

GLOBALIZED WORLD CRISES AND THEIR IMPACT ON NATIONAL AND GLOBAL SECURITY

Mihail ORZEȚĂ

Prof. PhD, National Defense University "Carol I", Bucharest, Romania
Corresponding author: morzeata@yahoo.com

1. THE INFLUENCE OF GLOBALIZATION ON WORLD SECURITY

The world is deeply divided by cultural, economic, technological, and religious information than by national borders of states. The differential access to information from that of common interest (news) and up to the scientific, technical, medical and military one generates discrepancies in the evolution of an important part of the world population. Illiteracy which affects about 25% of humanity is not a favoring prerequisite for building a successful common future that several leaders of different developed countries announce it.

The idea of using globalization as an engine for human progress and of reducing the technical, economic, and civilizing gaps and those of the living standards between the members of the international community is essentially rewarding. Unfortunately, the economic and political experts have launched in the public space different views about the essence and role of globalization, creating confusion, apprehension, mistrust, and even fear among some policy makers and ordinary people. The opinions regarding the concept of globalization generate confusion, perhaps because, as Dinu Marin asserts, "globalization is a theme whose truths have not been said." [1]

Opinions for and against globalization, stimulated or inhibited by such events as the terrorist attack on 9/11/2001, illustrate a picture of our world: on the one hand, "Prosperity due to increased economic integration," [2] on the other hand, terrorist attacks and wars, "even if not generated by globalization..., this contributed to their production." [3] The supporters of

globalization believe that "globalization is what we necessarily have to realize, if we want to be happy," [4] while the opponents of this process argue that the source of our unhappiness lies precisely in globalization." [5]

Guillermo de la Dehesa says that in the process of globalization "some will gain and others lose, as in all processes of economic development (...) Globalization is not an endless supply benefits to humanity, as some say, but it is not guilty of all evil that is held responsible." [6] The evil in many countries, according to Dehesa, is not caused by globalization, but of "bad governance, weak institutions and bad policies." [7] The same author also states that the number of poor is to a lesser extent than the world's population, the infant mortality is declining and life expectancy is increasing due to globalization and actions of governmental organizations and of some responsible international corporations. [8]

The inequality between rich and poor has become easier to spot and hard to tolerate after the world has become a "global village," allowing the knowledge of opulence and unimaginable poverty to others. David Korten believes that "the world is divided between the ones who enjoy wealth and those who live in a dehumanizing poverty, in servitude and economic uncertainty," [9] and the main cause is the leaders' lack of honesty "who promised us a golden age [but] they didn't keep their word" [10] and the transnational corporations that are interested in profit rather than the promotion of national states where they operate. These corporations produce where costs are the lowest, sell where profits are the largest and transfer their profits where taxes are the lowest. [11] In these circumstances the social tensions materialize in increased crime, drug abuse, divorce, domestic

violence, not only in underdeveloped but also in developing states. Everyday we find new cases of parricide, fratricide, incest, rape, kidnapping and ordered to prostitution, killing of one spouse by the other or pedophilia. Increasingly, more and more people stupefied by alcohol or drugs, driven by a desire for revenge on a society that has not intervene in time to their social decline, religious fanatics and followers of extremist ideologies kill their peers in schools, public administration, commercials or means of transport. Collective violence is also increasing. The confrontations between different communities within states are more and more. Street protests between different social groups, dissatisfied with their economic situation and the police and the armed clashes between the governmental forces and the separatist groups are almost daily events.

Are all these events of globalization? It is hard to say, and especially to prove. The fact is that globalization favors them through increasing competitions at political, diplomatic, economic and social levels among individuals within communities within the Member's communities and states in the international arena.

2. CAUSES TO WORLD SECURITY CRISIS

Life is a struggle and most likely will remain so. Getting off fight between individuals is impossible, Max Weber estimated, as they try to impose their peers through contrasting ways.[12] T. Parsons said that "in the modern industrial society the conflict is endemic as the equal opportunities is virtually impossible to occur and it is the risk to occur some <conflicting cultures> produced by the temptation of the strongest ones to exploit the weak" [13] Stanley Bing wrote that people are constantly engaged in a battle that takes place "in the worst of the trenches: the place in which we work." [14] Jose Ortega Y Gasset was firmly convinced that there can be no peace between the states, because they are engaged in a minimal or latent state of war. [15]

Crises are permanent in human existence. Basically, since birth, we are screaming. [16] Life has shown that the extent and intensity of crises differ according to emotional and

physical involvement of the human subjects. Perception towards crisis, i.e. the threshold of transition from normal to abnormal (crisis) is specific to each of us.

"If you want to know the depth and foundation of human nature, you must be prime minister and running for general elections," [17] says John A. Macdonald, Prime Minister of Canada. Human nature is complex and people can be dominated by the dark and the light side of their personalities. D. Bell said that humanity never ceased to wonder whether evil is inherent in human beings,[18] in order to find reasons for the committed crimes by people at different times in history. During the Antiquity, Plaut had concluded that "man is a wolf to people." [19] Later on, Thomas Hobbes said that "people need to consider each other as *equals*." [20] But, as he himself admits, regulating interpersonal relations based on equality is difficult to enforce because people are "aggressive to each other [...], live in perpetual distrust and seek to learn how to harm one another," [21] a situation that leads to "a war of all against all." [22]

Inside every man is an angel and a devil, Paolo Coelho said [23] but depends on the choice of us of the way to follow. Vladimir Volkoff believes that "human nature is bent towards envy,"[24] while Aleksandr Soljenitîn is convinced that "man is not the devil but he does not let you live... because the one that ate the same mess with you is going to sell you." [25] In his turn, Orwell, said that man is like "modelling clay." [26] His conclusion is supported by the impressive record of attitudes that most of the human beings show them in relationship with the others - from the "warbling" [27] ingratiating and terrified to the fanatic [28] and promoter of terror conviction. [29] In contrast, at the opposite of the dark side of the human nature stands the thread of loyalty, friendship, compassion, generosity, regard, affection and sense of justice considered by the individualistic people without content. [30]

