



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 11, 2020

**A new decade
for social changes**

www.techniumscience.com

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

Cultural Globalization and Sustainable Peace

Mohammad-Taghi Ghezelsofla¹, Hasty Sayady²

¹Associate Professor of Political Science – university of Mazandaran, Iran, ²Ph.D. Student of International Relations – Akdeniz University, Turkey

m.ghezel@umz.ac.ir¹, hasty.sayady@gmail.com²

Abstract. Preventing war and expanding international peace has always been one of the major concerns of the scientific and academic circles of international relations and therefore the recognition of the nature and discourse governing international relations is of particular importance. On the other hand the new phenomenon of globalization is a very influential element in the relations between the state and social forces which has particularly affected the human political social and cultural arenas in the past two decades. And in the meantime international peace can spread as much as possible through the expansion of cultural ties. Therefore the present paper seeks to explore the role of globalization of political culture in global peace expansion as one of the new areas in studies related to globalization. Obviously the present paper seeks to answer the question of how globalization of political culture has had an impact on international peace. In general the main reasoning behind the present study is to look at the phenomenon of globalization from the point of view of contemporary modernity that the globalization of political culture by creating a series of common values and norms has reduced the ideological contradictions that were the root of most of the warfare of human history and as a result has strengthened international peace.

Keywords. Globalization of Political Culture, Global Peace, International Relations, Democracy, Human Rights

1. Introduction

In 1919, when David Davies established the International Section his goal was to prevent war, twenty years later the field witnessed commitments to change the world based on normative views and the purpose of academic studies in this field was to make the world a better place, in this regard an idealistic vision emerged in the perspective of how the world should be, and the opposite view which is famous for realism deals with the world as it is, but the common ground in all the academic affairs of international relations is the concern for peace and the avoidance of war in international relations.

In the contemporary world with the end of the Second World War the process of globalization has begun and day by day is increasing its speed and power to change the world and today it has such an abundant potential that has influenced all aspects of human life and caused big changes. “In the context of the Third World Order (ethical liberalism) cosmopolitanism is becoming an important force in the world in the form of culture, civil society ties, transnational societies and technologies” [1], where mass media, transnational corporations, the flow of human beings, tourism,... and the growing interconnectedness of the economy, culture, politics

have been created, it is no longer possible to speak of politics among governments only by ignoring transnational actors, social networks, and political institutions that restrict the nation-government. In addition, international cooperation formed after the end of the Second World War, developed beyond most of the traditional areas of economic exchanges and military security and includes issues such as the environment, health, and crime which go far beyond the national borders [2].

Globalization and global networks have changed the way of diplomacy, military issues, economic relations between countries, the role of NGOs and intergovernmental organizations in international relations. [3] Based on the effects of globalization in human life different branches of this process have been taken such as globalization of the economy, globalization of politics, globalization of culture and globalization of security; but globalization from the viewpoint of political culture which the most important elements of it are “democracy”, “human rights”, “pluralism”, and cultural “negligence and tolerance”, has greatly influenced international peace and changed its quality.

In the context of globalization in the field of culture and along with it political cultures has been shaped by dual themes, some believe that cultural globalization is conducive to the proximity of cultures and homogeneity among nations and contributes to the strengthening of global peace. But the other emphasis is on expanding the diversity and cultural complexities of globalization, although, each of these spectra of thoughts offers some arguments, but the debates continue on this issue. For this, present study seeking and examining the role and effect of “globalization of political culture” on international peace in the new global age, we also will answer this: How has global political culture influenced international peace? The hypothesis in the answer to the main question of the present paper is that: The globalization of political culture has brought about a convergence of interdisciplinary fields among humankind and reduced the ideological contradictions between civilizations and given that the major wars and conflicts of human history have been ideological wars in the modern world, the roots of classical and macro wars have been dying in the international system and more peace and stability has dominated the international system.

2. Theoretical Framework

There are different approaches to globalization, each of these approaches knows and identifies globalization differently, and they come to various even contradictory results. In the meantime the college of schools and rival currents try to tell us what kind of paths or factors bring us to the desired destination. The important thing in the process of development and evolution of globalization is the set of elements of it and its gradual connection to the political and cultural system of the public, in fact while globalization has had an economic logic but over time it has become a social system.

