ON THE NEW-OLD POLITICAL CONCEPTS: RE-CONCEPTUALIZING AND EXPANDING THE VIEWS IN STUDYING POLITICS FOLLOWING THE IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION

Veton Latifi

South East European University, Republic of North Macedonia

e-mail: v.latifi@seeu.edu.mk

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the differences of pre-global and post-global conceptualizations in political sciences. It investigates the functions of political concepts under the changes globalization caused to political systems, culture and ideology. The paper does not engage with the methodological debates on political concepts, or question the undeniable importance of certain political concepts, but rather it addresses some of the principal concepts for which globalization may be a useful concept with regard to their similarities and differences with the Cold War era.

Despite the variety of political concepts as a result of various development phases of society, models of governance and ideological impact to the political processes along centuries, the concepts of power and authority seem to be among those that have survived in terms of the consistency of their relevance. However, the conception of politics through power, authority and leadership has been re-dimensioned significantly under the post-global era. By contrast, although the concept of sovereignty has been one of the initial concepts in the landscape of contemporary politics for many centuries back, following the effects of globalization, it has reduced its relevance significantly. In this view, as a consequence, the article discusses as well as the reconfiguration of the concept of state in a post-global era marked by a period of advancing causes—both trans-border and transnational causes—promoted by post-sovereignty states.

Under these circumstances the traditional debate regarding conflict versus cooperation in politics is one of the areas remaining within a *status quo* dimension in the dioptric view of both pre-global and post-global conceptualizations. With a contrastive methodological approach, the article as well analyzes the development and meaning of the concepts of political equality, justice and liberty as indispensable concepts in modern post-global political processes.

Key words: political concepts, globalization, power, state, political liberty.

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of the Cold War it has been quite difficult to explain world, national, regional, or local politics without taking into consideration the enormous impact of globalization. Contemporary world affairs differ in many aspects compared to previous phases as a result of globalization. Therefore, the political systems of many states have endured significant changes following the spread of globalization.

In the meanwhile, there seems to appear an additional difficulty in explaining politics in a post-global era as far as a significant influence of globalization besides that are being caused wide changes in the political discourses, at the same time globalization causes further complications being a controversial notion itself. The controversies are related mainly with the various and contradictory interpretations of scholars on what we mean with the globalization era in more accurate way, and what it includes, and as well as whether the main political concepts differ completely from those of previous periods.

For methodological reasons and to avoid a topical defocusing that would cause eventually a flow of various definitions on globalization, in the scope of the article as a fundamental the definition of globalization by Baylis and Smith is employed: meaning the process of increasing interactions among societies while the events in one part of the world create more and more effects on people and societies in other parts of the world. (Baylis and Smith, 2001: 13)

1. PRE-GLOBAL AND POST-GLOBAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS IN POLITICAL SCIENCES

Political scientists have long been aware of the most basic cognitive category, the concept. A concept is an entity of understanding that “carves at the joints” of reality (Kaplan, 1964: 50), a “unit of thinking” (Sartori in Collier and Gerring, 2009: 67), “an abstraction representing an object, a property of an object, or a certain phenomenon” (Frankfort- Nachmias & Nachmias, 1992: 27). It functions as a tool to authorize in attempts to discover a truth about the political system. According to one of the best-known systematic approaches to the study of concepts Giovanni Sartori (in Collier and Gerring, 2009: 71, 88) states that the only defensible basis for conceptual research is taxonomy—hierarchical classifications based on clear definitions.

One of the main challenges in pre-global conceptualizations in political sciences was the phenomenon of prevailing engagement of scholars in in “conceptual stretching” when they explored the ways of relating and defining various vague concepts originating in one context to different contexts. On the initial eve of the spread of the first globalization waves, and with an aim to avoid conceptual stretching, Sartori recommended clearly delineated concepts nested in a hierarchy of abstraction. When expanding the coverage of their research, scholars using the correct taxonomic approach would then be able to climb the “ladder of abstraction”—that is, to apply successively more general theories to successively more numerous cases—“without having to suffer unnecessary losses in precision and empirical insight” (Prindle, 2012: 23).

Despite many approaches to conceptualization and to all the empirical work done in the pre-global and post-global era, the question remains open in both cases: what are concepts for? The answer that arises from the major tradition of thought in political science is that concepts are, hopefully, the building blocks to *causal explanations*. Some concepts can be scientifically useful even if they are not causal in nature.

Following globalization, the societies and political systems in one part of the world at the same time are more and more influenced—widely and deeply—by the events in other societies and political systems of other parts of the world. Therefore, these developments have caused the need for reconsidering and reviewing the conceptualizations of the politics.