The promoter of the well known Wikileaks - Julian Assange - said that people should be more transparent and better. To achieve this goal he decided to publish the incriminating secrets of the banks, NGOs and institutions of the States for their illegal practices. [31] Among his

declarations of intent and his behaviour there are many inconsistencies that prove “the road to hell is paved with good *intentions*.” [32] Unfortunately, his attitude resembles the striking facts that incriminate him: he wants power, those who have different opinions than him are considered to be stupid, he behaves like a dictator, hiding important information to employees, he does not accept to be controlled and contested, and aims to become untouchable after he wins enough money and organizes sophisticated system of companies. Having been accused of sexual harassment in Sweden, although the charge is not related to the WikiLeaks action, he hidden and warned that he will publish more compromising information about governments and institutions. [33]

Andrei Luca Popescu, the Romanian journalist believes that “Wikileaks is a key hole through which an approved eye can understand more.” [34] Most people’s weakness consists in their interest which they pursue by any means. They can be persuaded to spy, to betray or to commit some of the most abominable suppress crimes if they are promising to be helped in order to attain their goals and interests or using blackmail or threat. On the other hand, some people behave with discretion, defy rules of social life and disregard their peers because “the justice of the strongest is always the best.” [35] Moreover, as always “the fallen ones were in disgrace” [36] the largest mass of the led ones must bear the dictatorial attitudes of the strongest, because they were not able to face them and they have been subjected to win the competition by any treachery, deceit, [37] bribery, violence, coercion, threat, deception, blackmail and manipulation of conscience. [38] People touched by the intoxication of power are usually uptight and paranoid, which is why they always consider any defeat a personal affront and strive to take revenge on those who put them in the shade. [39] This kind of people watches their partners beyond competition as rivals and we should not make illusions about the future. Between the time when Plaut compared the man with the wolf and present, 2000 years passed over, but there are no essential changes between the ancient and contemporary people’s behavior. Some leaders of old and new kingdoms and

empires were declaring death sentences only because the “guilty” ones belonged to another ethnicity [40] or just because they had opposed to war. Between the tyrannus’ behaviour of the Antiquity, and those of the twentieth century – Hitler, Stalin, Mao and others – namely the employees of the Blackwater ‘private armies’ – who used to trigger into the innocent civilians [41] – and the Triple Canopy – which is said to have practiced the “cult of lawlessness,” [42] there are important differences in the number of the killed people. In the 21st century “there are still people who enjoy when they humiliate others... they pretend to be friends, but they are, in fact, rivals who want to destroy each other, so as to get with the other’s money and influence.” [43]

Some people made the apology of war by which they thought they can solve the evils of the mankind, from changing values [44] up to overpopulation. [45] Jose Ortega Y Gasset, for example, is convinced that the war is “a brilliant idea,” [46] if we do not get into account the ugly face and the terror it inspires, because this could stand at the origin of mankind’s progress. Stanley Bing sees the “war as the highest and in the same time lowest expression of the animal in us and of civilization in which we live and die.” [47] In turn, Majid Khadduri believes that “human nature makes the war norm, not the exception.” [48]

Although it is difficult to prove, I believe that many countries are engaged in an undeclared global confrontation, the “subversion being the main weapon.” [49] The competition between states is preponderantly carried “in secret” and “the aim of the secret actions is to influence the actions of foreign governments (...) population in general or a segment of *it*.” [50]

3. THE SECURITY STATE IN THE WORLD TODAY

The end of the Cold War was greeted with hope that peace will prevail in a world freed from the threat of a devastating war between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. After that event, Francis Fukuyama forecast the “end of history,” by which he meant a world without conflicts. Hopes were quickly dashed by local conflicts becoming more and more violent in

Africa, Asia and Europe. The world security shows a discouraging situation: the economic crisis, overpopulation, poverty; environmental degradation, terrorism and transnational organized crime; use of force in relations between states; frozen conflicts, which multiply and affect us all, are all wounds on the the sick body of humanity.

Usually, the seizures are a result of a complex of related factors, and the trigger is an excuse or an immediate question, which we are accustomed to call it "the straw that fills the cup." On a whole, the intensity and magnitude of the crisis are maximum when are added together and more dysfunctions overlap. In other words, grievances accumulate and "explode" when the mental interior barriers of human individuals yields the pressures and decide to assert their rights and interests using any means.

3.1. Global financial and economic crisis

For several years the world faces an economic and financial crisis comparable to the years 1929-1933. The causes are more or less known and the crises are felt more sluggish and acute on the low-income population. We are in an economic and financial crisis because from a moral point of view, the crisis is not properly addressed. Too many of our peers are engaged in personal battles – for positions and privileges – not understanding, that by getting out of the crisis, the economic issues will be more favorable for each. Instead of authorizing our actions against crisis we struggle against one another like in a war, we could emphasize the vulnerability of human societies we belong to, and the negative effects of economic recession.

New global economic order, claimed with such vehemence by the representatives of the transnational companies, through which they no longer want the state to be the main actor in international relations, has to be a substrate which aims to remove regulations that do not allow big business to make all the pursuit of profit. Basically, the desire for enrichment amplified the greed of many businessmen who have no other moral and profit than the law.

The state is the obstacle that prevents conducting illegal business activities that lead to dehumanization, the accumulation of huge

profits by trading companies and, especially, power and means to influence governmental decisions. The state must protect those who cannot protect themselves against traffickers, weapons traffickers, terrorists, organized crime networks, those who practice tax evasion charge against smuggling, those who move their business in the so-called 'tax heavens' to pay lower taxes and to accumulate as much wealth, against those who hire workers for 'black,' so as not to pay legal fees to state institutions, of those who practice slavery. [51]

Many criminal organizations pursue the "usurpation of political power and the creation of a parallel economy that damages the credibility of the fundamental institutions of the rule of law to the citizens' [52] through a complex arsenal of activities from which there is no shortage of labor swindling, gambling, usury, contraband, tax evasion, money laundering, corruption of public officials etc. When the actions of the organized crime go hand in hand with transnational companies, "failed states" occur on the world map. These are ineffectively governed, the political leadership is weak in law enforcement, the government power is low, their institutions are weak [53] and the underworld bosses impose their own rules and require their own interests, accumulating wealth, power and influence at the expense of citizens and the rule of law.

