



In Search of an Alternative Public Policy Framework for Globalization

Julian V. Advincula Jr*

University of the Philippines Manila, Metro Manila, Philippines

Abstract

Globalization is a modern phenomenon affecting many countries around the world. Much of its concepts such as free trade, market economy and limited government have been derived from the capitalist ideas of classical economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo. As a counterpoint to these teachings, sociologist Karl Marx theorized the socialist thoughts which advocated worker ascendancy, centralized economy and strong state. Amidst the society's technological advancement and modernity, Marx's thoughts have apparently become the anathema of Smith's and Ricardo's ideas including the common notion and present practice of globalization today. This study would apply the social, political and economic thoughts of Marx, in order to offer an alternative public policy framework that can be adopted by any country in dealing with the issue and concern of globalization.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by EBSCO.

Keywords: Globalization, Public Policy, Marxism, Capitalism, Karl Marx, Adam Smith, David Ricardo

Introduction

Society is a unique framework which binds and segregates individuals and groups of people. For all the concepts and contexts under which it has developed and evolved through the years since the time of classical philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, society serves as a focal point of interrelated fields of study like sociology, economics and political science under the academic discipline known as the social sciences. As many different countries all over the world undergo modernization, understanding modern societies in the 21st Century and even beyond has become central to the reflection in making public policies. Various public policy approaches that have transpired in the 20th Century appear to be insufficient and inadequate in their capacity to explain modernization and predict shifts of socio-economic and political processes both on global and local scales. To better utilize socio-economic and political development in harnessing modern society, this paper offers an alternative public policy framework to address the current trend of globalization all over the world. As such, globalization is analyzed by crossing disciplinary boundaries through the use of social, political and economic thoughts of Karl Marx.

Globalization: A Way of Manifesting Modernity

Many substantial and crucial issues have been discussed and debated on since the start of the 21st Century. Amidst the continued existence of modern societies during this century, globalization has been often mentioned, quoted and referred to. According to Anthony Giddens, modernity can be characterized as a shorthand term for modern society normally associated with: world transformation through human intervention; complex economic institutions (especially industrial production and a market economy); and certain range of political institutions

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +0-000-000-0000 ; fax: +0-000-000-0000 .

E-mail address: author@institute.xxx

(including the nation-state and mass democracy) (Giddens, 1998: 94). Following Giddens' ideas on modern society, globalization can be viewed as a way of manifesting modernity.

By definition, globalization is "a process that encompasses the causes, course, and consequences of transnational and transcultural integration of human and non-human activities" including the interchange of world views, products, ideas, and other aspects of culture (Al-Rodhan and Stoudmann 2006: 2). In a more general and encompassing sense, it includes "all those processes by which the peoples of the world are incorporated into a single world society" (Albrow and King 1990: 8). As a modern phenomenon, however, the basic notion and the most common definition of globalization hovers on the economic aspect coupled with some political and social elements. Scribd, the world's largest digital library, defines globalization in an economic, political and social sense. First, it comes up with an economic definition of globalization as "the increasing unification of the world's economic order through reduction of international trade barriers such as tariffs, export fees, and import quotas" (Cultural Economy and Globalization 2013: 1) Next, it describes globalization with some political character related to the efficient increase of material wealth, goods, and services catalyzed by international relations, specialization and competition (Cultural Economy and Globalization 2013: 1). Finally, it qualifies globalization as a social process by which regional economies, societies, and culture become integrated through communication, transportation, and trade. (Cultural Economy and Globalization 2013: 1).

Much of the theoretical origins and ideas of globalization have been derived from the capitalist thoughts of classical economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Both Smith and Ricardo are considered pioneers of classical economics which mainly theorizes and assumes that: 1) free markets regulate themselves when free of any intervention; 2) markets move towards their natural equilibrium without requiring any outside intervention; and 3) prices both in the case of goods and wages are flexible (Keynes 1936: 3). As classical economists, Smith and Ricardo developed their thoughts and ideas using capitalism, an economic system which advocates private ownership as the means of production with the goal of making a profit (Jenks 1998: 383). Out of these theoretical origins and ideas, the most relevant attributes that are applicable to today's globalization are free trade, market economy and limited government.