Some of the traditional political concepts, as for example *power* and *authority* continued to be among the key tools in conceptualizing politics and explaining the political phenomenon in a post-global period as well. Some other concepts like *state*, *elites*, *legitimacy* and *sanctions* have been re-adjusted, as happened with them in previous phases of significant social changes in the

history of political sciences. While some of the classic concepts in *politicology* as for instance *political equality, justice and liberty*, continue to remain more in the dimension of political philosophy rather conceptualizations of politics, remaining therefore mainly as topics and notions of theorizing politics in the same way as in many centuries back. Perhaps the only change is related that these concepts have succeeded in imposing an attribution to the political philosophical debates around globalization's changes, but still without any essential modification of their contents and approaches in the conceptualization of politics. In the meanwhile, some concepts like sovereignty mainly, and not some extent *political representation and participation*, as well have been minimized as times goes by, or have seen their relevance in contemporary conceptualizing politics dimmed. And concepts like political culture, apathy and leadership have been brought into the scene more than ever and have imposed their relevance in describing and explaining the processes of political phenomena as a result of globalization.

As regarding the ideology following the effects of globalization, the issue of the relationship between the concept and the political reality in the case of ideology in a post-global era may be explained by using two important terms from contemporary political theory. On the one hand, we refer to the term *political doctrine*, and on the other, to the term *political ideology* itself. The semantic and conceptual relationship between the two terms has often been marked by an identification which was not entirely justified (Sandru, 2012: 93) in the pre-global conceptualization of the politics.

2. THE MUTATION OF POLITICAL CONCEPTS FOLLOWING VARIOUS PHASES OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

In daily political discourse we often face notions and concepts which are more or less improperly defined and used both in political practice and in the daily press. Political concepts are often used without analyzing them properly in everyday life and all this opens a space for various interpretations. In fact, traditionally this has led to historical arguments for proper definitions of the political concepts. Therefore, a clarification is required for the way these concepts are being used. The concepts include various aspects of complex political and social reality.

When contemporary political science was emerging as a modern academic discipline by the end of the XIX century, the classic theoretical legacy had a significant influence in defining

concepts as well. The scholars in Europe and the USA were concerned with the approach of the architecture of concepts; and the main issue here was how to identify which concepts will be preferable?

The Theory of Justice of Rawls in 1971 launched a new wave of interest in this direction. His theory shattered the monopoly of utilitarianism in a political philosophy and demonstrated the normative relevance that reopened the gates for concepts like *justice*, *equality* and *human rights* to retake a main seat in studying the political sciences. That was one more step forward to the eve of the period of social transformation under globalization.

In the meantime, in his book “The Tragedy of Political Sciences”, David Ricci was claiming that classical political sciences was dominated by overloading normative concepts as for example: *nation*, *justice*, *human rights*, *patriotism*, etc. (Ricci, 1984). According to him, the tragedy of the political sciences is related to the fact that these concepts either vanished totally or were replaced by other concepts, as for example: *position*, *knowledge*, *socialization* and *system*.

In political sciences some of the concepts are wide and some narrow in their formulation and their application; some seem to be more empiric and some more normative; some of them with more focus on conflict while some on cooperation. Whichever of the political concepts scholars are using, they should be aware that they may cover only some aspects of the complex political reality. Therefore, whenever we apply one or other concept we should be aware that we have considered only certain parts of the political or social reality.

The variety of plenty of concepts comes as a result of the different development of the society under centuries, which is then reflected with various conceptualizations of politics. Similarly, various phases of development of the state have influenced the conceptualizing of the politics and political processes. Furthermore, within the state there always exists a diversity of various political positions and interests, and all that results in an additional inner variety of conceptualizations of politics on the social and national levels.

2.1. SURVIVAL OF CONCEPTS OF POWER AND AUTHORITY UNDER GLOBALIZATION CHANGES

A power is considered traditionally to be one of the central concepts in political sciences, but at the same time in political reality, as well. However, there is still no overall accepted meaning of this concept. Under the era of Machiavelli, Hobbes and Spinoza, the concept of power has been developed within the frame of theories on the state, as a phenomenon of the regulated life in the state; and as well as obliged opportunity, power appears as a characteristic of the state. Since the XVIII century, the concept has been developed within the frame of social critics and it is perceived as an attribute belonging to social groups. Since the XX century the concept is distinguished from the other phenomena and it grew into an instrument of analysis in politics.