Located in different camps, divided by interest, most people think and act driven by today's concern and less by that of tomorrow. It seems that some understand society governed by the laws of market economy as one in which they must always win and others pay the price. It is the case of many bankers, who during the crisis and on granting substantial aid from countries where they work, their awarded salaries and benefits are consistent, moving to work with private jets and claim they are poor because of the crisis.

3.2. The use of evil force in interstate relations

According to Heraclit the "conflict is the principle or the father of all things." It sounds pessimistic, but the historical events have confirmed the truth. Although history has demonstrated many times, that the use of force

does not solve problems but amplifies or, at best, postpones their resolution, political leaders cannot be used to the idea that the army should have, first, a role to deter the potential aggressors and to participate in solving the crisis. In Kosovo fighting ended in 1999 but there are still tensions and they reignite from time to time. The war in Afghanistan ended with the victory of the Security Assistance Force since 2001, but the insurgency is amplified. The US-led Multinational Coalition against Saddam Hussein finished victoriously the war, but it continued to fight against the insurgents until 2011, [54] but the insurgence in Iraq still continues.

History, this “huge tower of experience, which time rose in the middle of the shedding endless plains of the past,” [55] gives numerous examples of the use of force between individuals and between communities, for the most powerful to impose their will and to achieve their goals. Since Antiquity it was believed that the gods are on those powerful sides. [56] Perhaps this is why the force was often, and not only the ultimate argument of kings, to settle a dispute between two individuals or between communities. Aristotle said that some people had made conquest and plunders their way to live. [57] Thomas Hobbes considered that “power which you cannot resist is a fair one.” [58] In the name of the “law force” campaigns of conquest were carried, empires were formed and ethnic and religious communities dismantled, forced to live in different states, and the tensions appeared, which subsequently degenerated into bloody confrontations.

3.3. Tensions between states and frozen conflicts

The dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the breakup of the USSR changed East-West balance of power and nature of relations between states belonging to the enemy military blocks in the Cold War. Currently, the relations between Eastern and Western European countries are based on cooperation rather than confrontation. NATO-Russia Partnership significantly contributed to reducing tensions between East and West. Russian attempts to regain its superpower status that the Soviet Union held it are marked by actions that tension

from time to time, its relations with the Western states, but the tensions are pushed to breaking relations. [59] The “file” of the issues in dispute between Russia and Occident includes NATO intervention in Kosovo and Serbia, in 1999, without the UN Security Council and recognizing the independence of the Serbian province of Kosovo, the US-led Multinational Coalition intervention in Iraq, 2003, without the UN Security Council, NATO’s expansion eastward, including the coverage of the Baltic States, former members of the USSR; the approval of the defense system against ballistic missiles, with interceptors in Poland and Romania, respectively aerocosmic space surveillance radar in the Czech Republic; the installing of the U.S. military bases in Romania and Bulgaria or the political support to Georgia during the “War of the five days” (7 to 13 August 2008) between Georgia and South Ossetia, supported by Russia.

Presenting the U.S. defense budget, in February 2012, President Obama said that the budget is one of crisis, but it is greater than the following 10 countries worldwide (China, Japan, Russia, France, Britain, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Italy, India, Brazil). The defense secretary Leon Panetta said that the draft budget will be lower in 2012 than in 2011 (662 billion in 2012 to 671 billion in 2011), because the forces were withdrawn from Iraq. [60] During his campaign for a second term, President Barack Obama has to find solutions to counter the accusations coming from the Republicans; they consider him the true cause of the U.S. security strategy weakness for that country cannot longer support two simultaneous land wars as before. [61] The administrative aimed at saving between 500 and 1,000 billion over the next 10 years by resizing and reorienting the defense budget priorities. In the future, the U.S. will provide more money for investment in areas that allow force projection – Air Force and Navy – top fields of cybernetics (equipment, software and technology to counter the bad cyberterrorism) and Special Forces. [62] During the press conference held at the Pentagon, President Obama reiterated that the defense budget will be sufficient to meet all known and projected threats. [63] Obama has also expressed his concern over the rapid growth of China’s military capabilities and of the

expenses opacity of its military and in order to honor its vows to the allies in Asia, the U.S. will refocus its priorities, concentrating its efforts in the Asia-Pacific defense.

Some American commentators emphasize the need for European allies to assume greater responsibilities in security capabilities to reduce U.S. dependence – mainly the air-space surveillance, management and force projection. Given the historically low defense budgets, made by the European members of NATO – on average 1.67% of GDP – U.S. allies put on the agenda of the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the foreign ministers formed in November 2011 and the agenda format NAC defense ministers in February 2012, as the issue of responsibilities. Nowadays, the U.S. has currently a defense budget that represents about 75% of the total NATO defense expenses. Therefore, the issue to assume responsibilities was discussed during the NATO Summit in Chicago from May 20 to 21, 2012. Americans have offered the “smart defense” solution which means the joint efforts on joint projects common to the NATO countries to reduce duplication, to reduce individual costs and focusing the resources to complete procurement projects faster, research-development, modernization, investment etc.

Referring to the U.S. shift to Asia-Pacific Region, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe – Admiral James Stavridis, during the Conference on security in Munich (3-4 February 2012), said that the twenty-first century is neither of the Pacific nor the Atlantic, but a global century. Consequently, NATO is not a global actor but an actor in a global world. In turn, the U.S. Ambassador to Germany – Philip Murphy – said, in the same conference in Munich, that the allied countries in Europe and the EU will remain the most important U.S. partner in security. [64]

During the preparatory activities of the conference in Munich, Sabrina B. Schulz opined that the efforts of the human societies should be redirected to reduce states dependence on fossil energy savings. Her opinion is based on data provided by specialists in the field who estimate that if current consumption rate of fossil fuels will continue, it will cause a warming of about 4.5°C by 2100. Corroborating this with the

prediction for population growth (about 9 billion by 2045) results in increased demand for food by 50% and the drinking water and energy by about 40%. The probable consequences are disastrous: the escape of 250 million people by 2050 is predicted; the melting of large parts of the Arctic ice is possible and raising ocean levels, affecting the harbours and the transport infrastructure of fossil energy; global warming will have global political, economic, social and demographic consequences not just in one area, but on a large area of Earth. [65]

During the election campaign and presidential elections in **Russia** Vladimir Putin promised in March 2012, the strengthening of the Federation military capabilities by assigning at least 540 billion dollars over the next 10 years for the purchase of a fighter aircraft in November, the development of ballistic intercept intercontinental missiles and something better, namely to modernize the fleet of submarines. Although impressive, the amount announced by the current Russian president is lower than those planned to be allocated by the U.S., or China, respectively, at the same time.