Foremost, free trade is one feature of globalization that can be directly traced from the thoughts and ideas of Smith and Ricardo. For his part, Smith has enriched the relevance of trade to the concerns of people. In *The Wealth of Nation*, Smith argued that human beings have propensity to barter or exchange goods with their fellow human beings. As such, Smith has maintained that they should exchange surplus goods – goods that are part of the produce of labor but are over and above one's own consumption. Through barter, the practice of trade is enhanced because: 1) it encourages every person to specialize; 2) it stimulates division of labor (operation that is subdivided into separate operations carried out by a different person); and 3) it promotes free market (market where prices are determined not by government but by independent decisions of buyers and seller without anyone being able to determine outcome especially prices beforehand) (Bennagen 2002: 151-153). Meanwhile, from his end, Ricardo has laid out the foundation of free trade that is being approximated and emulated by present day globalization. As demonstrated by his opposition to the Corn Law implemented by the British Parliament in the early 1800s, Ricardo has set the idea that imported goods/products (grains/corn in the case of Corn Law) should not be imposed with taxes/tariffs (Heilbroner, 1992: 79-80). His advocacy of free trade has advanced his famous Theory of Rent. As defined by Ricardo himself, rent is the portion of the produce of the earth which is paid to the landlord for the use of the original and indestructible powers of the soil. For him, imported products should be allowed to access local markets because scarcity of such imported product (just like corn/grain) would lead producers to put money on their lands, even the least productive ones. When such a scenario happens, rent increases as less fertile lands are tilled. Ultimately, capital accumulation slows down since: 1) landowners are not concerned with capital accumulation itself because they just want to get as much rent as possible from their properties; and 2) workers cannot contribute to capital accumulation since they do not have any surplus earnings to save (Bennagen 1992: 165-166). Less or no capital accumulation does not sit well in capitalism. Hence, imposition of taxes/tariffs on imported products is not beneficial to a capitalist economy.

Next, market economy is another facet of globalization that can help in increasing material wealth, goods, and services of global community members through efficiencies catalyzed by international relations, specialization and competition among themselves. At the center of Smith's capitalist thoughts and ideas lies his theory of market economy. Smith's market economy follows the so called Law of Supply and Demand. This law is determined by market forces, the mechanism of which is run by the invisible hand. As devised by Smith, invisible hand denotes "the way in which the market mechanism is capable of coordinating independent decisions of buyers and sellers without anyone being able to determine outcomes" which in turn acts as the automatic equilibrating mechanism to maintain the competitive nature of market, maximize individual welfare and keep the economic activities efficient (Pass et al 1991: 275). This invisible hand serves as conduit of individual member countries to beef up their own material wealth, goods and services to improve their international relations, specialization and competition in the global arena. Relative to Ricardo's capitalist thoughts and ideas, market economy plays a vital role on labor and wages. These labor and wages are the ones creating the material wealth, goods and services of a nation. In effect, international relations, specialization and competition of these nations in the global arena depend on labor and wages. Ricardo's Labor Theory of Value has postulated that wages and labor are affected by the market economy simply because wages of laborers are a function of natural price of labor (determined by price of food, necessities and conveniences which workers need to support themselves and their family members) and of market price of labor (the price that is actually paid for labor depending on the demand for and supply of it) (Bennagen 2002:167-168). Abundance of labor results into low market price which cuts the labor wages. With the opposite effect, scarcity of labor translates into high market price which augments the labor wages. Fundamentally, market economy, as devised by Smith and built upon by Ricardo, affects the economic activities of individual players and group stakeholders in globalization.

Lastly, limited government is an essential characteristic of globalization where regional economies, societies, and cultures can become integrated through communication, transportation, and trade. Aside from free trade and market economy, limited government is one of the core values of capitalism put forth by Smith. Limited government stems from the doctrine of *laissez faire*, as developed also by Smith himself. Meaning "let things alone," *laissez faire* advocates free trade and market competition. As the means of production in the capitalist system are privately owned by individuals and firms, market forces work on their own without any intervention from government. Nonetheless, as acknowledged by Smith, capitalism should still have a government albeit at a limited capacity (Curtis 1981: 107). It should not be totally abolished but instead kept to a minimum to play the roles that it can perform alone, such as: 1) protection of societies from violence and external attacks; 2) protection of everyone from injustice or oppression; and 3) erection/maintenance of public institutions, public works (bridges, roads, canals) and public programs (including education) (Bennagen 2002: 156). Moreover, it has some limited power of taxation but most definitely, it has no power or authority in the economic sphere. With such limited government, integrating regional economies, societies, and culture through communication, transportation, and trade looks very conducive to the full realization of globalization. Like Smith, Ricardo also advocates *laissez faire* or hands off policy particularly on foreign trade. To this effect, Ricardo originates the Law of Comparative Advantage. Such law theorizes that international trade between countries would be beneficial for any two countries if each country specializes in the production of the good at a lower resource input cost than the other country (Pass et al. 1991:79). Hence, Ricardo's Law of Comparative Advantage reinforces integration of regional economies through trade as a valuable aspect of globalization. Furthermore, it harnesses global production of goods and services through specialization in international relations.