The Global Age is entering a large community that has essentially been out of state of closure, having geography, and native form. There has been a kind of interaction between national and transnational factors that are now linked to the globalization of communications. The new world is a connected world and the new age is the age of connectivity [4]. Thus globalization is a triangle that is composed of three interrelated economic, political and cultural contexts and its secondary logic in individual philosophy is to record and grow the scope of individual freedoms in the advancement of the exploitation of facilities [5]. In the political arena the core of the democratization of the internal and international political-social contexts is to pressurize and gradually eliminate authoritarian and totalitarian systems, and as Fukuyama says:” The practical consequence of globalization in the area of policy of closing totalitarianism and totalitarian ideologies is to justify tyranny and slavery of human beings and what else will not

return is totalitarianism and totalitarian ideologies that after Sept. 11 have been shown that if there is any indication of it, the world will stand against it” [6].

Therefore it is necessary first to present a general theory of the two thinkers of modernity; Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens, and the purpose of globalization in their opinions. These two defend a few explanations of the reasons for globalization which they consider to be the result of modernity and rejects the interpretation of the Marxist single cause on the basis of which capitalism is the force of the movement of globalization. Giddenswo sees the globalization as the result of the dynamics of modernity (retrospective) which contains what he calls relying on (socializing) social relationships through spatial spacing and retrospective use of knowledge. He varies between the period of modernity and the earlier periods. Beck like Giddenswo believed that we are living in a period of retrospective modernity and not the age of postmodernity.[7] The key concept that Beck puts forward in new modern expression (reflection modernity) is reflexive modernization. He described this concept with Giddenswo in the mid-1990s. Reflection Modernization is an attempt to evolve and reformulate the attitude of the rigorous community as a social theory with an emphasis on political-cultural perspectives.

This approach examines the dichotomy between industrial civilization and global culture. The characteristic of industrial civilization is the rigorous society. A society that generates dangers in the transition from a modern era that is largely unnoticed. Alongside industrial civilization we are faced with a global culture that is somewhat familiar with the dangers of industrial civilization and seeks at least theoretical level to overcome these dangers. The creation of societies in the form of a state-nation based on the logic of capitalism and industry, the formation of large groups and social status are the first modern structural signs that accompanied the environmental crisis, personal development, the employment crisis and the processes of globalization that are now gradually losing their credibility. These developments make it possible for the rules of institutionalizing the ordering within states and the rules governing the resolution of conflicts between governments from void and new dynamics and extends to the extent that these conditions are considered to be a normal situation. The second modern in this situation is formed to provide the appropriate solutions in this situation. Beck calls these solutions the “democratization of structures”, “the community of citizens”, and “globalism”. At this time one can see the emergence of a new world order that leads to the emergence of a kind of transnational or metropolitan state.

3. Globalization of Political Culture

Globalization is one of the most controversial issues of the current era with many advocates and opponents. The thinkers of different societies have been dealing with each angle so there is no definitive definition about the exact meaning. Some define globalization as a purely economic concept while others have addressed the cultural, political, economic, and environmental components of this phenomenon, and some emphasize its positive aspects and some of its negative aspects.

The Oxford Political Science dictionary defines globalization as: Globalization is about a universal process or a set of processes that transcends multiple communication and interconnectedness that go far beyond the states and societies that make up the modern global system. Globalization involves a sharp increase in the depth and intensity of economic, biological and social interdependence. Here “intensity” refers to the increase in the number scope and extent of exchanges between the borders and “depth” to the degree to which that interdependence affects and influences the ways in which the societies are internally organized. [8] According to David Held, Anthony McGraw globalization is the process or set of processes

that embraces the transformation of the organization of relationships and social associations. These changes are measured by their extent, depth, speed, and impact, and cover subcontinental, intercontinental, and interregional flows as well as networks of action, interaction and enforcement [9].