China, the world’s second largest economy, allocated about \$100 billion annually to develop its military capabilities. Albeit Russia – in qualitative terms, because they have sufficient force projection capabilities – aircraft carriers and strategic transport aircraft – China is still a strong reason for concern for the neighbors who are allies of the U.S. – Japan, South Korea, Philippines, Thailand and Taiwan. [66] The concern of the mentioned states is justified by the continuous growth of the Chinese offensive capabilities: it has 60 conventional submarines and it is planned to build another 90; it possesses intercontinental rockets; it has 8 nuclear submarines and it builds an aircraft carrier. [67]

India has a territorial dispute with China since 1962, when Chinese troops occupied the Aksai glacier in the northwest of China, belonging to Kashmir and Pakistan over Kashmir. Consequently, India is upgrading its fleet of the Russian products Su-30 Mk aircrafts, purchases the Rafale aircraft, produced by French that won the competition against the Eurofighter Typhoon’s in January 2012 [68], increases its fleet of air refueling aircraft and air surveillance

in cooperation with the U.S. and cooperates with Russia to manufacture the fighter aircraft of 5th generation and the refurbishment of the Admiral Gorșkov aircraft carrier, renamed INS Vikramaditya. [69]

The experts of the Security Institute for Strategic Studies in London noted that countries in Asia and the Middle East have increased military expenses to avoid and – if necessary – to counter threats that proliferate on the horizon of political instability in Egypt, Libya, Bahrain, Yemen and Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria insurgences.

The tension in Gulf is growing by tightening the economic sanctions against **Iran**, imposed by the U.S. and EU (banning oil imports from Iran, from July 1, 2012, if the Ahmadinejad regime does not give up its program to enrich uranium and to the intention of nuclear weapons production).

To these sanctions, Iran responds with the threat to close Strait of Hormuz through which about 40% of oil extracted from the Gulf States is exported. Celebrating 30 years since the Islamic Revolution in Iran (February 1, 2012), Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said his country will support anyone who fights against Israel and warned that if the U.S. military attacks Iran, it will lose confrontation and hegemony over the world. [70] Russia is in favor of stopping Iran's nuclear weapons program, but it is against tightening the sanctions because it has major economic contracts with the state. China and South Africa are against harsher penalties because they need the Iranian oil. Turkey is quite seriously affected by sanctions and decided that Turkish businessmen are free to decide themselves how to continue the economic exchanges with Iran to reduce the impact of sanctions on the country's economy. [71]

Some Western political commentators hurry to announce a possible war against Iran with the participation of the U.S., Israel and, possibly of the Gulf monarchies. President Barack Obama did not rule out the war, but he believes it the *last resort*. The current situation of the Iranian regime is similar to that of Ayatollah Khomeini, after the overthrow of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi Ariamer. Khomeini gained followers because he denounced corruption of Pahlavi

regime, the influence of Western culture and traditions and the public removal of traditional Muslim values. Although much of the population was against the Shah, it was not too pleased of the establishment of a strict Islamic regime, as Khomeini predicted. The legitimization and strengthening of the Islamic Republic have been helped from the outside: the failed attempt of the U.S. government in November 1979 to release American hostages held by the Ayatollah's followers, was categorized as interventionism; [72] Ataquing Iran by Iraq, on September 22, 1980[73] determined the population to support the Islamic regime and to defend the country against invasion, the invasion of Lebanon by Israel in June 1982 (the Operation Peace for Galilee) has helped to strengthen and enhance the prestige of Ayatollah Khomeini regime who accused Israel of aggression against the Arab states, "with the complicity of Christian powers, especially the U.S."

Currently, the Islamic government accuses Israel of killing some of its best scientists in the study and production of nuclear energy and the production of some damages to some of its study facilities and of ground-ground missiles experiments; [74] the Iranian officials accuse U.S. and Israel of cyberattacks against some uranium enrichment facilities in the Persian state; [75] Israeli officials said they are ready to attack and destroy Iranian nuclear facilities, but only if other options do not allow the objective of halting nuclear weapons development program by Iran. [76]

The events from Syria may have a similar pattern to those in Libya. The international community is increasingly dissatisfied by the increasing violence and requests President Bashar al Assad to stop using force against its own citizens. The lack of the Syrian political management response drew the Syrian ambassadors' expulsion from several countries, including Romania, to punish killings in this country of which authorities are accused, culminating in Houla. The peace plan proposed by the envoy Kofi Annan does not seem to play out. The military intervention solution of the international community is supported by the French President Francois Hollande, provided its approval to the UN Security Council, but it is

repudiated by Russia and China. U.S. President Obama declares himself horrified by the violence in Syria, but he states that his country cannot stop all the horrors in the world.

The strained relations between Turkey and Israel after the incidents on the Mavi Marmara ship, which led, in 2011, the expelling of the Israeli ambassador in Turkey, put gas in coals that is smoldering under the ashes of the Arab-Israeli wars. The Arab League guessed the advantage of Turkey's support in its dispute with Israel at the UN International Court of Justice in The Hague and quickly joined Turkey. The Turkish-Israeli dispute may compete with the Arab-Israeli disputes, thus the Iranian-Israeli conflict leading to a huge potential, with possible expansion in Europe and worldwide.

Amid growing anti-Americanism in the Muslim world, [77] an armed intervention against Iran would strengthen the current Islamic regime and, more important and more dangerous, would cause an increase in its prestige in the Muslim world, promoting the making of an Islamic front "against Crusaders and Jews," or a new "iron curtain Metals" to separate Islam from Christianity. Middle East "boils" because of both Iran and Syria as well as of the connections with the Middle East and North Africa.

The breakaway, self-proclaimed independent regions exists under some "rights and uncertain responsibilities in the international system, what diplomacy was designed to avoid over the last few centuries," [78] straining the relations between states and regional and global communities.