Reactions to the processes and activities of globalization in its current inclination and disposition have been varied. Individual persons, groups of people, sectors of society, nation-states and international organizations have become either proponent or opponent of globalization. Generally, proponents of globalization support it primarily due to its necessity and desirability to the well-being of human society specifically in terms of economic growth, expansion and development (Sen 1970: 131). They believe that globalization promotes economic liberalism, free trade, global democracy, international cooperation and global civics/philanthropy. On the other hand, opponents of globalization block it mainly because of its detriments to the social well-being of stakeholders both on global and local scales, as suggested by: questions on social/natural sustainability of long-term continuous economic expansion;

social structural inequality caused by globalization processes; and the cultural superiority (colonial, imperialistic, hegemonic ethnocentrism), cultural assimilation and cultural appropriation that underlie such processes (Sen 1970 131-151). As such, they see the unfavorable consequences of globalization like “social disintegration, breakdown of democracy, more rapid and extensive deterioration of the environment, spread of new diseases, increase of poverty and alienation.” (Capra 2002:83-84). Most importantly, critics of globalization argue that unrestricted free trade gives advantages to the rich at the expense of the poor since the rich themselves have more financial leverage (Faux 2004: 1-2).

If only for its great potential and realizable ability as an innovative and forward looking phenomenon, globalization could have been adequate and sufficient enough in understanding socio-historical development and modernity. Its capability to plan and direct the international community to a more cooperative, interdependent and harmonized future cannot be discounted or set aside. The capitalist ideas of classical economists Smith and Ricardo involving free trade, market economy and limited government help so much in making globalization achieve this end. Nevertheless, valid concerns and substantial issues raised and highlighted by the critics and opponents of globalization against the very same thought of Smith and Ricardo necessitate that an alternative means in studying globalization be utilized in order to see its overall value in the analysis of modernity. In this regard, a corresponding alternative public policy framework is pursued by crossing disciplinary boundaries and delving into the social, political and economic thoughts of the most famous critic of capitalism and classical political economy – Karl Marx.

Marxism: An Alternative Means of Studying Globalization

Developed by German sociologist Karl Marx, Marxism is a doctrine which encompasses sociological, political and economic ideas such as worker ascendancy, centralized economy and strong state, among others. Being a reaction, commentary and critique of capitalism, it is perceived as the anathema of globalization. As an alternative means of coming up with a public policy framework to better understand socio-historical development and modernity, Marxism can be ironically used to dissect and evaluate globalization itself specifically the social, political and economic thoughts of Marx in the following areas of concern: 1) Materialist Theory of History; 2) Critique of Classical Political Economy (Division of Labor, Alienation and Importance of Working Class); and 3) Class Struggle (Capitalism, Socialism and Communism as the End of History).

Socially, Marx has advanced the Materialist Theory of History which holds that the existence of a person is determined by his/her material condition. This view has been reflected in *The Communist Manifesto*, a collaboration of Marx with another social scientist and German political thinker/theorist/philosopher, Friedrich Engels. Theoretically, the Materialist View of History is a perspective which looks at human problems by studying the real conditions of human existence especially those related to the satisfaction of simple economic needs (Ebenstein and Ebenstein, 2000: 645). According to him, the social existence of human beings determines their consciousness based on their material condition that is shaped by the structures and processes that confront them in their everyday existence. For him, a person’s existence and manner of living coincide with what and how they produce to satisfy basic human economic needs. Such production, as studied by Marx through the course of history, focuses on the mode of production that exists at a particular time in history. By mode of production, Marx refers to both means of production (anything in external world used to produce material needs and maintain existence) and relations of production (the link between how a society produces and the social roles of individuals in production process) (Bennagen 2002: 210-211).