In the Hyper Dictionary, globalization is defined as growth on a global scale by explaining the discourse of globalization [10]. Jean Baudrillard contends that globalization through the abandonment of the old meanings of the signs, puts into a new form of social life and introduces certain meanings to the signs [11]. Waters also believes that globalization involves the collapse of generalism and specificism. Because globalization has eliminated time and space, every person in each situation are both a person and a member of the human society at the same time [12]. Giddens and Ulrich Beck consider globalization as the outcome of modernity and reject the interpretation of the Marxist single cause on the basis of which capitalism is the force of globalization. Giddens sees globalization as the result of the dynamics of modernity which embraces what it calls the social rejection of space spatial and retrospective use of knowledge. He differed between the period of modernity and the earlier periods, as Beck like Giddens believed in this attitude that we are living in a retrospective modern age not the age of postmodernity [13].

The views of people such as Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck who believe that the globalization is the continuity of the modern age and its prominent set of commitments, and is not limited to the generalization of capitalism but human rights and human freedoms within the framework of the International Covenants. [14] Ulrich Beck considers globalization to be a deep political debate. If we see globalization as merely an interest in global peace this is just the beginning not the end of politics.

Giddens in the simplest definition of globalization sees "interdependence". That is living in a more global world living in a more interdependent world in which one-world events directly affect the events of the other side. [15] Giddens believes that displaying time and space on the clock and map will allow them to be used independently of any particular social status and as a result mechanisms will be available that will bring social activities from the local context and organizes them again throughout time and space. He mentions two specific mechanisms: the "mechanism of symbolic signs" like money which is the symbol of the world of exchange and the mechanism of the "system of expertise" through which technical knowledge is used to organize into material and social environments and includes specialists such as physicians, engineers, architects and psychologists and... They have no reliance on tradition and are potentially subject to wisdom and help rethink modernity and make essential decisions for everyday life. These two mechanisms are both abstract and never bound to spatial frameworks. Ulrich Beck like Giddens believes that the process of globalization can be evaluated within the framework of modernity and that the views of those who consider it to be modernist and post-modernist are incorrect.

The main characteristic of Beck's work is that he believes the dangers of the new era are distinguishing it from previous periods. According to Beck the feature of contemporary social life is the unpredictable degree of dangers that is the dangers of human intervention in nature, while in previous societies the dangers were natural events which are usually assessed locally. The dangers of contemporary society such as environmental crises and the threat of nuclear war are global in scope and there is still room for exaggeration. These dangers are not tied to time and space, and hence Beck calls the name of contemporary society, the society of risk, that is a community at the threshold of risk that responding to these risks can also take global dimensions (such as the response of environmental movements). Beck believes that these risks lead us to a radical modernity in which global dangers create global confrontations and reactions and

awareness of these dangers undermine modern values like the importance of the development and progress, as well as the production of wealth to avoid a global catastrophe. In this regard he refers in particular to the role of NGOs and believes that these organizations have been affected by the successes of the modern age in safeguarding civil rights freedom of expression and the independence of the judiciary which has brought political culture in which formal institutions are marginalized, and thus rejects any perception of globalization as a consequence or sign of a postmodern period. [16]

In general a variety of explanations have been presented for globalization but the part of globalization associated with different aspects of political life is related to globalization in the field of culture and especially political culture.

Many analysts view all aspects of globalization including the globalization of culture as a consequence of economic growth after World War II and increasing economic interdependence. According to their analysis even the growth of the national democratic environment and the globalization of democracy are also the result of the industrial revolution and the growth of technology. But the fact is that the growth and development of the economy and the growth of communication technologies are only accelerating than generating the globalization of culture that is the globalization of its own culture was the result of another factor. More precisely the field of political culture can be considered as a separate area from other areas of globalization. Hence, it can be noted that the expansion of democratic models and the growth of revolutions and democratic liberation movements and human rights as the most important components of the globalization of political culture are not necessarily the result of industrialization, economic dependence and technological growth. In general, the globalization of political culture is not based on the certainty of the culture of a single world and the degradation of other cultures but also on the mere diversity of pluralism and the absence of common global values [17]. In other words, "the globalization of culture does not mean the abandonment of native and traditional values and cultures, but the creation and expansion of shared human values along with preserving cultural diversity in the world". [18]