Taiwan is an independent *de jure* territory – operating on Formosa Island – but not also because of China, which considers the island part of the Chinese state. As a permanent Council member of the UN Security Council, any decision in favor of Taiwan, taken by this body will be blocked by China. Taiwan could not remain independent *de facto*, had it not been supported by the U.S. and the Western states. The recognition of Taiwan independence by the community of the Western states could lead to a war which nobody wants. Also on the Chinese territory, **the Tibetan community** claims the right to self-determination, having a government in exile headed by Dalai Lama. After recognizing the independence of

Kosovo, taking advantage of the Olympic Games in Beijing in August 2008, Tibetan militants have carried out an extensive protests campaign, trying to determine the boycotts of the Western countries sports challenges unless their demands are met. The firmness with which they were rejecting both protests and diplomatic efforts initiated by various foreign political figures have calmed the spirits and brought the conflict at a lower level, until favorable opportunities will arise and cause reactivation.

The situation of Kurds is a topical issue because it uses terrorist attacks against the Turkish state structures and representatives, where most of this ethnicity lives. The recovering of the historical Kurdistan is held up by the community in northern Iraq which enjoys wide autonomy in 1991, after the first Gulf War. The government Army in Ankara has bombed several targets located in Iraq and developed military actions in the northern part of this state to destroy the foundations of training and to capture militants. On this issue, the Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan said: "Turkey will not tolerate the establishment of an independent Kurdish state in northern Iraq!" [79]

Kosovo has been recognized by most Western countries, despite the opposition of Russia and China as the Western powers considered, correctly, that Russia will not trigger a new world war, as in 1914, to support Serbia. The agreement on unifying the consular offices in Kosovo and Albania, signed on October 20, 2011 has reignited fears of making the Greater Albania. The Albanian prime-minister Sali Berisha called for similar agreements in the customs, fiscal, educational, social and environmental areas, saying that Albanians should feel as well in Tirana and Pristina. The Agreement and Declaration of the Albanian Prime Minister Lazar Lazarov prompted to declare that such agreements usually hid some substrates. [80] The International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague ruled that the Serbian province's independence violates international law. In addition, the independence was recognized by 80 states and Serbia already has an agreement with its former province accepting representation in international relations, requiring that the name of the province should bear a meaning that "the name does not

affect the decision of the UN Security Council no. 1244 and complies with the ICJ decision.” [81]

The Caucasus presents striking similarities with the Balkans in terms of ethnic, religious and the relationships between communities that inhabit the area. Christians and Muslims make up a true ethnic mosaic: Armenians, Georgians, Azeris, Chechens, Circassians, Ossetians, Balkars, Adjaras, Abkhazias, Tatars, Alanis and Russians.

Soviet authorities have always been obsessed with the assimilation of the national minorities. This has made transfers of population from the Baltic states to Siberia and Kazakhstan, from the Caucasus in Siberia and Central Asia, from Bessarabia and Bukovina in Siberia and Central Asia etc. In place of these populations Russians were brought. If the interfaith and interethnic animosities were taken under control by force in the communist period after the disintegration of the USSR they erupted with anger by many hundreds thousands of people and causing an influx of refugees into the neighboring countries.

The conflict state is the main feature of the Caucasus. The armed confrontations did not solve their problems between past and present belligerents, but have slowed the development of the Caucasian states and have created a serious security gap. [82] The North Caucasus was the scene of confrontation between North Ossetia and Ingushetia, between Chechnya and Russia respectively. The South Caucasus was rocked by the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh, respectively by the conflict between Georgia and its breakaway provinces of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, the latter being supported by Russia. The Russian intervention for Ossetia, followed by the secession of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, during the Georgian-South Ossetian conflict in August 2008, was the response, given by the West for recognizing Kosovo's independence and a warning that it will not tolerate interference in the area being considered its sphere of influence.

The ethnic cleansing and violences pushed to the absurd were used by all sides during the armed confrontations. As in the Balkans there have been internal and external interests, pride, tradition and cultural differences which will not be harmonized too soon. To the rivalry between Russia, Turkey and Iran, the hegemony over the

Caucasus are added between Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, respectively the rivalry between the ethnic groups inhabiting the Caucasian states. During the confrontation between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, for example, Turkey and Iran have supported the Muslim Azerbaijan and the Christian Orthodox Russia supported Armenia. In the confrontation between Chechens and Russians, the community of the Muslim countries supports the Chechens subversively. The majority of the Western countries sustain the human rights, international law and the moderate use of force.

The Kashmir, a “land of legend and beauty...”, situated in the foothills of the Himalayas and Pamir” [83] as Joseph Korbel describes it stretches between India, Pakistan and China. Its territory is due to a fight between the quasipermanent India and Pakistan since its independence from the British Empire of the two countries in 1947. The declaration of independence was followed by the movement of about 10 million people – Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims – between the newly formed states [84] and religious purges that made at least one million deaths, mostly Hindus and Sikhs [85] and hundreds of thousands of refugees. Several armed conflicts (1947, 1965, 1971, 1998) were between Pakistan and India, all won by India. The nuclear tests made by India and then by Pakistan in 1998, have increased the tensions in the region and the international community fears of escalating the violence by use of nuclear weapons.

After 2000, the activities of the terrorist groups in Jammu and Kashmir has intensified and expanded, culminating in the attack on the Indian parliament of December 13, 2001, [86] with the attempt to assassinate the Prime Minister of Jammu State and Kashmir – Farook Abdullah in 2002 – and killing over 30 people in the Indian military camp of Kalucha. [87] After 2003 the situation began to return to normal by announcing the measures to reduce tension, coming from both countries. India's military potential is increasing and beats Pakistan in terms of military costs, number of military personnel, number of weapon systems and, partially, in terms of the quality of weapon systems. In the nuclear field it can be accepted that there is a parity between the two countries as a nuclear war

will not really have winners, because of he subsequent consequences.[88]

Pakistan wants to incorporate the entire Kashmir, for which it engaged in a real arming race with India, in order to achieve parity. Because of the conventional inferiority, Pakistan could be tempted to use nuclear weapons first.