Authority as well presents one of the most used concepts in the political sciences today, after power. Authority could be analyzed as a special manner of relationship of someone who is demanding the legitimacy of someone who requested it, and it is gratitude by others as actors in this process. The authority marks the action by someone on his or her own initiative because it is required by the first person. Someone has authority if he/she directs the activity of the others while not using any blackmail, use of force, and persuasion. Weber used to make a difference between the traditional and rational authority. In both cases authority leads toward a stable system of laws. In modern liberal democracies, rational organized systems provide the laws with an authority of political-bureaucratic leaders. Both arguments are supported by the moral doctrine.

In some cases, divergent thoughts regarding authority may appear in the form of conflicts, especially in transition phases or in times of crisis. For instance, in the Balkan countries following the fall and dissolution of the former socialist Yugoslavia, during their transition to democracy, the authority of leaders of ethnic parties in the multiethnic societies (like especially Bosnia and Herzegovina and North Macedonia, and perhaps Kosovo as well), the leader of ethnic parties of non-majority ethnic groups often proved to be in conflict with the head of the state/government. Both leaders had authority, but none of them was having both traditional and rational authority in front of the population of the country, under the era of globalization, which fits with the period of transformational and structural political changes in the society.

2.2. IS THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY MARGINALIZED?

Although sovereignty is considered as a debated concept in world politics following the impact of globalization, however even in a post-global era the concept of sovereignty remains a significant topic in political rhetoric, especially for those who seek to slow and reverse reductions of national self-determination versus globalization. But the transformation is evident because both in legal and practical terms the state regulating capacities' ceased to meet the original criteria of sovereignty, as traditionally was the case.

For many centuries the concept of sovereignty has been a foundational concept in the realm of politics. Sovereignty is attached to the idea of the uniformity and blinkeredness of the sovereign entity, that is, of the state or of the people; and contains ideas of political order towards peace, security, and hierarchy from one side; and toward the equality of states, and the prohibition to intervene, from the other side. The concept arranges assumptions about the nature of law and the major outline of public authority as the highest power.

State sovereignty is based on the premises of territorial geography. With an aim for the government to exercise total and exclusive power over the specific territorial domain, according to this principle the event necessary to occur in territorial and juridical locations, they have by default to be distinguished from demarcated territorial borders which the officials can keep in a strict way.

When globalization started flaring up and making an enormous impact, social relations saw the basis of a supra-territorial quality and borders became transparent with a giant electronic flux, which de facto meant that with the effects of globalization therefore are not dominating anymore the preconditions for an effective sovereignty.

Political science and legal perspectives describe and consider a world order in which the concept of sovereignty in empirical and in normative terms oscillates between insignificance and redefinition. Accordingly, the debate has created and still creates a whole range of new conceptual compounds – such as “late-sovereignty” (Walker, 2003:3–32), “divisible sovereignty” (de Witte, 1998: 282), “disaggregated sovereignty” (Slaughter, 2004: 159), and many more. All these attempts aim to rethink the meaning and function of the concept for a newly forming global order. Sovereignty has become a contested concept.

Though not in total, still so many material developments following globalization have reduced significantly the sovereignty of states. Today the state is totally incapable on its own to control

phenomena such as ecological global problems, satellite commands and communication, activity of global multinational companies, global stocks and trade, etc.

Since Rousseau, sovereignty has *also* meant political-democratic self-determination, which remains underexposed in the whole jurisprudential enthusiasm for the (process of) *constitutionalization* beyond the state. Dieter Grimm stresses that the process of denationalization may thankfully have broken state absolutism, but it is accompanied for its part by massive losses in democratic legitimation. Sovereignty's most important function today lies in protecting the democratic self-determination of a politically united society with regard to the order that best suits it. Today sovereignty protects democracy. (Grimm, 2015: 128)

Political and social repercussions of this process are extraordinary ones. What is obvious is the fact that the governments since globalization find it impossible to disconnect their own people from the river of information, which can be treated as well as kind of political bomb at any time. The increase of global interdependence of states, individuals and social and economic organizations is reducing the autonomy of certain states.

In parallel with the material changes, globalization as well has caused among others the minimization of some of the important cultural and psychological characteristics of sovereignty. For example, as a result of the growth of trans-border networks, many people found or are still searching for loyalty attachments which are supplementary and even surpass the feelings of national solidarity which prior to that was met by state sovereignty.

At the same time, many people in the contemporary globalized world intensively became ready to devote more attention to values such as economic growth, human rights and ecological integrity, favoring them with much higher priority compared to the previous situations provided by state sovereignty and social norms of the concept of national self-determination.