As it exists in the 21st Century, globalization can be discerned by relating it to Marx’s Materialist Theory of History. Globalization is either supported by its proponents or contradicted by its opponents, be it individual persons, groups of people, sectors of society, nation-states and international organizations, based on their own respective material conditions (means of production) as well as the structures and processes (relations of production) that confront them as a consequence of globalization. As it cuts along the North-South Divide, globalization widens the disparity between rich and poor nations. Being the richer and more developed region (comprised of US, Canada, Western Europe, Japan and South Korea), the North maintains 1/4 of the world population, controls 4/5 of the world income and owns/houses 90% of manufacturing industries (Mimiko 2012: 47). As the poorer and less developed

region (consisted of Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe and Asia), the South carries 3/4 of the world population, shares 1/5 of the world income and serves as a source of raw materials for the North (Steger 2009: 31). The North, along with China and the Newly Industrializing Economies (NIEs) of Asia like Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan favors globalization through their more liberal economic policies because they benefit from free trade and borderless economy around the world. In contrast, the South remains more critical of globalization through their more protectionist economic policies since they bear more of its costs than benefits. In terms of structures and processes, globalization perpetuates and reproduces unequal relationships and opportunities between the North and the South by favoring the privileged and further marginalizing the disadvantaged (Kacowicz 2007: 565). Moreover, Karowicz suggests that social and economic gaps between countries are enhanced since globalization requires economies and societies to adapt in a very rapid manner. For him, such adaptation almost never happens in an equal fashion. Hence, some nations grow faster than others. Consequently, the North (developed/richer countries) engages the South (less developed/poorer countries) to a point where less developed societies become dependent on the developed ones for survival. In addition, globalization also favors the richer countries. They have the more highly skilled and educated workers who occupy professional, managerial and technical positions in a global community and market setting. Trade wise, they are also at a more advantageous position as they sell technically advanced industrial products and high value manufactured goods like defense and electronic equipment. In contrast, poorer countries have less skilled laborers who perform tasks in factory/assembly lines and service related jobs. In international trade, the products that they offer are normally semi-processed goods, agricultural products and raw materials that have less valuation in the global market. Usually, the scope of trade and area of economic activities of richer countries are broader as they set their sight on global markets to accommodate their extended if not expanding economy. For poorer countries, they do not have the luxury and much capacity to be as active and aggressive in international trade because of their own domestic woes, issues on self sufficiency and concerns on global competitiveness on trade, capital and investment movements.

Politically and economically, Marxism is a critique of classical political economy specifically the system of capitalism. Instead of mode of production, capitalism is concerned only with means of production and not on relations of production. With means of production in private hands operating under free market economy and run by invisible hands (earlier discussed under the thought and ideas of Smith and Ricardo), Marx has analyzed capitalism as being wasteful and exploitative. For him, capitalism has inherent contradictions especially in the development of labor that would bring about its own downfall. Among these stark contradictions is the concept of division of labor which capitalism fosters and the resulting alienation that stems from extreme or extensive division on labor. Undeniably, Smith's idea of division of labor increases labor efficiency through specialization. As they have specialized tasking in the division of labor, workers also increase their productivity through: 1) promotion of their dexterity (indefinite repetition of tasks); 2) reduction of their idle time (eliminates loss of working time in changing from one task to another); and 3) stimulation of technical progress (facilitates invention of machineries) (Bennagen 2002: 152). However, Marx's critique of Smith's division of labor is also valid. Through division of labor, workers are robbed of their own skills as such skills become a dependent property of combined division of labor. As harnessed by capitalism to increase productivity and maximize profit, division of labor is normally put in its extreme or extensive condition. Such condition, as theorized by Marx, brings alienation to the workers themselves in four (4) basic forms: 1) alienation from production of labor (objectification) as they cannot relate to their outputs; 2) alienation from productive activity (forced labor) as they cannot relate to the process/function/pursuit of their work; 3) alienation from human species (physical existence) as they cannot relate to human life itself; and 4) alienation from fellow human beings (service to other persons) as they cannot relate to other persons. Subsequently, alienation disrupts cooperation and undermines the importance of the working class. As acknowledged by Smith and Ricardo in the Labor Theory of Value, workers create labor that determines the value of goods and the wealth of nations. But then again, as put forth by Ricardo in *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, wages of laborers depend not only on the value of goods and products that they produce but also on the supply and demand for laborers themselves. Coupled with more machines and technology due to division of labor, the market price for wages of laborers can be lower due to lesser demand for them. If such a condition happens in capitalism, the result would be unemployment and underemployment of workers, lowering of their wages and oversupply of goods. As workers get

exploited, worsening condition would exist that may lead to the collapse and overthrow of the capitalist system by the frustrated workers. To correct this inherent contradiction of capitalism, Marx has put importance to the working class above all others to the extent of calling for the abolition of families, countries and nationalities. It is by this premise that Marxism has become famous for its battle cry “workingmen of the world, unite!”