With the advent of globalization, in the area of culture, many of the characteristics tastes and cultural orientations are matched and common features are formed between different cultures but this never means the uniformity and synchronization of cultural and cultural identities, because profound and root causes such as religion, language, and race are effective in shaping cultures and cultural identities that globalization forces not only do not eliminate them, but also give them the possibility of rebuilding and rejuvenating them, and while there is a kind of homogeneity between different cultures, but their different identities persist. Therefore, in the field of culture two simultaneous occurrences occur: one is the homogeneity of cultures in terms of their effects on rationalism and global conscientiousness and the consolidation and strengthening of distinct cultural identities namely the homogeneity and integration of different cultural identities simultaneously. [19] Hence, the globalized political culture can be defined as: a cultural situation based on common values, norms and symbols in the global arena in which homogeneous areas of the world of culture in their globalized world are expressed in the form of politics and its most important symbols can be seen in the universal patterns of democracy, human rights and pluralism.

4. Global peace

The main field of conflict and confrontation in human society is in the field of thought and the opposition of historian to man has been a confrontation in the field of ideology when the thoughts and cultures of history are organized in the form of different ideologies and stand against each other the history of the bloody events and wars is shaped. In the face of war

throughout human history peace-building efforts have existed. In particular, over the past few centuries, thinkers and politicians have raised many issues about peace. The meaning of the word "peace" refers to concepts such as reconciliation, Salm, paternity between the interlocutors, compromise, Haddaneh, front of the war. [20] Legally speaking the term peace is defined as: "Peace; in the term, it is a matter of affection, whether the intention is the same or the interest or the exclusion of debt or the right or otherwise. [21] In the political tradition, the word peace refers to the state of non-conflict between countries. Also, according to the definition of some scholars, peace means defiance in all forms of physical, social, psychological, political, and structural conflict. [22]

Peace as one of the aspirations of human history has always been the subject of controversy among various political communities throughout history. But in fact, serious attempts have never been made in the field of international political realities to achieve peace in the realm of human life for several centuries. In other words, the establishment of a lasting peace and the avoidance of war has long been a source of great interest from philosophers and great thinkers, and they have presented their writings on the establishment of an international organization that can maintain peace and international security, which has not really been welcomed. In the early nineteenth century, the thoughts and views of thinkers and philosophers on the formation and establishment of a permanent global organization were considered by politicians.

Meanwhile, the most important philosopher who has brought peace in the world and the achievement of a lasting peace of the world is Emmanuel Kant. "In Kant's view a legal system based on morality is an irrefutable condition for the realization of peace and this of course is the cause without sufficient reason". [23] Kant as the theorist of lasting peace, defines peace as lack of hatred and hostility and as a peacemaker hears anyone who hates any kind of hostility. Kant has two types of peace-loving: one is that man wants peace for himself and the other is to design peace for others, the second type is dignity. [24] What is most desirable for peace in the second or for others which corresponds to the rules of his philosophy of morality? In other words, to Kant's view of a system of universal and universal morals in which man is considered as an end and not as a means; it is essential to establish the goal of global peace. Although Kant's thinking about peace was very much considered, but practically until the middle of the twentieth century after the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War serious efforts were not made to achieve peace on the world stage. In this regard, post-World War II peace studies have been expanded and expanded to independent and diverse universities and institutes as well as by scholars of human philology each day to study ways to prevent conflict and from time to time strategy. [25]

Ulrich Bek believes that although there is war and peace today, but as long as neither war nor peace is sustained, both of them have lost their meaning and new international institutions are living and thinking and discussing under the Damocles atomic self-destructive sword. [26] From the point of view of democratic peace believers, liberalism seeks to ensure that consistency of the interests of individuals is ensured by ensuring everyone's freedom of conscience, accordingly liberalism requires the existence of structures that protect the right to self-reliance on one citizen including those structures that give citizens leverage to influence decision-makers in government. Freedom of expression is necessary to allow citizens to punish those who have violated their rights. [27]

From neoliberal internationalism, globalization has caused massive social and cultural transformation in various societies and has created a level of coordination among the interests of different countries. In other words, the globalization of the social space of the human society has led to peace, human rights, development and prosperity, and given that governments are still a major player in international relations the realization of international peace depends on

peaceful and peaceful behavior, while authoritarian governments are pushing for controversy in the international system for their own interests to move the focus from internal issues to foreign and international issues.