Grimm claims to have recognized a fundamental difference in contemporary times from previous debates about the status and concept of sovereignty. According to Grimm, the global development of law has led to the fact that the "object of the term" (Grimm, 2015: 4) itself is being questioned — in other words: what seems doubtful is "whether the object encompassed by the concept of sovereignty still exists" (Ibid.). If this is the case and the object has disappeared, sovereignty would have lost its place in our political and legal vocabulary. Against this backdrop, Grimm examines the question of whether the concept of sovereignty is still suitable for categorizing, describing and explaining political and legal developments today.

Under the influence of globalization even the constitutions of states have been facing changes. The sovereign states normally have promoted so far their domestic interests and have been acting as defending barriers in relation to external influences. Different to this, with globalization, post-sovereign states are often advancing trans-national causes besides their national cause.

2.3. RECONFIGURING THE STATE FOLLOWING GLOBALIZATION EFFECTS

There are two sides of the coin of power of the state in the post-global era. From one side a series of transformations introduced by the globalization process have reduced the strength of the state within its territory following the decline of the strict conceptualization of sovereignty; and from the other side, globalization has provided plenty of opportunities for states to be more powerful than ever in the international arena.

For most of the states today it is impossible to control on their own such phenomena (and solve major problems) like ecological threats, trafficking, trans-border smuggling, piracy, cyber-attacks, etc. It is obvious for the governments of the state to keep aside their citizens from the flow of information, communication and trans-national movements.

As a result, the concept of the state in political sciences is being re-dimensioned and modified significantly in terms of its limits of scope of action, forms of intervention, dynamics and nature interaction, etc. First of all, the growth of global interdependence of states, individuals, economic companies, and international organizations is reducing every day the autonomy of states, and therefore is reconfiguring the traditional concept of the state in studying politics.

The attainment of the modern concept of the state as a tool of government distinct from both the ruler and the ruled is largely what distinguishes modern political thought from its earlier precursors prior to globalization's impact. If Weber's account of the modern state can hardly bear the weight Skinner assigns to it, then the appearance of something similar in the work of Bodin should not be seen as marking a decisive turning point. More seriously, if there are reasons to doubt the definitive character of Weber's account of the modern state, there are more substantial reasons to question the category of "modern political thought". (Hindess, 2017). According to this logic, the treatment of political thought, in terms that Skinner takes directly from Hobbes, with "the rights of states and the duties of subjects" should be considered as a partial explanation.

Hindess, who has used some of Foucault's work to suggest that political thought concerning the government of populations has not always aimed at working through the state, claims that Foucault's work on government, like Skinner's, is interesting and suggestive but, again like Skinner's, has its own striking limitations. According to him Skinner's *Foundations* can be accused of paying insufficient attention to European reflections on rule over non-Western peoples; the same must also be said of Foucault's examination of European ideas on government (and on liberalism in particular) in a somewhat later period. (Hindess, 2017: 13-14)

3. CONFLICT VERSUS COOPERATION IN POLITICS BEFORE AND AFTER GLOBALIZATION: A *STATUS-QUO* DEADLOCK

One of the major theoretical rifts in political sciences is linked to the relationship between human nature and politics. The philosophers, the theologians, psychologists, and political scientists and thinkers historically have debated the inevitable conflict and aggression among people, which comes as a result of different political aims. In this direction, globalization has not caused any major shift or changed the situation in general.

On the right side of the this traditional debate still the inspiration to the political scholar is coming from Hobbes and Nietzsche and some others who look at politics as a an attempt for a victory and a battlefield, for establishing dominance of human nature, and as a consequence of the use of the manner when those refer to the notion of a "sharp state", a way which leads towards peace and freedom of states.

On the left side of the debate, one finds the opportunity for a consensus and cooperation among people. This concept is a continuity of those who follow the path and thought of John Locke and Rousseau.

While the right side even after globalization looks at conflict and violence as something natural, the left side nowadays justifies this as a learned and skills-developed behavior.

Many classical authors of theories of political sciences in XVI and XVII century have attempted to explain the necessary need for the state, and for identification with the state. From the main hypotheses of this period there emerges the concept that there exists a "natural status" in which the state didn't exist before.

Hobbes claimed that under these conditions exists the battle of a human being against the human being, and therefore the benefits move towards a “natural status” which gives more guarantees in security rather than any eventual defeat of the freedom in recognizing governance. Has this political conceptualization changed a lot under globalization? Both the ongoing theoretical debate and the practice show that the answer is: not really so much.

Early liberals like Locke and Rousseau have debated that people even before the state used to be social beings, and they have built cooperation amongst themselves.

The definitions of politics by Harold Lasswell (1958) and David Easton (1953) which are widely used in the history of political sciences in essence address the main source of the conflict in human societies: a low quantity of things that people estimate most.

