

Palo Alto, 15. siječnja 2017. god.

Priopćenje za javnost – Ivan Đikić

Ponukan izjavom premijera Plenkovića “Koliko sam ja s njim (Ministrom Barišićem) razgovarao, on me uvjerava da je riječ o **tiskarskoj pogrešci**, a vidimo da u akademskoj zajednici postoje različita mišljenja od onih koji ga kritiziraju do onih koji ga podržavaju”, te člancima u *Jutarnjem listu* grupe znanstvenika te kolumnista Inoslava Beškera, odlučio sam prikupiti i osobno proučiti konkretne podatke o neetičnim radnjama u znanstvenom radu Ministra Barišića “Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?” (*Synthesis Philosophica*, god. 23, br. 2, 2008, str. 297-303).

Na temelju do sada prikupljenih podataka zaključio sam da je ministar Barišić:

1. **Plagirao tekst Stephena Schlesingera “Can Democracies be Organized”** – [Dokument 1](#) pokazuje da su dva odlomka iz njegovog teksta gotovo doslovno prepisana na str. 301 bez navođenja izvora.
2. **Neetično prisvojio ideju iz knjige Samuela P. Huntingtona *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century*** – [Dokument 2](#) pokazuje da je Barišić Huntingtonovu ideju o tri vala demokratizacije koristio kao svoju ideju/otkriće, a da nigdje u svom radu nije citirao autora i knjigu gdje je ta ideja izvorno iznesena.
3. **Koristio ideje iz knjige Carla Boggsa, *The End of Politics kao svoje bez citiranja izvora*** – [Dokument 3](#) Barišić preuzima ideje i neke formulacije iz Boggsove knjige, a ta knjiga se uopće ne citira u cijelom članku niti na jednom mjestu.
4. **Nekorektno prisvajao ideje iz knjige Roberta A. Dahla, *On Democracy* (Yale University Press)** – [Dokument 4](#) ukazuje na prenošenja tuđih mišljenja na nekoliko mjesta bez ikakvog citiranja originalnog izvora. Barišić u čitavom članku navodi izvor za samo jednu rečenicu preuzetu iz Dahlove knjige *On Democracy*, međutim čak dvije stranice prije toga (str. 299-300) Barišić prepisuje niz ideja i formulacija iz Dahlove knjige ne dajući pritom nikakvu naznaku o njihovu pravom izvoru.
5. **Koristio COPY/PASTE s Wikipedije.** To je neznanstvena metoda koju je ministar Barišić koristio opetovno kopirajući dijelove informacija s Wikipedije a bez korektnog citiranja originalnih radova. Takve greške nisu dopuštene studentima na fakultetima niti znanstvenicima, a pronađene su u ovom radu ministra Barišića u više navrata:
[Dokument 5](#) – Ministar Barišić prepisuje iz *Wikipedije* i griješi u navođenju izvora jer natuknica iz *Wikipedije* je krivo ukazivala na knjigu *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), a pravi izvor tih informacija jest članak “The End of History?” objavljen 1989. u časopisu *The National Interest*. Barišić kopirajući Wikipediju pokazuje da vjerojatno nije pročitao originalni rad i da ne zna za njegovo postojanje nego je krivo kopirajući Wikipediju citirao i krivi izvor.
[Dokument 6](#) – pokazuje da je ministar Barišić preuzeo više podataka i formulacija iz članka “Democracy” objavljen na *Wikipediji*. Barišić koristeći *copy & paste* kopira i pogrešno napisano ime autora jer se u tekstu iz *Wikipedije* prezime filozofa Fukuyame navodi na pogrešan način: “Fukayama”.
6. Promjene koje je ministar Barišić unio u kasnija izdanja svojega rada (*Dokos* 2010., str. 9 i Wischke [ur.] 2012., str. 238) pokazuju da se ne radi o “malom tipografskom propustu zbog kojeg se Barišić već ispričao”, već o **ozbiljnim znanstvenim nepravilnostima, jer je u popravljenom tekstu ideja o tri vala globalizacije pripisana Samuelu P. Huntingtonu - i u glavnom tekstu i u fusnoti s referencom** ([Dokument 7](#)).
7. Ministar Barišić je jučer popravio izvornu verziju svog članka u online izdanju časopisa *Synthesis philosophica* ([Dokument 8](#)) o čemu je izvijestio javnost na svojoj osobnoj