In this way, there is a link between peace and democracy that democracy is a new model that democratic nations and democracies especially in the last decade of the twentieth century and the beginning of the new century have been taken to avoid war and bloodshed and the establishment of international peace and security, and the dominant approach in the United Nations is that democracy is one of the basic foundations of international peace and security. As long as the United Nations Security Council considers violations of democracy in some countries to be a violation of peace and has conducted advisory and executive actions in accordance with the provisions of the seventh chapter of the promise. It is also believed that not only democratic countries have a tendency to resolve peaceful relations in their relations, but they are also peaceful in their foreign relations. Because in the democracies need citizens to declare war there is no doubt that naturally people will be very cautious in this risky game because this is the people themselves who must participate in the war, pain and hardship, and after the end of the war they are the people who have to bear the costs of reconstruction. In general, internationalists, since democracy will lead to peaceful relations the rise of democracies will be realized as a result of the growth of human intellectuality and rationalism and will develop peace which ultimately as Kant says: "the end of history will witness eternal peace between democratic governments". [28]

Hence, globalization will increase the number of democracies in the world, and lead in the same way to the elimination of conflict on the international scene and to replace peace. Also, globalization with the strengthening of pluralism, human rights and democracy, and the redefinition of the nature and sovereignty of the state based on common humanitarian ideological values has become an obstacle to war and has promoted humanitarian existence. Accordingly, globalization of security is a kind of feedback from the cultural dimension of globalization, that is, in the modern world of societies and diverse cultures it is in line with democracy and globalization and transformed and redefined according to its values so that no great culture and civilization and history are in conflict with these common human values. Fukuyama states in this regard that "no tradition or religion is in itself and in itself conflicting with the interests of democracy and human rights and the values of globalization unless, like the Taliban, they put culture and indigenous identity under the pretext of TV ban and personal and collective interests. [29]

5. Globalized Political Culture and Global Peace

Globalization especially its political sphere is a massive social process that takes place within the context of the human society namely "the movement of peoples, [30] signs and phenomena in the intercontinental and inter-regional space the global movement and exchange of ideas, information and values through the new communication technology has caused all areas of people's lives to be influenced by each other from political values to economic interests and even religion. [31] The world sees itself as members of a single world which should live together in the best of security prosperity and mutual respect. The emergence of the idea of global convergence in humankind is so widespread and profound that the violent and inhumane aspects of the country's internal conflicts or conflicts in different parts of the world bring such pressure to the public that it is necessary to allow humanitarian intervention in these areas.

Nay and Cohen consider the process of spreading populism to be one of the inevitable consequences of globalization, which will lead to further consolidation of public opinion. The populist attitudes towards global cooperation and convergence have made global politics and

international politics impossible without satisfying and considering global public opinion. Frequently, globalization based on the principle of integration and assimilation itself, as well as counteracting the offensive burden of diverse cultures and ideologies is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence which leads to the convergence of nations and conflicts losing ground to their existence. [32] On this basis it can be said that globalization from the bottom i.e. the massive transformation of globalization into global public opinion has necessitated and achieved globalization from above. Francis Fukuyama writes in the first lines of the introduction to *End of History and the Last Man*: I argue that there is a significant consensus on how democracy is governed as a desirable system of governance in the age of globalization around the world and on other modes of governance. In addition, I argue that democratic governance is the last form of human rule. [33]

In general, the democratization of the global political climate is a major part of the process of globalization of culture and politics. Democracy as the people's government is widely regarded as the fundamental moral principle and legitimacy of modern sovereignty. Although it is determined those definitions of democracy and the mechanism for achieving it are different in different countries and periods, there is a widespread and almost theoretical consensus that good governance is democratic governance. With the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the process of globalization of the international community has evolved. Today, for the first time in the history of the world, there is a world-wide continuous and stable international community based on the rule of law, a set of values and regulations that the most important of these is manifested in the United Nations Charter. The values and norms of the contemporary international community, which is the goal of forming the United Nations and at the head of that Security Council, are international peace and security. As Emmanuel Kant believed, the will and human potential for global peace could only be achieved by changing the attitudes of individuals and linking states to various federations. [34]

At the present time, in the modern world the change in the approach of people in the world to peace has been unprecedentedly realized, and the process of democratization and global consensus on the political model of the democratic government has led to decisions being made whether in the domestic or the international arena based on the priorities and attitudes of the global human community which can be termed "humanism in global politics". This policy has led international politics and above all world politics to have more color than peace and the use of force and power in international relations has declined, and an increase in interactions and cooperation in order to achieve the over-territory and cross-border interests of citizens at the regional and global levels.

