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity*. Translated by M. Ritter. London: Sage.
- Featherstone, M. (1990). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Featherstone, M. & Scott Lash. (1995). Globalization, modernity and the spatialization of social theory: an introduction. *Global Modernities*. edited by M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson. London: Sage.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press

Gordon, P. (2004). *Europe's Cautious Globalization*. Martindale Center. Leigh University.

Hall, S. (1997). The local and the global: globalization and ethnicity. *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, edited by A. D. King. Minneapolis. University of Minnesota Press.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, edited by M. Featherstone. London: Sage.

Hannerz, U. (1997). Scenarios for peripheral cultures. *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. edited by A. D. King. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell

http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/international/globalisation, Retrieved April 25, 2013.

http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/culture/l29019_en.htm, Retrieved April 28, 2013.

Jacoby W., & Meunier S. (2010). Europe and the Management of Globalization, *Journal of European Public Policy* 17: 3 April 2010: 299-317.

Keohan R. & Nye J. (2000). *Globalization: What's New? What's Not?. Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. New York: Longman

McGrew A. (1990). A Global Society. Stuart Hall, David Held, and Anthony McGrew, *Modernity and Its Futures*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Piore, M.J. & Sabel, C.F. (1984). *The Second Industrial Divide: Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.

Reich S. (1998). What is Globalization, Working Paper, Kellogg Institute. Retrieved April 20, 2013 from <http://kellogg.nd.edu/publications/workingpapers/WPS/261.pdf>

Ritzer, G. (2000). *The McDonaldization of Society: New Century Edition*. Thousand Oaks, California: Pine Forge Press.

Ritzer, G. & Malone, E. (2000). Globalization theory: lessons from the exportation of McDonaldization and the New Means of Consumption. *American Studies* 41, 97-118.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.

Robertson R. (1995). Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. *Global Modernities*, edited by M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson. London: Sage.

Sachs, W. (2000). *Globalization and Sustainability*. Heinrich Boll Foundation, Berlin.

Salajan, F. (2007). The European Union in a Changing World: Globalizer or Globalized?. *The Romanian Economic Journal*. 10 (25), 161-178.

Smith, A. (1990). Towards a global culture?. *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, edited by M. Featherstone. London: Sage.

Verolme, H. (2012). *European Climate Leadership Durban and Beyond*, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, European Union, Brussels

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I. (1983). *Historical Capitalism, with Capitalist Civilization*. London: Verso.

Watson, J. (1997). *Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

ADDITIONAL READINGS

Bhagwati, J.N. (2004) *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. & McGrew, A. (2003). *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Leonard, M. (2005). *Why Europe Will Run the 21st Century*. New York: Public Affairs.

Moore, M. (2003). *A World Without Walls: Freedom, Development, Free Trade and Global Governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Paterson, Mathew. 1996. "IR theory: neorealism, neoinstitutionalism and the Climate Change Convention." in *The Environment and International Relations, Global Environmental Change Series*, edited by J. Vogler and M. F. Imber. London: Routledge.

Steger, M.B. (2003). *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suter, K. (2003). *Global Order and Global Disorder*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.

Wade, R. (1996). Globalization and Its Limits: Reports of the Death of the National Economy are Greatly Exaggerated. In S. Berger & R. Dore (Eds.), *National Diversity and Global Capitalism*, 60-88. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Yearley, S. (1996). *Sociology, Environmentalism, Globalization*. London: Sage.

Yohe, G. & Robin C. (1998). Economic analysis. *Human Choice and Climate Change, Volume 3: The Tools of Policy Analysis*, edited by Steve Rayner and Elizabeth L. Malone. Columbus, Ohio: Battelle Press.

KEY WORDS & DEFINITIONS

European Union (EU): An economic and political partnership between 27 European countries that together cover much of the continent.

Globalization: Processes by which the people of the world are incorporated into a single world society, global society.

Economic Globalization: It is a worldwide phenomenon wherein countries' economic situations can depend significantly on other countries.

Globalization of Culture: The idea of societal transformations and cultural interconnections that are brought about through the dispersion of social habits and culturally iconic traditions specific to some places to the rest of the world.

Environmental Dimension of Globalization: The rapid rate of globalization is creating many environmental problems and the human race's impacts on environment have reached the global scale.

Management of Globalization: Creating and implementing strategies according to changes and challenges that occur with the effect of globalization.

European Union's Single Market: The market which seeks to guarantee the free movement of goods, capital, services, and people – the EU's "four freedoms" – within the EU's 27 member states.