Capitalism’s means of production and Marxism’s relations of production (as another factor of mode of production aside from means of production) do not sit well together in 21st Century globalization. Similar to capitalism’s means of production, traditional metrics like Gross Domestic Product (GDP) -- the market value of all officially recognized final goods and services produced within a country in a given period of time, together with balance of trade, foreign direct investment and capital flow are used by proponents of globalization to emphasize economic growth, expansion and development. Analogous to Marxism’s relation of production, other indicators beyond traditional metrics like GDP et al are considered by opponents of globalization to measure the impact of globalization processes and ascertain human costs. These indicators include: Gini Coefficient, a measure of inequality of income or wealth; and Happy Planet Index, an index of human well-being and environmental impact. In effect, the perceived incompleteness of capitalism’s means of production in appraising the probative value of globalization is addressed by Marxism’s relations of production. Such probative value of globalization can also be fully examined by connecting division of labor to the dynamics of globalization. The different specialized tasks operating in the division of labor can be likened to the various countries interacting in the process of globalization. These countries offer in exchange of getting something out of globalization. Similar to alienated workers in the division of labor, the poorer countries hold the losing end and bear the brunt of globalization. They suffer in carrying a lot of its costs as richer countries enjoy in reaping most of its benefits. Richer countries have more wealth, income, capital, goods/services and technology which enable them to generate industrial products and manufactured goods. Meanwhile, poorer countries have lower economic growth and development which relegate them to stick to yielding agricultural products and supplying raw materials to richer countries. Poorer countries just cannot keep up, more so compete with the richer countries in the international trade and the world market of globalization. Like suffering alienated workers in the division of labor, poorer countries are often at the behest of the richer countries which, in turn, act like the controlling capitalist owners of production and set the overall dynamics of globalization. Just like Marx’s belief regarding the importance of working class in the overthrow of capitalism, poorer countries are very relevant indeed in prognosis and future direction of globalization. For sure, these poorer countries are needed whether to preserve the status quo and continue the present form of globalization or to change the existing system and overhaul its current form to make it more acceptable, equitable and suitable to them. It would be a struggle for both poorer and richer countries as they plan, develop and follow through with their own respective social needs, political interests and economic priorities pertaining and relating to globalization.

The envisioned struggle between poorer and richer countries in the issue of globalization is not very much different from the idea and belief of Karl Marx in his view and concept of class struggle. Marx’s class struggle is a reflection of his converging social, economic and political thoughts about society. As argued by Marx in *The Communist Manifesto*, class struggle exists on the following conditions: 1) formation of a class when its members achieve class consciousness and solidarity; 2) members of the class become aware and conscious of their exploitation and the conflict with another class; and 3) upon realizing their shared interests and a common identity, the class takes action against another class that exploits them. In his analysis of society, Marx identifies two main social groups/classes: 1) labor (the proletariat or workers); and 2) capital (the bourgeoisie or capitalists). The proletariat is the ruled class which includes anyone who earns their livelihood by selling their labor power and getting a wage or salary as payment for their labor time. They have little choice but to work for the bourgeoisie since they typically have no independent way to survive. The bourgeoisie is the ruling class which includes anyone who gets their income not from labor as much as from the surplus value they appropriate from the workers who create wealth. As described by Marx in *Das Kapital*, surplus value roughly refers to the new value created by workers that is in excess of their own labor cost as appropriated by the capitalists to accumulate capital and generate profit. Marx’s class struggle involves the exploitation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie which leads to class war, overthrow of the bourgeoisie as ruling class by the proletariat and ultimately establishment of communism. Communism is a process of class conflict and revolutionary struggle, resulting in victory for the proletariat and the

establishment of a classless, socialist society wherein private ownership is abolished with the means of production and subsistence belonging to the community (McLean and McMillan 2003: 96). In Marx's theory, communism is a consequence of Georg W.F. Hegel's historical dialectic and his own (Marx's) idea on evolution of socio-historic development and mode of production. Hegel's historical dialectic advances the concept of thesis (the initial view as prevailing idea), antithesis (the contradictory idea pitted against prevailing idea) and synthesis (the best of the old and new ideas brought together and becomes new thesis) which form part as elements of a cyclical process in search of arriving at the absolute truth (McClelland 1998: 528-529). In the Hegelian sense, communism for Marx is the end of history, a final synthesis that will no longer be contested or contradicted by any other system (Bennaggen 2002: 207). Based on Marx's own idea on evolution of socio-historical development and mode of production, communism is the final result in a series of class struggle which linearly develops across time in the following stages: Table 1. Marx's Evolution of Mode of Production