In the era of globalization, individuals and groups have become powerful and influence the governments as stakeholder groups influencing their decisions, plans and desires and making questions on the role of government in the domestic and international arena. [35] In such a situation, democratic states and the globalization of democracy are the means to ensure this. In the process of globalization of political culture in three fundamental dimensions of the spread of tolerance and indulgence, the weakening of the role and the rule of government, and the human rights discourse plan is linked to the global peace process.

1) Tolerance and indulgence: One of the important points in the process of globalization of political culture is the issue of tolerance and indulgence. By accepting the view that globalization leads to sustainability and even diversity and cultural diversity while shaping cultural commonwealths in the world, the world has more cultures and civilizations than ever before, but along with the greater emphasis on cultural and native differences a new pattern of meaning, identity and community is formed in which the human society and the state of the society are in the process of encouraging the mixing and dimming of the distinction between

nations, civilizations, religions and ideologies, which has exacerbated intercultural and social interrelationships that authors such as "Nedervin Peters" and "Haters" refer to this phenomenon as "hybridization" and "transplantation" in globalization. Also this cultural development that is the process of increasing the diversity of cultures in human societies necessarily require another form of social morality that differs from the common customs and the nature of old cultural societies based on non-consensual self-discipline between distinct groups which enables the peaceful coexistence of diverse cultures and ideologies in human and metropolitan communities.

2) Undermining the role of the state and the sovereignty of the state: Many analysts have linked the development of global relations with the weakening of the national government and the collapse of the national government and the retreat of the government (Kibel, Schmidt and Strange) and others have set foot and announced the crisis of the national government and the extinction of the national government (Hursman, Marshall, Ohmai, Bowman) but in front of them writers have emphasized that globalization has not done anything to undermine the authority of national governments (Thomson and Krossner) but in fact the government is heavily influenced by the phenomenon of globalization and political, cultural and economic activities are increasingly becoming transnational. [36]

The fact is that, with the collapse of the bipolar system and the growth of globalization governments were more vulnerable, more restricted sovereignty, more permeable borders, and government authority faced serious challenges. In this situation the state is left out of a territorial form and limited to a particular geopolitical situation and many of the patterns of behavior are no longer subject to the status of a given land physically. Under such circumstances people as one of the main elements of the constitution of the state are not subject to a distinct identity and government unit and do not consider themselves to be a single national and state identity as plurality and variety of identities. Reducing citizens' loyalty to the national government and transferring loyalty to supranational and global institutions can be seen as other effects of this transformation within the framework of the state which has changed the interface between citizens and governments and led to the diminished nationalism, the most prominent examples are Kurds, the Welsh, Catalans in Spain, and Quebec in Canada. The main reason for these developments is due to the loss of monopoly of meaning by governments in the age of globalization. [37] In general, the weakening of the political sovereignty of governments has led to the expansion of the power of nongovernmental institutions and as a result the pressure of governments to pursue another war is not as effective as the past. Hence, the pressure to promote peace at the global level has been sweeping through the weakening of the political sovereignty of governments in the international arena.