stranici: http://www.pavobarisic.eu/hr/dossier_fusnota.html. Pokušavajući prikriti svoj originalni plagijat ponovo je napravio znanstvenu pogrešku. Na kraju fusnote dodao je sljedeću referencu: "Cf. Stephen Schlesinger, 'Can Democracies be Organized?', *Maxim News Network*, 11/6/2008."

Kratice "Cf." stoji za "confer", odnosno "uspoređi". Međutim, tekst fusnote nije nešto što treba USPOREDITI sa Schlesingerovim člankom, već se tekst uglavnom SASTOJI od Schlesingerova teksta preuzetoga od riječi do riječi. Dakle, **opet nema propisnog citata** s navodnim znakovima, već se čitatelje zavarava da je tekst Barišićev.

8. Barišićev članak je zaprimljen 21. prosinca 2007. ([Dokument 9](#)). Schlesingerov rad je objavljen na portalu 10. lipnja 2008. ([Dokument 10](#)), a Barišić citira "*Maxim News Network*, 11/6/2008". Kako je Barišić uopće mogao citirati Schlesingerov članak koji je **objavljen pola godine NAKON što je Barišić dovršio i poslao svoj članak u *Synthesis philosophica*?**
9. **Kako je moguće da u jednom radu bude toliko profesionalnih grešaka?** Očigledno taj rad nije podvrgnut kritičnoj recenziji uredništva časopisa u kojemu je objavljen. Kad se pogleda Barišićev opus (<http://bib.irb.hr/lista-radova?autor=009735>), može se vidjeti da je u vrijeme dok je bio glavni urednik (1993.-2005.) dvaju "sestrinskih" časopisa - *Filozofska istraživanja* (na hrvatskom) i *Synthesis philosophica* (na svjetskim jezicima) - u svojim časopisima objavio čak 14 znanstvenih radova, dakle u prosjeku jedan rad godišnje. Urednici i članovi odbora odlučuju kome će se radovi poslati na recenziju i birajući "prijateljske recenzente" često se događa da uopće ne postoji profesionalna ni kritička recenzija.

Zaključak: Utvrdio sam postojanje plagiranja, niza neetičkih pogrešaka, krivih citata, kopiranja rečenica i dijelova odlomaka, te zataškavanja prijašnjih propusta. To pokazuje da ministar Barišić više puta preuzima tuđe ideje i predstavlja kao svoje te da čini cijeli niz grešaka u svom radu koje su u suprotnosti s akademskom čestitošću i stručnim znanstvenim radom.

Prvenstveno jer je plagiranje službeno potvrđeno od najvišeg relevantnog tijela u Republici Hrvatskoj, Odbora za etiku u znanosti i visokom obrazovanju koji imenuje Hrvatski Sabor, te uz ove dodatne činjenice koje sam pronašao smatram da je sve to dovoljno da odgovorni ministar **osobno podnese ostavku** jer se radi o kršenju akademske čestitosti i političkoj odgovornosti njegove važne pozicije. Brojnost ozbiljnih znanstvenih pogreška jednostavno su **nespojive s obavljanjem funkcije ministra znanosti i obrazovanja**.

Moji **osobni motivi** za uključivanje u raspravu ovog slučaja su jasni: ustrajavanje na akademskoj čestitosti te uvođenje nulte tolerancije na plagiranje u Hrvatskoj. Uključio sam se u ovu raspravu tek kada je službeno donesena odluka Odbora za etiku u znanosti i visokom obrazovanju koja nas sve **obvezuje da ne relativiziramo plagiranje u Hrvatskoj**.