USSR dissolution, the separation of the Czech Republic from Slovakia, the gradual dissolution of Yugoslavia, the separation by force of Transnistria from Moldova, the secession of Abkhazia and South Ossetia from Georgia – are just some of the stages of a long process, whose aim is difficult to anticipate. The Executive Manager of the Independent Executive Agency of Geopolitical Studies – George Friedman – estimates that “there will be countless Kosovo and Iraq’s sites in unsuspected places, at times hard to predict... Pandora’s Box is not yet closed.” [89] In a similar note, Madeleine Albright – former U.S. Secretary of State during the war in Kosovo – said: “when some conflicts give some hot, others simmer.” [90] Kashmir, the Caucasus, Transnistria, the Western Balkans, the Middle East, Middle East, North Africa, Venezuela, Peru and other parts of the world where the smoldering conflicts boil and which we typically call them “frozen conflicts” could change the world map in the coming years.

4. EDUCATION IS THE KEY OF REDUCING VIOLENCE IN HUMAN INTERRELATIONSHIPS

Several intellectuals believe that the human nature and culture are always in conflict because the human mind wants the unfettering by the barriers of the social conventions and the culture aims to reduce conflict level by building some “safety valve” [91] i.e. of some ways and institutions to control conflicts between people, of those between individuals and communities, as well as those between communities and of directing the human energies to non-destructive actions. The sociologist Lockwood thinks of culture as a “true infrastructure” [92] limiting the extent of conflict, although they will continue to appear in human communities.

Jean Jacques Rousseau believed that man was naturally born good, but the perverted civilization

makes him worse and he advocated for the removal of the civilizational barriers that do not bring anything good to people. [93] In keeping with Rousseau, Schiller blames civilization for that man turned into a villain.[94] In contrast, Freud opined that the suppression of civilization is a “shortsighted” [95] because its abolition would remove any barrier of the most bestial instincts of man.

Through education people acquire knowledge and build up their skills as they use to survive and to create material and spiritual values. Education should form characters as the moral integrity will be the one that will determine the well-educated man to choose right from wrong, legally from illegally, to maintain honesty and verticality in difficult situations. To avoid confrontations people have agreed on rules of conduct, of laws and other regulations locally applicable, to state or international. These have to be known and applied otherwise their existence is not reached. The knowledge and adaptation of the regulations to world development is possible only through education.

Education is the “weapon” that the terrorists and extremists can be defeated by who base their views on confrontation and on the differences between races, sexes, ethnicities, cultures and religions. The most important environment of confrontation is the psychological one and the target – the minds of ordinary people, of political leaders and religious moderates. These people need to understand the benefits of a peaceful coexistence in multiethnic, multiracial and multi-religious societies. The „non-violent” [96] activism will help the public to perceive the difference between the way of life based on permanent confrontation, used by the extremists and terrorists, and that one in which peace, negotiation and understanding are the basis of solving all the individual and collective problems. A well educated man will always use the power of argument in relation to other peers, while a man of low or high education, but who is immoral, most likely will use force as an argument to impose his point of view. A well educated man is responsible for himself, his family and community, while an illiterate one is closer to animal and especially leads himself by instincts, by going through emotional states and he is

dependent of the community leader which he belongs.

Darwin set out a principle of the human inter-relationships, then considered the “golden rule” of ethics, according to which we must behave to the others as they should behave with us. [97] **Understanding the other** and not “divide and conquer” should be the outlook governing all nations and the world. This pretty old concept may be considered by some outdated and utopian, but it is the way to achieve a peaceful coexistence and the acceptance of a common set of values of humanity through convergence and not by the clash of civilizations.

Endnotes

1. Dinu Marin, *Economie contemporană. Ce este globalizarea?*, Editura Economică, București, 2000, p. 16.
2. Eduardo Aninat, *Surmounting the Challenges of Globalization*, Apud “Finance & Development” (a quarterly magazine of the IMF), March 2002, volume 39, Number 1, p. 1, http://iip.State.gov/PD/IRC/Article_Alert.nsf
3. Richard Kugler, *National Security in a Globalizing World of Chaos: The US and European Response*, in „The Marshall Center Papers“, No. 4/2002, p. 39.
4. Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalizarea și efectele ei sociale*, Editura Antet, an și localitate neprecizate, p. 5.
5. *Ibidem*.
6. Guillermo de la Dehesa, *Învingători și învinși în globalizare*, Editura Historia, București, 2007, pp. 2-13.
7. *Idem*, p. 310.
8. *Idem*, p. 311.
9. David Korten, *Corporațiile conduc lumea*, Editura Samizdat, Filipeștii de Târg, Prahova, 1995, p. 28.
10. *Idem*, p. 27.
11. *Idem*, p. 147.
12. Max Weber, Apud Raymond Baudon, *Tratat de sociologie*, Editura Humanitas, București, 1992, p. 267.
13. T. Parsons, *The structure of Social Action*, New York, The Free Press, 1937, London McGraw Hill, 1964, Apud Raymond Baudon, *Tratat de sociologie*, p. 271.
14. Stanley Bing, *Sun Tzu Was a Sissy (Sun Tzu era un biet mototol. Subjugă-ți adversarii, ține-ți aproape prietenii și stăpânește adevărata artă a războiului)*, Editura Curtea Veche, București, 2009, p. 14.
15. Jose Ortega Y Gasset, *Revolta maselor*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2002, p. 262.
16. N. Sillamy, *Dicționar de psihologie Larousse*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1996.
17. John A. Macdonald, Apud Des Machale, *Vorbe de duh*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2005, p. 176.
18. D. Bell, *La morale et le mal, Les deux cadres de la culture de XXIe siècle*, Commentaire nr. 111, 2005, p. 658, Apud Vasile Boari, *Tratat de etică*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2006, p. 15.
19. Plaut, Apud I. Berg, *Dicționar de cuvinte, expresii, citate celebre*, 2004, p. 153.
20. Thomas Hobbes, *Elementele dreptului natural și politic*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2005, p. 122.
21. *Idem*, pp. 123, 125.
22. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Londra, 1651, p. 64, Apud, Mary Midgley, *Originile eticii*, in “Tratat de etică”, p. 30.
23. Paolo Coelho, *Manualul războinicului luminii*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2003, p. 45.
24. Vladimir Volkoff, *Defectele democrației*, Editura Antet, Filipeștii de Târg, Prahova, 2002, p. 55.
25. Aleksandr Soljenițin, *Arhipelagul Gulag*, Editura Univers, București, 1997, volumul 2, pp. 153, 196, 201.
26. George Orwell, 1984, Editura Cartier, Chișinău, an neprecizat, p. 222.
27. Aleksandr Soljenițin, *Arhipelagul Gulag*, volumul 2, p. 247.
28. Dominique Colas, *Genealogia fanatismului și a societății civile*, Editura Nemira, București, 1998, p. 11.
29. Aleksandr Soljenițin, *Arhipelagul Gulag*, volumul 2, p. 379.
30. Mary Midgley, *Originile eticii*, în “Tratat de etică”, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2006, p. 31.
31. Daniel Domscheit-Berg, Tina Klopp, *Wikileaks: mărturisirile purtătorului de cuvânt al celui mai periculos website din lume*, Editura Pandora M, București, 2011, pp. 12, 28-30, 276.
32. Samuel Johnson, *Viața poezilor englezi*, Apud I. Berg, *Dicționar de cuvinte, expresii, citate celebre*, p. 148.
33. Daniel Domscheit-Berg, Tina Klopp, cited paper, pp. 11, 20, 22, 75, 84, 91, 111, 117, 160, 171, 200, 230, 232, 272, 282.
34. Andrei Luca Popescu, *Ghid de lectură Wikileaks. Partitura lui Băsescu citată în cheia Taubman*, <http://www.gandul.info/news>, from September 21, 2011, accessed on December 14, 2011.
35. I. Berg, *Dicționar de cuvinte, expresii, citate celebre*, p. 191.
36. *Idem*, p. 341.
37. Vladimir Volkoff, *Dezinformarea văzută din est*, Editura Pro Editură și Tipografie, București, 2007, p. 29.
38. Alex Mucchielli, *Arta de a influența*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2002, pp. 191-193.
39. Tom Ambrose, *Despoți și dictatori, de la Nero la Saddam Hussein*, Editura Litera, București, 2008, pp. 28-39.
40. Michael Worth Davison – chief editor, *Where, When, Why and How It Happened (Când, unde, cum și de ce s-a întâmplat. Cele mai dramatice evenimente... și cum*