3) Human rights: International human rights are globalized and operate beyond all state borders and mechanisms. These rights are among the discourses of all societies and all government organizations that address both elites and oppressed both organizations and societies. Human rights are also part of globalization. [38] Once the governments, with those who were in their jurisdiction would have behaved in any way and with the claim that human rights are within their domestic jurisdiction and that each state alone is responsible. Governments also resisted the critique of their actions but in the new era human rights are a well-established section of international law with an institutional structure and universal scope. Each single state has ratified a treaty that includes commitments for the protection of human rights. Now, human rights have become a set of rules for the discourse of the international community. Political, economic, social, and cultural reactions throughout the world come about in the field of human rights and countries have accepted at least in principle that the promotion and protection of all human rights are a matter of concern for the international community. [39]

Globalization has had an impact on international protection of human rights and has created opportunities to end the absolute sovereignty of states on how to deal with those who are in their infancy. In such a way that no state can easily capture the long-awaited expectations of the naive within its territory or the demand for free movement and freedom of expression on the pretext that these expectations and demands are extant, and not necessarily through deliberate pressures but only through communication and the provision of unwanted patterns such that in the last 50 years the international human rights law has grown dramatically based on the idea that human rights should be protected globally, it has grown dramatically and appears to have become the main symbol of globalization. [40]

Conclusion

In a new global context, space for intercultural encounters and contacts is far more interesting than before. Globalization through new articulation gives signs and a new meaning to concepts, new identities and meanings of man, society, and social interaction representing it as the truth and objectivity of life. The possibility of a world without borders has become so large that there is a common political culture in this area in different societies to the extent that governments have ideological commitments and shared interests they will be prepared to concentrate and decentralize the sovereignty of the state as well as to eliminate the protection and defense frontiers.

Globalization has been able to end the classic struggle in the field of human ideology. While ideological warfare continues to be on the global stage, but different from the past. In general, the ideologies that organize the war in the age of globalization are not as historic as the past. In the era of globalization any ideology and culture that is in the midst of war bloodshed and contradiction cannot expand and become history. However, the great powers do not plan to fight each other and the emergence of such a war is very unlikely. Today the international environment has become very different and more complex in comparison with past ages concerns about the threat of global war and the clash of civilizations are gone, and fears of such wars in the international community are not felt. Therefore, it can be said that globalization has become a deterrent to war and has exacerbated the security of the past. Thus, the concepts of collective-security in the modern world have become more coherent in nature and it seems that the international community, the community of states, the United Nations and governmental and nongovernmental institutions in the fight against terrorism until its definitive destruction and full realization.

In the end, suggestions are made: 1) Understanding the current situation of the world and paying attention to the rapid changes in the field of science and technology to achieve a proper position in global relations. 2) Research on the issue that globalization has not had a positive impact on international security but has also been a factor contributing to terrorism, in fact globalization has led to the emergence of terrorism as a form of instability and a new security crisis in the world.

References

- [1] M. GHEZELSOFLA, *“Philosophy of Political Philosophy: Theoretical Conflicts in the Age of Globalization”*, Tehran, Roshd-e- Amozesh press, 2011, p. 86. (In Persian)
- [2] J. SMITH, “Transnational Processes and movements”, *the Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, (Eds , D. Snow et al), Blackwell, 2007, p. 311.
- [3] J. BAYLIS, *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, Oxford University Press, 2020, p. 123.