Apel Premijeru Vlade Republike Hrvatske gospodinu Andreju Plenkoviću

Poštovani gospodine Plenkoviću, nadam se da uviđate, da se uopće **ne radi o maloj fusnoti niti o tiskarskoj grešci**, kako Vas je ministar do sada uvjeravao.

Uviđam da ste u svom diplomatskom odgovoru koristili izjavu "U ovom trenutku on ima moje povjerenje" - pitanje je do kada? Ono što je meni osobno najžalosnije jest da svakim danom odugovlačenja šaljete sljedeću poruku mladima u Hrvatskoj: **Znanje je nevažno, važnije je kopiranje**.

Kako ćete se osjećati Vi ili bilo koji roditelj kada tijekom nedjeljnog ručka pita svoje dijete:

P: Kako je bilo ovaj tjedan u školi?

O: Dobro, napisao sam dva eseja. Bilo je lagano. Dobio sam 5.

P: O čemu si pisao/la?

O: Ne znam. Mi u školi koristimo COPY&PASTE iz Wikipedije. Uopće ne stignem proučiti samu temu jer brzo kopiramo.

Je li takva obrazovna metoda dobra za mlade u Hrvatskoj? Nama je neophodno uvođenje više STEM sati u obrazovni sustav, ali može li se to svesti samo na funkcije CUT, COPY, PASTE bez razumjevanja? Ako se ne slažete s takvim obrazovnim sustavom, onda porazgovarajte s ministrom Barišićem još jednom i upitajte ga je li koristio iste metode i u drugim svojim znanstvenim radovima objavljenima u svojim časopisima?

Također skrećem Vam pozornost na još dvije važne informacije:

1. Na tekst o istoj temi profesora B. Lenharda (Imperial College of Science, Medicine and Technology, London) u kojemu je vrlo jasno definirano zašto ovaj slučaj predstavlja klasični primjer plagiranja

<http://www.telegram.hr/politika-kriminal/globalno-priznati-znanstvenik-boris-lenhard-malo-se-uzrujao-zbog-tekstova-kojima-brane-barisica-pa-je-analizirao-njegov-rad/>

2. Na tekst koji je rezultat istraživačkog novinarstva gospodina Nenada Jarića Dauenhaura, a koji pojašnjava moguće razloge podrške hrvatskih znanstvenika ministru Barišiću

<http://www.index.hr/vijesti/clanak/otkrivamo-znanstvenici-koji-su-podrzali-barisica-od-njegace-dobiti-milijune/943919.aspx>

Apel predsjedniku Sabora RH gospodinu Boži Petrovu:

Poštovani gospodine Petrov, preuzimanjem funkcije predsjednika Hrvatskog Sabora obvezali ste se na održavanje visokih kriterija političke odgovornosti u društvu. Javno ste naglašavali da ćete djelovati iskreno, moralno i odgovorno. Prema Vašim riječima, tvrdili ste da niste isti kao HDZ i SDP te da ćete biti korektiv negativnosti koje su te velike stranke u Hrvatskoj generirale godinama.

Osobno se nadam da iskreno podržavate politiku NULTE TOLERANCIJE na plagiranje, krađe i druge malformacije u Hrvatskoj. Na temelju pravorijeka Odbora za etiku u znanosti i visokom obrazovanju koje imenuje Hrvatski Sabora o plagiranju ministra Barišića, molim Vas da tu odluku prihvatite kao obvezujuću i djelujete u tom smjeru prema Vladi Republike Hrvatske. Odluka toga najvišeg državnog tijela za etiku u znanosti u Republici Hrvatskoj je do sada najvažnija službena odluka u ovom konkretnom slučaju.

Stoga apeliram na Vas da razmislite nastalu situaciju jer su političke štete u zemlji već sada očigledne. Nastavak javnog djelovanja ministra kojemu je Odbora za etiku u znanosti i visokom obrazovanju službeno utvrdio plagiranje uzrokuje eroziju moralnih i stručnih kriterija te ukazuje na nedodirljivost političara u našem društvu protiv čega ste se javno zalagali.