- au schimbat ele lumea), Editura Rider's Digest S.R.L., București, 2005, p. 19.
41. Jeremy Scahill, *Blackwater: ascensiunea celei mai puternice armate private din lume*, Editura Litera Internațional, București, 2007, pp. 30-33.
 42. Steve Făinaru, *Legea celor puternici*, Editura Litera Internațional, București, 2009, p. 40.
 43. Cristina Martin, *Clubul Bilderberg: stăpânii lumii*, Editura Litera Internațional, București, 2007, pp. 3-14.
 44. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Apud Nicolae Râmbu, Tirania valorilor. Studii de filosofie culturii și axiologie*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică R.A., București, 2006, p. 101.
 45. Thierry P. Millemann, *Fața ascunsă a lumii occidentale*, Editura Pro Editură și Tipografie, București, 2008, p. 22.
 46. Jose Ortega Y Gasset, *Revolta maselor*, p. 250.
 47. Stanley Bing, *Sun Tzu Was a Sissy (Sun Tzu era un biet mototol)*, pp. 170-171, 209.
 48. Majid Khadduri, *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1955, p. 57, *Apud Dr. Lewis B. Ware, An Islamic Concept of Conflict in Its Historical Context*, in Blank, Stephen J, Grinter, Lawrence E., Magyar, Karl p., and Wheeters, Bynum E., *Conflict, Culture and History*, Air University Press, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, USA, 1993, p. 67.
 49. Roger Muchielli *Apud Costel Susanu Riscurile vulnerabilității informaționale*, in "Psihologia luptătorului", coordinated by Horia Pitariu and Filaret Sîntion, Editura Militară, București, 2003, p. 225.
 50. Abram N Shulsky și Gary J. Schmitt, *Războiul tăcut. Introducere în universul informațiilor secrete*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2008, p. 129.
 51. *Idem*, p. 265.
 52. Vasile Fulga, Cristina Fulga, Dan Fulga, *Ucideți teroarea. Terorism, antiterorism, contraterorism*, Editura Centrului Tehnico-Editorial al Armatei, București, 2009, pp. 108-109.
 53. Chris Donnelly, Senior Fellow la Academia de Apărare a Marii Britanii, *Cuvânt- înainte la cartea Noul aliat. Regândirea politicii de apărare a României la începutul secolului XXI*, de George Cristian Maior, Editura Rao, București, 2009, p. 11.
 54. Rebecca Santana & Lara Jakes, *Iraq Prime Minister: Immunity Issue Scuttled US Troop Deal*, Associated Press, October 22, 2011.
 55. Hendrik Willem van Loon, *Istoria omenirii*, Editura Tai Pan, București, p. 9.
 56. Lucanus, *Farsalia*, *Apud Francois Bluche, De la Cezar la Churchill*, p. 35.
 57. Aristotel, *Politica*, *Apud Thomas Hobbes, Elementele dreptului natural și politic*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2005, p. 159.
 58. Thomas Hobbes, *Elementele dreptului natural și politic*, p. 126.
 59. *Russia and NATO: Pushing Tensions to the Limits?* Article posted on the Independent Agency of geopolitical Studies STRATFOR, in February 2012, <http://www.stratfor.com/Russia-and-the-US-pushing-tensions-to-the-limits/TRATFOR.htm> , accessed on March 2, 2012.
 60. Robert Burns, *Obama Unveiling Strategy for Slimed-down Military*, Associated Press, January 5, 2012, <http://www.nj.com/newsflash/index.ssf/story/obama-unveiling-strategy-for-slimed-down-military/1a6651a1f9734d6397742b76815d2204> , accessed on February 26, 2012.
 61. Thom Shanker & Elisabeth Bumiller, *In New Strategy, Panetta Plans Even Smaller Army*, *The New York Times*, January 05, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/05/us/in-new-strategy-panetta-plans-even-smaller-army.html?> , accessed on January 8, 2012.
 62. *Panetta Says Part of Defense Budget Will Get Fatter*, U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv, <http://mintpress.net/panetta-says-part-of-defense-budget-will-get-fatter.html>
 63. Jeffrey Smith, *Will Cutting the Defense Budget Leave America at Risk?* in *National – The Atlantic*, January 6, 2012, <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2012/01/will-cutting-the-defense-budget-leave-america-at-risk.252010/> , accessed on January 6, 2012.
 64. Tobias Bunde, *Building Bridges for a Global Century – An Outlook*, the 48th Munich Security Conference, 03.02.2012, <http://www.securityconference.de/Article-Detailes.57+M51a405efc27.0.html>, accessed on February 4, 2012.
 65. Sabrina B. Schulz, *Energy, Resources and the Environment-New Security Parameters?* April 3, 2012, <http://http://www.securityconference.de/Article-Detailes.57+M5c41a74bc41.0.html>, accessed on February 4, 2012.
 66. Sabine Pirone, *China's Pacific Reach to Spur US Spending in Antisub Warfare*, in *Bloomberg Business Week*, <http://www.iiss.org/wats-new/iiss-in> accessed on January 30, 2012.
 67. *Ibidem*.
 68. *Limits in the Modernization of India's Air force*, February 11, 2012, [http://www.stratfor.com/Limits in the Modernization of India's Air Force](http://www.stratfor.com/Limits%20in%20the%20Modernization%20of%20India's%20Air%20Force) STRATFOR. htm, accessed on March 6, 2012.
 69. Vladimir Radyuhin, *INS Vikramaditya sets out on trial voyage*, "The Hindu" 08 June 2012, <http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/article3503982.ece>, accessed on June 10, 2012.
 70. *Khamenei: Iran will Help anyone Confront Israel*, Associated Press, February 03, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/feb/03/khamenei-iran-help-confront-israel?INTCM=ILCNETTXT3487>, accessed on February 26, 2012.