Both tribal societies and modern states, similar to those following the impact of globalization, always have been occupied with the conflict of insufficient values. In the same way, it entails dealing with these kinds of conflicts, and politics in itself covers as well as the cooperation from another hand. Having in mind that human beings are social beings, therefore their existence and development is dependent on affinity to keep efficient social organizations (Parsons, 1977).

As much as one society achieves cooperation among its members, but as well as with other societies following the impact of globalization, that society will more and more have chances to grow and prosper. As Hartz claims, all forms of societies since the those tribes have evolved and grouped around states and later on states in alliances with an aim to make a higher degree of security, richness, prestige and force (Hartz, 195). The same logic pushed ahead Western Europe toward its unification. According to Palmer, the largest number of European leaders today believes that one united Europe will bring more security, force, prestige and richness rather than one fragmented Europe (Palmer, 1997: 11-12).

Conflict is a public enemy to societal organization and to the political system. If it is not controlled, the conflict obviously fragments societies in contradictory fractions and squanders valuable resources of the system. It continues in a similar way and with deadlocked exits nowadays under the globalization era.

Therefore, politics has its two faces: conflict, and cooperation. Wars, revolutions, terrorism, assassinations and ethnic conflicts, all of them seem today to be political processes, among others. However, politics as well includes the resolution and management of these conflicts,

and the accommodation process toward more stable societies in which individuals are ready to cooperate for the sake of their common goods.

Often, governments are destined to manage conflicts, but they are also often focal points for those conflicts. And politics most likely is considered to be a discipline which deals with the study of political leadership and governance.

Political scientists nowadays look towards conflict as something which can be managed, but not able to be eliminated totally if not resolute and if it is left into the dimension of management. In fact, the permanent tension between winners and losers continues nowadays to remain the essence of the politics. Some governments manage conflicts more successfully than others, but what is common is the fact that all political systems are in one same range of the flux, having in mind that diverse groups within that society make efforts to defend or expand the distribution of social resources. For this reason it is claimed that politics is a dynamic process in change, while the impact of globalization since the end of the Cold War made the political processes go under a higher degree of major changes and with quick dynamics in continuity.

Ironically, human history and the history of conflicts also recognize cases when conflicts are shown to be positive forces in developing certain societies. These are mainly controlled conflicts. And under the globalization era this category of conflict is given credit that without them in many societies there would not be an impulse for change and the societies would stagnate (Olson, 1982). Usually, governments use three widespread techniques for managing the conflicts in one society: force, persuasion and economic reward. The levels to which the governments use each of these methods vary from one state to another state. Governments which usually are shown to be more efficient in making democracy and stability work usually have used the method of persuasion and economic reward first rather than the coercive method of use of the force (Palmer, 1997: 13)

Democracies usually aspire to spread the political meanings of moving the private disagreements into a public arena. If politics is not build up over public decisions of the government, then it will come from private decisions. Traditionally, the principle *laissez faire* used to mean the government should not interfere in private business. As a practical issue, it used to mean that the government supports the decisions of the businesses via the legislation and court decisions which were legitimizing and reinforcing the interest of the corporation. As a result the corporations were developing a politics which was expanding one control over the life of unprotected individuals from the intervention of the government. With the doctrine

laissez-faire, business expanded toward individual economic needs via free companies and it has been monitored from the government. However, with the growth of giant corporations at the end of XIX century, the force of the business organizations was growing over the life of individuals in parallel with the peak impact of globalization in the beginning of the XXI century. The result therefore was the demand for action of the government to correct the abuse of force by the collective interest.

Exploring the concepts of the theoreticians of both eras (those before and after globalization), one can notice that they are focused in collective entities as society, or classes in their political analyses, while the others analyze them as particular in their activity. The differences in the methods of analyzes reflect the fundamental difference of the values.

4. TRANSCENDING POLITICAL CONCEPTS: POLITICAL EQUALITY, JUSTICE AND LIBERTY IN POST-GLOBAL POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Most of the conceptual and theoretical approaches borrowed by political science have originated in other social sciences or the humanities (Axelrod, 2008: 3). Occasionally, however, ideas make their way through its porous disciplinary boundaries from farther afield, from the natural sciences. However, transferring such concepts requires more adjustment, both to the discipline and to the concept, than it does for the more automatically political science-friendly ideas of adjacent disciplines. In order to fit natural science concepts into political analysis, it has often been necessary to transform them (Prindle, 2012: 21). This emerged as an immediate need in studying politics especially with the transforming process of globalization.

