

Globalisation : a Good or a Bad thing ?

Dossier Ref : 160456

Author : Janjac Baretta

Among the majority of people directly concerned (Austria, France, Greece, Great Britain...) from a Europe such as it has become, French people are questioning more or less openly the issue of globalisation and how it has come about without their being given any rational explanation or logical justification.

But it is not really surprising when you know that almost all French and foreign political figures have in turn been guests of the Bildeberg Club (Fillon, Juppé, Valls, Macron, etc...). This very discreet, indeed almost secret group, appears to be an authority on thought and discussion regarding the main issues that concern civilization. It comprises 30 permanent members who form the management committee and an additional 100 members who are invited every year, some of whom have participated several times in the annual reunions that take place over a weekend, at a venue unveiled at the very last moment.

A number of big international bankers, top international businessmen, multinational administrators, political figures (for their contacts), ranking officers from the army etc... participate in these gatherings which determine (even if the group defends itself against this view), political, economical, relational, even military security strategies, to be implemented in countries considered powerful or representing a threat to the global economy. From then on, it is easy to perceive that this group, which is very powerful financially, could govern the planet according to its short-term, middle and long-term interests and thereby impose the globalisation that the 30 permanent members yearn for.

This would be to plan the death of national sovereignty, already in a very sick state because of this ineffective, incompetent Europe, which ignores the interests of the people to the benefit of a privileged cast.

But what can the man in the street expect from a globalisation he would have to submit to with no hope of escape. For, if today, France can exit from Europe (cf. column also, with same headline), the supporters of globalisation will impose, among other things, the kind of economic conditions that one country alone would not be able to face.

So, is globalisation a good or a bad deal for the future ?

Globalisation : a good deal :

The dreamers, the poets, the cinematographers have successively presented several forms of globalisation.

A pacific globalization where robots would serve Human Beings (I Robot), unless these robots rebelled (Mondwest), on to Star Wars which refers to a single entity governing all planetary systems.

Once the entertainment is over and the dream has vanished, reality catches up with daily life.

A globalisation that has been well designed to take advantage of minds seems to be attractive in many ways.

It is understandable to think that it is the logical result of an ideal Europe (free circulation of people and goods). It offers an opening to new markets and the sharing of production could certainly lead to a drop in prices. This generalized sharing in all fields of civic life (social for example), or indeed military (security) would show the way to a new prosperity that would benefit all.

It is also quite conceivable that an effective, industrial and commercial globalisation including planning, research and engineering services etc.... would be such as to enhance a profitable economy for all nations. On the cultural level, in public education, leisure etc... globalisation can bring an extraordinary development of intellectual capacity thanks to the extent and variety of knowledge on offer ; populations would meet and pass on their knowledge, traditions, skills and even more...

A politically well-managed globalisation, without prerequisite towards individual interests, can negate the need for war, especially with the calculated distribution of the wealth that it will have generated.

Globalisation offers some undeniable advantages, at least in theory ; because in terms of practical implementation, this dreamed of globalisation demands above all, a significant budget that requires organisation and an unequivocal willingness to create a 'globalisation of good deals '.

It is hardly likely that financiers will consider investing huge sums of money out of their own good will without having the absolute certainty of a substantial return. That would, for them, be a very 'bad deal '.

Globalisation : a bad deal :

Different political groups or lobbies (the Antiglobalisationists or Alterglobalisationists, among others...), have, for a long time now, been denouncing the consequences or even the dangers of excessive globalization .

A... 'global government', which would only be economic, applying a frenzied liberalism to serve big multinational corporations, would render national policies practically irrelevant because interest and profit would take precedence over the fate of the people engendering significant risk of popular uprising.

As has been said in other words by the French man Jean Sevilla, a world renowned economist, 'Gold prevails over man... '.

In these conditions a hierarchy of nations would appear, even stricter than it is today, dividing up countries according to their economic potential, their ability to manufacture goods and provide services. Traditional ranking would from there-on show wealthy countries, developing countries and poor countries, and no longer take into account quality of life, but only their economic power and ability to pay off their debts. This system risks harbouring a threat for the long term : an increase in impoverishment for the weakest countries and average countries displaying a wealthy class while the rest of

their population sink into relative insecurity. Countries would only appear on top of the ranking if they were able to create, manufacture and pass on their wealth. So it seems that globalisation may not be the hoped for miracle of the 21st century. In the world where money rules, the US industrial and financial hegemony is obvious but does this power work for the betterment of humanity or does it only serve to furnish some of the Bildeberg club with more wealth than ever.

CONCLUSION

Regarding what has been said above, globalisation as foreseen, has left us puzzled, doubtful and worried about the future of humanity. The ordinary person wonders if this globalisation, which began at least in the 18th century, could be the original cause, though not openly admitted, of all territorial wars that have taken place during the industrialisation of the world.

It is a well established fact that war creates wealth ; when a bridge is destroyed we have to rebuild it. According to this principle, Americans, as the ultimate businessmen, immediately understood these opportunities ; they took possession of an excellent training ground with the Wars of Independence and intervened, belatedly it is true, in all armed conflicts of the 20th century.

However, it is obvious that the inescapable character of this globalisation has asserted itself in the last decade, presiding over all other considerations. This probably leading to its own defeat and the end of the present economic system but above all, quite simply, the extinction of humanity.

The globalisation now in progress is, and will continue to be much written about ; however, no matter what approach we take, be it optimistic or be it pessimistic, be it good or be it bad, globalisation will come, it is coming... Perhaps in the future, some inspired governments, having the experience of the past at their disposal, will know how to use it for the sake of humanity. This is the vow that forms the basis of the organisation 'The Great Gathering for Inalienable Actions' (V.R.A.I.)