Apeliram još jednom na Vas i premijera Plenkovića da Vlada RH što prije postavi ministricu ili ministra koji će svojim imenom i životopisom uvesti visoke stručne i moralne kriterije u taj resor te doprinijeti uvođenju konsenzusa u društvu o neophodnim promjenama u obrazovanju u Republici Hrvatskoj.

Srdačan pozdrav,



Ivan Đikić

DOKUMENT 1

Barišić, “Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?”, str. 301, bilješka 4

The *concert of democracies* or ‘League of Democracies’ is **one of the most talked about concepts for the American foreign policy community. This idea was put forth by Democrats** and more notably, by prominent **Republican presidential candidate John McCain**. The philosophical basis is Kant’s idea of ‘perpetual peace’ with the argument that democratic governments are less likely to go to wars – particularly with fellow democracies rather than autocratic regimes. The assumption is that **a grouping of about 100 democratic nations would be able to protect human rights, enforce peace, and achieve prosperity around the globe – and even possibly influence nations under dictatorial rule to move toward democratization – and more importantly, circumvent the power of authoritarian states like China and Russia in the United Nations Security Council. The belief is that** the ‘League of Democracies’ could respond to global humanitarian crisis. In the past decade, the idea of the league of democracies had been promoted mostly by Democrats, **including such figures as President Obama’s foreign policy adviser, Anthony Lake, and Ivo Daalder, of the Clinton Administration.**

Stephen Schlesinger

(<http://tcf.org/commentary/2008/nc1930/?searchterm=schlesinger>)

One of the most talked about concepts for the American foreign policy community lately is the notion that the United States should organize a concert of democracies or "League of Democracies" to help reorder the world. **This idea has been put forth both by Democrats, including such figures as Anthony Lake, Barack Obama's foreign policy advisor, and Ivo Daalder, of the Clinton Administration -- and, most famously, by Republican presidential candidate, John McCain.**

The belief is that **a grouping of perhaps about 100 democratic nations would be able to protect human rights, enforce peace and achieve prosperity around the globe -- and even perhaps influence nations under dictatorial rule to move toward democratization -- and more importantly, circumvent the power of authoritarian states like China and Russia in the United Nations Security Council, who have blocked intervention of various sorts in places like Zimbabwe, Darfur and Myanmar (Burma).**

DOKUMENT 2

Barišić, “Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?”, str. 298

After the founding of the first modern representative democracy in America in 1776, the previous political epoch was symbolically delimited by two significant democratic revolutions – the French in 1789 and the ‘Velvet’ revolution 1989. This era was dominated by the model of the national state and building of the representative, constitutional, social, and liberal democracy under its frame. In this epoch, we can distinguish **three waves of democratization:**

1. The transition from a non-democratic to a democratic form of government – **1828-1926;**
2. A gradual renewal of democratic regimes in Japan and in the Middle Europe (West Germany, Austria, Italy) – **1943-63;**

Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century*, str. 15-16

Three waves of democratization have occurred in the modern world. Each wave affected a relatively small number of countries, and during each wave some regime transitions occurred in a nondemocratic direction. In addition, not all transitions to democracy occurred during democratic waves. History is messy and political changes do not sort themselves into neat historical boxes. History is also not unidirectional. Each of the first two waves of democratization was followed by a reverse wave in which some but not all of the countries that had previously made the transition to democracy reverted to nondemocratic rule. It is often arbitrary to attempt to specify precisely when a regime transition occurs. It is also arbitrary to attempt to specify precisely the dates of democratization waves and reverse waves. It is, nonetheless, often useful to be arbitrary, and the dates

3. The foundation of democracy in Southern Europe (notably the Mediterranean Area: Spain, Portugal, Greece), South America (Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia) – 1974-89.

of these waves of regime changes are more or less as follows:

First, long wave of democratization 1828-1926
First reverse wave 1922-42
Second, short wave of democratization 1943-62
Second reverse wave 1958-75
Third wave of democratization 1974

DOKUMENT 3

Barišić, “Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?”, str. 299

The 1990’s illustrated the increased **crisis of citizenship** in the world through the **loss of democratic civic values** and participation, **a decline of the sense of political efficacy**, and shift from interest on public good to **privatized life** and prosperity which is an important influence on the democratic participation of citizens in politics.