Stage	Struggle For/Between	Means of Production
1)	Tribal Existence and Survival	Gathering and Hunting
2)	Agrarian System Citizens and Slaves	Private Property
3)	Feudalism Landowners and Tenants	Land Ownership
4)	Capitalism Bourgeoisie and Proletariat	Capital
5)	Socialism Centralized Economy, Strong State	Collective Ownership
6)	Communism Classless, Moneyless, Stateless Society	Common Ownership

Marx's idea of class struggle, especially his view of class conflict between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in capitalism that would transitionally result to socialism and ultimately lead to communism, can be very much related to the present form of globalization in the 21st Century. The conflict between proletariat and bourgeoisie in capitalism, as depicted by Marx, can also be interpreted as a conflict between those who benefit and suffer from globalization. As globalization spread around the world, the different countries in the international arena can also be branded as part of either proletariat or bourgeoisie on a global scale. By virtue of their superiority in terms of wealth, income, capital, goods/services and technology, richer countries (North in the North-South Divide) sets, controls and even dictates the rules and regulations in the four basic aspects of globalization identified in 2000 by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), as follows: 1) trade and transaction; 2) capital and investment; 3) migration and movement of people; and 4) dissemination of knowledge. These four basic aspects serve as the means of production in globalization. The poorer countries (South in the North-South Divide) usually follows the dictates of the richer countries out of necessity and own survival. They have the majority in sheer number but they do not have much voice in internationally because they have less in the overall means of production in globalization. As the poorer countries struggles with the richer countries in the current set up of globalization, the occurrence of a class (poorer countries) taking action to overthrow and rule over another class (richer countries) that exploiting them, as per Marx's theory of class conflict, remains to be seen if at all it will happen in the future, immediate or otherwise.

Linking Marxism and Globalization: In Search of an Alternative Public Policy Framework

Towards a Common End of Understanding Socio-Historical Development and Modernity

In search of an alternative public policy framework as a conceptual framework in learning and appreciating socio-historical development, any researcher can use the social, political and economic thoughts of Marx. Marxism itself is a theoretical framework grounded on the study of both sociology and history. As a sociologist himself, Marx has developed his doctrine of communism based on the social existence of human beings and their social roles in the production process in the society. In his efforts to understand, change and revolutionize society, he has put a social dimension to Smith's definition of means of production by coming up with his own definition of relations of production and putting these two definitions under the concept of mode of production. His revolutionary communism even advocates fundamental social and economic change attainable only through class war, violence and revolution. In his theory of class struggle/evolution of mode of production, the social relationship between conflicting classes (the ruling and the ruled classes) serves as the defining mechanism of such a theory. His penultimate call for the unification of the workingmen of the world has posed a great challenge in overhauling the society and social relationship through his idea of abolishing families, countries and nationalities. In the same light,

using Marxism as a framework would reinforce any researcher's knowledge and sense of history since Hegel's historical dialectic and Marx's Materialist Theory of History are important features of Marxism. Moreover, Marxism has paved the way through time to be tested and applied to many countries all over the world, most notably in Eastern Europe, Latin America and Asia. In the course of world history, it has even spawned some ideological variants like Leninism, Trotskyism, Maoism and the like.

Aside from socio-historical development, modernity can also be understood and learned better by using globalization as the subject of this alternative public policy framework. In theory and practice, globalization has evolved tremendously. It has brought people, cultures, markets, beliefs and practices into increasingly greater proximity to one another through a complex web of forces and factors (Sorrells, 2012). As a phenomenon, it reflects modernity because it is transformative, encompassing, affecting, dynamic and forward looking with capabilities of changing global structures and processes, altering international relations and re-setting policies and priorities in the world stage.