There are several political concepts whose origin can be found back for instance in evolutionary biology, but not only there. For instance concepts like liberty, equality and justice are discussed as well in early records of biology when it comes to the natural instincts and inclinations of human beings and some other beings as well in organizing their life in a group. Certain aspects of these discussions are imported as metaphorical concepts into political science as well when it comes to these three basic political concepts. The globalization age contributed a lot in transforming the metaphor back into a scientific concept and transcended the biological paradigm in the study of political concepts of equality, justice and liberty, regardless of the border limitation.

Political equality is best conceived as the distributive principle that is used to allocate values in a democracy. We argue that, as such a principle, it is both more complex than and superior to

either equality or the public interest, and it is to this principle, rather than these others, that democratic governments should make reference in the public policy process (Ware, 1981: 393). Following the significant post-global transformations of the political systems it is much easier and with plenty of opportunities for political equality to allocate democratic values.

In a similar way, globalization's opportunities in terms of making borders more and more irrelevant, increased cross-border movements and declined limits of the political interactions, have opened the gates for transcending the political concept of justice, and bringing back the early ideas of Jeremy Bentham when in 1780 in his book "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation" he advocated for more goods to search in a higher number by legislators (which in post-global era would mean to spread the justice all around the world and with no border limits as globalization aspires) as a way to arrive at justice. In fact this transcending opportunity for justice today is very helpful in re-conceptualizing politics, as Bentham would claim in a prophetic way at the time, that justice can be found in democratic society which respect for the equality of the individuals that compose that society (Bentham, 1948), and which is a case with transcending the justice in the global societies especially. In a paradoxical way, at the same time Rawls (1971) seems today to be right about the globalization era, despite the fact that the Theory of Rawls was the biggest criticisms of the above ideas of Bentham, when he claims that following the equal opportunities for everyone for the application of justice certain immature individuals in one TV talk show can win the hearts of million mature citizens, and still this is within the frame of justice and equal rights, and especially in an age of globalization with many unlimited opportunities for cross-border communication.

Since Ware's claims in 1981 when he stated that political equality may be conceived as being related either to equality in the distribution of certain political resources, or to equality in the distribution of those benefits over which government is claimed to have responsibility, with globalization it has not changed a lot except that this concept gained more space in transcending regional borders and more and more international organizations (both intergovernmental and non-government) monitor on an annual basis the status and situation of political quality in every country of the world in their comparative reports that create an image of the internal democratic situation of the state. So, political equality not necessarily continues to refer to the conditions under which political decisions are taken or to the outcome of those decisions, as Ware claimed at the time. He was right that these are not the same. Not necessarily will there be an equal distribution of all resources under globalization, including those considered only tangentially 'political', might result in an unequal distribution of benefits, as Ware has been insisted.

Similarly, more equally distributed benefits might result from unequal resources- and for this he was right as it proved to be a case later on with the globalization transformations. Nevertheless, Ware (1981: 393) somehow predicted in a correct way when he claimed it is scarcely surprising that most political theorists attempt to link these two aspects of political equality, which in meanwhile proved to be the case.

Liberty continues furthermore to be a vital concept in modern political discourse. Despite scholars like Hansen who claims that distinction between “modern” and “ancient” liberty is overstated (Hansen, 1998: 76), still the classical understanding of liberty as the protection of personal rights (that also implies the distinction between the private and public realms) which was counted among the essential elements of the Greek democratic ideology, it has transcended with the globalization transformations. Within the context of globalization, the concept of liberty it is not anymore so widely defined and it is much determined concept in studying politics, as it was a case for many centuries referring to the dictionary meaning of the word based on the early signs and concepts of ancient democracy. It is of course easier to find examples of positive liberty in metaphysical discussions, where it is equaled with virtue or ethical life. Stoics could be seen as exemplifying this sort of conceptualization. (Podoksik, 2010: 227), but with the globalization transformation the essence of negative concepts is clarified much more to set a very concrete range of possible applications in a public discourse. If a certain person tells us today that he or she wants to be free, we certainly know the rough meaning of what being free involves. In a pre-globalization era by merely knowing the meaning of it, we used not to know enough. Therefore, following the globalization era via the expanded concept of the political liberty it was much more clarified whether this person wants to be free from censorship, jail, abuse, or from something else.

5. CONCEPTUALIZING POLITICS THROUGH RE-DIMENSIONED CONCEPT OF POWER IN A POST-GLOBAL ERA

The early definitions of politics which dominated for a longer period dominated via the definitions of science on power and leadership bring to one tautological circle and such tautological definitions then obstruct us to speak clearly about political power, because according to them each power is in fact a political one. Most probably, among nations and social groups there exist not only political relations, but as well economic, ideological, cultural and other kind of relations.