71. Aaron Stein, *Turcia și Iranul: un echilibru delicat*, in "SETimes", posted on June 20, 2011, <http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/ro/features/setimes/features/2011/06/20/reportaje-01>, accessed on March 2, 2012.
72. Tim Weiner, *CIA, o istorie secretă*, Editura Litera Internațional, București, 2009, pp. 273-276.
73. Maj. Ronald E. Bergquist, *The Role of Airpower in the Iran-Iraq War*, Air University Press, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, USA, 1988, p. 31.
74. Julian Borger, *Who is Responsible for the Iran Nuclear Scientists Attacks?* <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/jan/12/iran-nuclear-scientists-attacks>, accessed on February 12, 2012.
75. *The Telegraph*, *Apud* <http://www.incont.ro/it-c/razboi-cibernetica-la-celmai-inalt-nivel-o-arma-fara-precedent-in-lume-a-fost-expusa-dupa-ce-a-atacat-iranul>, accessed on May 29, 2012.
76. Vladimir Yevseyev, *No Appetite for War: Israel View on the Iranian Problem*, 07.02.2012, <http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20120207/171202651.html>, accessed on February 26, 2012.
77. Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, *a Year after the Irak War*, 16 March, 2004, <http://www.people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=206>: the negative perception about the U.S. was of 93% in Jordany, 68% in Maroc, 63% in Turkey and 61% in Pakistan, accessed on March 15, 2012.
78. Graeme Wood, *Lumea nimănu*, article published in *FP România Journal* 1/ 2010, p. 54.
79. *Strategic Survey 2003/2004*, 2004, p. 148.
80. Svetla Dimitrova, *Un acord între Albania și Kosovo reaprinde vechi suspiciuni*, "SETimes", 31.10.2011, Sofia, <http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/ro/features/setimes/features/2011/10/31/feature-03>, accessed on February 26, 2012.
81. Igor Iovanovici, *Acord cu privire la reprezentarea regională a Kosovo*, "SETimes", 25.02.2012, Belgrad, <http://www.setimes.com/cocoon/setimes/xhtml/ro/features/setimes/features/2012/02/25/feature-01>, accessed on February 26, 2012.
82. Svante E., Cornell and S. Frederick, Starr, *The Caucasus: A Challenge for Europe*: <http://www.silkroadstudies.org/new/docs/Silkroadpapers/0606Caucasus.pdf>, accessed on September 7, 2011, p. 25.
83. Joseph Korbel, *Danger în Kashmir*, London, 1967, preface.
84. Farndon, John, cited paper, pp. 92-93.
85. Tariq Ali, cited paper, p.7.
86. Paul Wallace, *Terorism and the Indo-Pakistan - U.S. Triangle*, in George Cristian Maior, Larry Watls, coordinators, *Globalization of civil-military relations: Democratization, reform and security*, Enciclopedia Publishing House, Bucharest, 2002, p. 637.
87. *Idem*, p. 638.
88. *The Military Balance 2002-2003*, p. 222.
89. George Friedman, *Următorii 100 de ani. Previziuni pentru secolul XXI*, Editura Litera, București, 2009, pp. 48, 64.
90. Madeleine Albright, *Doamna secretar de stat. Memorii*, Editura Rao, București, 2008, p. 537.
91. L. Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflict*, The Free Press of Glencoe, *Apud* Raymond Baudon, *Tratat de sociologie*, p. 272.
92. D. Lockwood, *Quelque remarques a propos de „The Social System”*, *Apud* Raymond Baudon, *Tratat de sociologie*, p. 272.
93. Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, London 1762, pp. 188-194, *Apud* Mary Midgley, *Originile eticii*, în "Tratat de etică", p. 30.
94. Friedrich Schiller, *Scrieri estetice*, Editura Univers, București, 1981, p. 262.
95. Sigmund Freud, *Viitorul unei iluzii*, în "Opere" vol. I, Editura Științifică, București, 1991, p. 375.
96. Samir Amghar, Amel Boubekeuer, Michael Emerson (editors), *European Islam. Challenges for Society and Public Policy*, Center for European Policy Studies, Brussels, 2007, p. 17.
97. Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, London, 1859, p. 106, *Apud* Mary Midgley, *Originile eticii*, p. 38.