By linking them together, Marxism and globalization can be utilized as a powerful tool towards a common end of understanding both socio-cultural development and modernity. Although they are and they can stand alone as separate and distinct social science phenomenon with different nature and purpose, they can be closely brought in together as interrelated phenomena, either positively or negatively.

Since they seem to be diametrically opposed to each other, Marxism and globalization can be interrelated negatively. They can be used side by side to debunk one another by highlighting each other's weaknesses and downplaying each other's strengths. Through their negative interrelation as opposites, each of them can promote and work on the failure of the other in order to validate and strengthen its own success. For example, globalization's failure would validate Marx's belief of capitalism's inherent contradictions that would bring about its own downfall.

In another way, Marxism and globalization can also be interrelated positively. The requirement here is to find a point of convergence between the two phenomena through refinement of definitions or reinterpretation of concepts involved. To illustrate this point, the disposition and scope of globalization can be recast in such a way that it could fit in even one idea or thought of Marx. Thus, a possible alternative public policy framework can reinvent the relationship of Marxism and globalization in such a way that it would favorably and solidly adhere on a premise or proposition that the genuine success of globalization for all parties concerned would indeed strengthen and even validate Marx's call for the ultimate unification of all workers of the world.

Conclusion

Superficially, Marxism appears to be unsuited and inappropriate in studying and understanding globalization due to their inherent differences in terms of origins and purpose. But, if any researcher would only take a second hard look and delve on the probative value of these two phenomena, he/she would discover and realize that Marxism and globalization are not and need not be completely incongruent and inconsistent with each other. As elucidated by the conflicting thoughts and clashing ideas of Marx/Engels and Smith/Ricardo, Marxism and globalization definitely have more points of divergence than convergence. Nevertheless, by linking them together, either positively or negatively, Marxism proves to be a sufficient public policy framework that can adequately explain globalization's possible success or failure in the future.

Finally, the social, political and economic thoughts of Marx immensely illuminate the national security concerns of individual state players that participate in the process of globalization. Such concerns, as dictated upon by their own social, political and economic interests, well-being and priorities, would determine the extent of their participation, adherence and commitment to globalization now and in the years to come.

References

Albrow, M., King, Elizabeth King, eds (1990). *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*. London: Sage Publications, 1990.

- Al-Rodhan, R.F.N., Stoudmann, G. (2006). *Definitions of Globalization: A Comprehensive Overview and a Proposed Definition*
- Bennagen, P. DC. (2002). *Social, Economic and Political Thought: A Study Guide*. Quezon City, Philippines: University of the Philippines Open University.
- Capra, F. (2000). *The Hidden Connections*. New York, New York: Random House.
- Curtis, M. (1981). *The Great Political Theories (Volumes 1-2)*. New York: Avon Books.
- Cultural Economy and Globalization. (2013). [<http://www.scribd.com/doc/88082690/Cultural-Economy-and-Globalization-HSE>].
- Ebenstein, W., Ebenstein, A. (2000). *Great Political Thinkers: Plato to the Present*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.
- Faux, J. (2004). *NAFTA at 10 // Economic Policy Institute // Commentary on Wages, Incomes*. 2004. February 9. [http://www.epi.org/publication/webfeatures_viewpoints_nafta_legacy_at10/]
- Giddens, A. (1998). *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Heilbroner, R.L. (1992). *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times and Ideas of Great Economic Thinkers*. New York: Touchstone.
- International Monetary Fund. (2000). *Globalization: Threats or Opportunities*. IMF Publications.
- Jenks, C. (1998). *Core Sociological Dichotomies*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Kacowicz, A.M. (2007). *Globalization, Poverty, and the North–South Divide*. *International Studies Review* 9.4 2007:565-580.
- Keynes, J.M. (1936). *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. Cambridge: Macmillan Cambridge University Press, 1936.
- Marx, K. (1848). *The Communist Manifesto*.
- _____. (1867). *Das Kapital*.
- McClelland, J.S. (1998). *A History of Political Thought*. London: Routledge.
- McLean, I., McMillan, A. (2003). *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mimiko, O. (2012). *Globalization: The Politics of Global Economic Relations and International Business*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic.
- Pass, C., Lowes, B., Davies, L., Kornish, S.J. (1991). *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Economics*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Sen, A.K. (1970). *Collective choice and social welfare*. San Francisco, CA: Holden-Day.
- Ricardo, D. (1821). *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*.
- Smith, A. (1776). *The Wealth of Nations*.
- Steger, M. (2009). *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.