In a similar way is the number a basic concept in mathematical and some natural sciences. Relations among states in International Relations, the norm in law, benefit in economics, as well as power is considered by analogy to be of the same basic relevance in political sciences. It remains nowadays including the post-global era to be one of the central concepts in studying politics.

The closest concepts to it in politics are: force, authority, influence, violence, control, rule, etc. Therefore, often in daily political affairs, and as well as in studying politics, these words are used interchangeable and are misused often instead of the concept of power.

To make it more clear the difference of power with other two close concepts to it which are widely used as well: influence and authority, there are used some logical judgments that help to identify easier these three basic concepts still very present in the political sciences.

Power can be recognized through the judgment “I will do what I want; otherwise I will do something that you don’t want”. The influence is expressed in the form of the judgment “I do something that I want myself and I do something that you want”. The authority can be recognized via the judgment “I do what you demand, because it is you.”

Or, to put it otherwise, power is exercised via the threat of sanctions in case of disobedience; the influence via the intentional persuasive activity; while the authority is accomplished without a threat and without intentional persuasive activity, but because of the conviction that it has the recipient of the demand as to be a right choice.

In defining and studying power there are plenty of approaches available. One of the most popular approaches is the identification of power with force and violence. According to it conducting politics means to use force or violence. The father of this approach is Max Weber who defines the state as “an organization that keeps successfully the monopoly of legitimate use of force in a certain territory” (Weber in Gerth and Mills, 1948: 78). But, under globalization this approach is not available anymore, having in mind the reduced capacities of the sovereignty and often external intervention of foreign states in the internal affairs of other states, and especially when one includes humanitarian interventions. And to make a clear distinction between power and force we need to clarify the issue of the object of power- towards whom is power applied? There are clear criteria, however more than ever under so many opportunities for quick information in the globalization era.

One of the reasons why power is intermingled with the force is related as well as to the definition of power itself, looking to it as something that relates to the opportunities to force the others to conduct some actions that would not undertake with own wish, therefore over them one can exercise sanctions.

Unequal and inappropriate distribution of power's resources in society is determined by a series of mechanisms of which the main are the capacities and relations of production, geographic and democratic factors, military techniques, technological achievements, etc. Following the impact of globalization the last three came up even more in front for identifying power of one state in international affairs and understanding the politics of the state, while the first two remain further relevant for understanding power of the state but on transnational and global setting when one recall the role of the multinational corporations as an important actor of international relations today. Different to force, historically the interaction of power is oriented toward the subjectivity of people, conscience, rather than toward the body of the subject as it is a case of force's primary orientation. The concept of power is not changed in essence in this view following globalization, but only in its forms. The orientation remain toward the same subject as has been historically the case, but now power is exercised toward transnational masses and global conscience, so one state can show its capacities in trans- border competition.

The roads to come to power more or less remain the same standard ones, but with the additional factors (the opportunities for much quicker information and persuasion with technological platforms of communication; and global domain of exercising power):

- through *coups d'état* and plots in high spheres of power;
- through external intervention, aggression, (while conquest and occupations and previous forms are now not widely present and transformed more into the umbrella of the interventions from abroad);
- through social revolution much less and more through political revolutions; and instead of armed violence from below, now via ethnic conflicts mainly;
- through elections, e.g. in democratic systems (which often can be only formally democratic and essence can be won in some cases even by autocrats as well);
- through nomination and career advancement, or via system of nomenclature, or and external imposes;

- through ancestral line as in monarchies, etc.

For a power to be legitimate it has to increase the faith of followers and deferred people with some ideas for the work of power. Moral and legal basis of power are logical consequence of doctrines and views established by certain ideology, which is again like in time of classes spread internationally, but with a difference now following the globalization freedom of movement and exchange that is not aiming a solidarity like used to be in times of classes but rather attempting the global governance and control over other people and states in political and economic terms. Furthermore, the role of ideology on global setting today is aimed via certain system of orientation of cultural, political and economic values to make opportunities equal for everyone despite the sovereignty norms of the states, and to increase the influence, dominance and at the end to support or even impose certain structure in other countries to come to power either in terms of political access or economic control. Therefore, if the ruining of certain structure of power used to start with the subversion of its ideology, now in post-global era the matrix of ideology is much complicated and it has another nature.