- [4] M. GHEZELSOFLA, “*Philosophy of Political Philosophy: Theoretical Conflicts in the Age of Globalization*”, Tehran, Roshd-e- Amozesh press, 2011, p. 80. (In Persian)
- [5] M. SARI-OL-QALAM, *Iran and Globalization: Challenges and Solutions* Center for Strategic Research, Tehran, 2005, p. 23. (In Persian)
- [6] F. FUKUYAMA, “History Is still Going our way”, Wall Street Journal, Friday, October 5, 2001, P. 30.
- [7] A.M. FARHADI, “Analytical Investigation of the Globalization Phenomenon Focusing on the Culture”, *Journal of Strategic Studies of Globalization*, 2(5), 2011, P. 12.
- [8]. I. MC.LEAN, A. MC.MILAN. *The concise Oxford dictionary of politics*. Oxford, 2009, p. 409.
- [9] D. Held, Et al, *Global Transformations*, Combridge: Polity Press, 1999, p. 16.
- [10] “Globalization”, 2002, at: <http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/globalization>.
- [11] S.A. SAJJADI, “Discourse Analysis of Globalization”, *Journal of Political Science*, 7 (28), 2004, p.4. (In Persian)
- [12] M. WATERS, *Globalization (Key Ideas)*, Taylor & Francis Group/Books, 2001, p. 97.
- [13] A.M. FARHADI, “Analytical Investigation of the Globalization Phenomenon Focusing on the Culture”, *Journal of Strategic Studies of Globalization*, 2 (5), 2011, P. 14.
- [14] GH. NASRI, “In Quiddity of Globalization - A Theoretical Reflection on the Nature of Globalization”, *Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies*, No.3, 2001, p. 302. (In Persian)
- [15] A. GIDDENS, *Global perspectives*, Tehran: *Tarh e No*, 2005, p. 58. (Persian translated version)
- [16] K. RASEKH, at: <http://keramatollahrasekh.blogfa.com/post-621.aspx>.
- [17] A. KARIMI-FARD, “The Status of Culture in the Light of Globalization”, *Correction, Education*, 1 (47), 2005, p. 12. (In Persian)
- [18] F. FUKUYAMA, “History Is still Going our way”, Wall Street Journal, Friday, October 5, 2001, P. 12.
- [19] A. DEHKHODA, *Dehkhoda Dictionary*, Tehran, University of Tehran Press, 1965, p. 305.
- [20] H. TAHERI, *Civil Rights*, Vol. 4, Qom, Society of Teachers, 1997, p. 35 (In Persian)
- [21] M. TOLOUI, *Comprehensive Political Culture*, Tehran: Science Publishing, 200, p.665. (In Persian)
- [22] M. GHADERI, A. NAQIBZADEH, *Explaining Peace-Based Curriculum in Kant's Philosophy*, Curriculum Studies Quarterly, 8, 2008, p. 52. (In Persian)
- [23] N. SHAFIE, *Development of the concept of peace*, 2010, P. 25 at: [http://dr-shafie.ir/post-930.aspx\(1389/07/04\)](http://dr-shafie.ir/post-930.aspx(1389/07/04))
- [24] I. KANT, *Lectures on ethics*. Vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 287.
- [25] Z. NOPARAST, “Democracy, Justice and Peace”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 9, 2009, p. 6. (In Persian)
- [26] U. BECK, “Risk Society’s ‘Cosmopolitan Moment’”, *Lecture at Harvard University*, November 12, 2008, p. 9, available at: <http://www.labjor.unicamp.br/comciencia/files/risco/AR-UlrichBeck-Harvard.pdf>
- [27] A. LINKLATER, ed. *International Relations: Section V. The Liberal Peace. Section VI. Marxism*, Vol. 3, Taylor & Francis, 2000.
- [28] H. EHTESHAMI, Studying the Globalization of Democracy and its Impact on International Peace and Security, *Journal of Politics*, 39 (1), 2009, p. 17. (In Persian)
- [29] R. JAHANBAGLO, *Government and Democracy in the Age of Globalization*, Tehran: Rozaneh Publications, 2003, p. 41. (In Persian)
- [30] D. Held, Et al, *Global Transformations*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999, p. 329.
- [31] H. SALIMI, *Various Theories on Globalization*, SAMT Publications, 2005, p. 70.

- [32] R. KEOHANE, I.NYE, “*Globalization: What's? What's not? (and so what?)*”, Foreign policy, spring, 2000, P. 110-113.
- [33] F. FUKUYAMA, *The End of History and last man*, New York: Free press, 1992, p.1.
- [34] J. BAYLIS, *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, Oxford University Press, 2020, pp. 83- 84.
- [35] D. MIR-MOHAMMADI, “Globalization, Dimensions and Approaches”, *National Studies Quarterly*, 11, 2002, p. 65. (In Persian)
- [36] M. WATERS, *Globalization (Key Ideas)*, Taylor & Francis Group/Books, 2001, p. 9731.
- [37] A. QAVAM, “The Crisis of Meaning in the Age of Globalization”, *Foreign Policy Quarterly*, 14 (3), 2000, 637. (In Persian)
- [38] R. Falk, *The making of global citizenship: beyond the new world order*, 1993, p. 39.
- [39] R. MC-CORQUODALE, R. FAIRBROTHER, “Globalization and human rights”, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 21.3 (1999), 735-766.
- [40] J. BAYLIS, *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, Oxford University Press, 2020, p. 131.