Types of power today are still determined by similar elements of relationship of power with the subjects of power, its objects, resources, spheres and values of human activity, etc. but in different forms of expression and in much wider domains and with the need to take into consideration as well as the criteria of free movement and exchange across the borders. We still speak about the following types of power: individual, organizational, despotic, ideological, democratic, monarchist, communist, etc.; and much less about bourgeois, despotic, family power; and under globalization impact we much more speak about economic, political and state power, and especially more than ever we speak today about global power, and power of international organizations; and some new types are emerging more and more and therefore we speak today even about internet power, and power of multinational corporations.

In politics it often and easily happens that influence dresses up manipulation. Hobbes noticed it very early when he stated that the goal of influence is to achieve a soft influence. The manipulation is a wrapped and intentional communication which aims to cover the real aims of one side according to the preferences, and for the aims of the other side. The syndrome of the fake news present in the second decade of the XXI century with grow of information technologies and quick communication via social networks which are typical for the globalization era opportunities, have been replaced the chair of the transformative propaganda of the XX century inspired and constructed by political ideologies. However, in both forms of

classical propaganda and contemporary fake news syndrome the action aims are hidden behind the imaginary goals, but these can't be understood so easily.

CONCLUSION

The political consequences following the impact of globalization are enormous. The political concepts are readjusted following significant social and political changes caused by the process of globalization both in terms of reconfiguration of political actors, systems, nature of interactions and enlarged domain of political scope, leadership and behavior. Therefore politics itself cannot be defined anymore in a traditional way because of the need to re-adjust its basic concepts, and expanded range of views and actions in politics.

Some traditional political concepts continue to remain highly ranked instruments in conceptualizing politics even in the age of globalization, but of course with adjusted dimensions, forms and domain. Whichever concept we use in re-conceptualizing politics we need to be aware about at least two issues: it covers only partial aspects of the complex political reality; and it doesn't function in a universal way as far as we do not take into consideration the post-global transformation, new world order and regional processes.

Theorizing politics via early classical concepts and approaches without updating it in every aspect, only within the philosophical debates and with the same types, factors and forms of manifestations, doesn't work anymore and the complex political and social realities then are either partially described, or they may miss the real picture.

REFERENCES

- Axelrod, Robert. 2008. "Political Science and Beyond: Presidential Address to the American Political Science Association." *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (1): 3–9.
- Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Bentham, Jeremy, *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, ed. W. Harrison, Oxford, Blackwell, 1948.
- Grimm, Dieter, *Sovereignty. The Origin and Future of a Political and Legal Concept*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.
- Hansen, Mogens, Herman, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, Paperbacks, 1998.
- Hartz L., *The Liberal Tradition in America*, New York, Harcourt, Brace, 1955.
- Hindess Barry, *The Concept of "the State" in Modern Political Thought*, *Australian Journal of Politics and History*: Volume 63, Number 1, 2017, pp.1-14.
- Kaplan, Abraham. *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science*, Chandler Publishing Company, Scranton, 1964.
- Minkinen, Panu, *Sovereignty, Knowledge, Law*, New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Olson Mancur, *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation and Social Rigidities*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1982.
- Palmer Monte, *Comparative Politics: Political economy, political culture and political interdependence*, F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1997, Itasca, Illinois.
- Parsons Talcott, *Social Systems and the Evolution of Action Theory*, Free Press, Glencoe, 1977.
- Podoksik, Efraim, *One Concept of Liberty: Towards Writing the History of a Political Concept*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Volume 71, Number 2, April, 2010.
- Prindle, David F., *Importing Concepts from Biology into Political Science: The Case of Punctuated Equilibrium*, *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 2012, Policy Studies Organization, Wiley Periodicals, Oxford.
- Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- Sandru, Daniel, *Ideology, Between the Concept and the Political Reality*, *Sfera Politicii*, nr.3 (169) / 2012.
- Sartori, Giovanni, "The Tower of Babel" in David Collier and John Gerring, eds., *Concepts and Methods in Social Science: The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*, Routledge, New York, 61–96, 2009.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie, "Disaggregated Sovereignty, Towards the Public Accountability of Global Government Networks," *Government and Opposition* 39, 2004.
- Walker, Neil, "Late Sovereignty in the European Union," in *Sovereignty in Transition*, Neil Walker, ed., Oxford: Hart, 2003.
- Ware, Alan, *The concept of political equality: A post-Dahl analysis*, *Political Studies*, Volume 29, Issue 3, 1981, pp. 392-406.
- Weber Max in Gerth, H. and Mills, C. Wright (eds), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1948.
- Witte de, Bruno, "Sovereignty and European Integration. The Weight of Legal Tradition", in *The European Court and National Courts. Doctrine and Jurisprudence*, Anne-Marie Slaughter, Alec Stone Sweet and Joseph Weiler, eds., Oxford: Hart, 1998.