Carl Boggs, *The End of Politics*, str. 25

The **crisis of citizenship** has assumed several forms, including the **loss of civic values** and trust, **a decline of the sense of political efficacy**, lower voter turnout, decreased levels of social knowledge, mounting hostility to government, and the embracing of **privatized lifestyles** and identities.

DOKUMENT 4

Barišić, “Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?”, str. 299-300

The step from the polis democracy to the national state democracy was the result of change from the direct participation to the representative democracy. The so called second democratic transformation led to a radically new set of political institutions to represent the political will of the equal citizens. The representative democracy is **a system which combines democracy at local levels with a popularly elected parliament at the top level** and secures the consent of free citizens through election. Basic political institutions are representatives elected in national parliament and **popularly chosen local governments that are subordinate to the national government**.

The system of modern representative democracy **originates from Great Britain, Scandinavia, Switzerland, and areas mainly north of the Mediterranean**. Modern democracy was perfected in North America with a **system of checks and balances among the country’s major social forces and the separation of powers within the government**. Developed from the American Founding Fathers under the influence of ideas from Charles **Montesquieu** and John Locke, the **American democratic republic** became **in due course something of a model for many other republics**.

Robert A. Dahl, *On Democracy*, str. 17-18, 21

From today's perspective, conspicuously absent from all these systems were at least three basic political institutions: *a national parliament* composed of *elected representatives*, and **popularly chosen local governments that were ultimately subordinate to the national government**. **A system combining democracy at local levels with a popularly elected parliament at the top level** had yet to be invented. This combination of political institutions **originated in Britain, Scandinavia, the Lowlands, Switzerland, and elsewhere north of the Mediterranean**.

[...]

In the 1700s this seemingly marvelous **system of checks and balances among the country's major social forces and the separation of the powers within the government** was widely admired in Europe. It was lauded by the famous French political philosopher **Montesquieu**, among others, and admired in America by the Framers of the Constitution, many of whom hoped to create in **America a republic** that would retain the virtues of the English system without the vices of a monarchy. The republic they helped to form would **in due time provide something of a model for many other republics**.

DOKUMENT 5

Barišić, "Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?", str. 297, bilješka 1

In the famous book, *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), Francis Fukuyama claims that the **development** of the **western liberal democracy** may designate the **final phase** of **mankind's political evolution** and the end of history:

"What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_End_of_History_and_the_Last_Man

The End of History and the Last Man is a 1992 book by Francis Fukuyama, expanding on his 1989 essay "The End of History?", published in the international affairs journal *The National Interest*. In the book, Fukuyama argues that the **advent** of **Western liberal democracy** may signal the **end point** of **humanity's sociocultural evolution** and the **final** form of human government.

"What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War, or the passing of a particular period of post-war history, but the end of history as such: that is, the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government."^[1]

Referenca 1 glasi: The End of History and the Last Man. (Fukuyama, 1992.)

DOKUMENT 6

Barišić, "Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?", str. 297

The increasing **trend** of **40 in 1972** up to the **current** estimated **123 democratic countries** of the 192 states registered in the United Nations **may continue in the future**. Speculation of various theories such as **Francis Fukayama's** *End of History and the Last Man* (1992) that **liberal democratic nation states** were the **universal standard form of human society** has been disproved through the globalization process which flattened the boundaries and led liberal democracies over the state borders to a supranational world society. Transformation to global democracy threatens the fundamental principles of the former liberal nation state democracy.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy>

Currently, there are **123 countries** that are **democratic** (up from **40 in 1972**). As such, it has been speculated that this **trend may continue in the future** to the point where **liberal democratic nation-states** become the **universal standard form of human society**. This prediction forms the core of **Francis Fukayama's "End of History"** controversial theory. These theories are criticized by those who fear an evolution of liberal democracies to post-democracy, and other who points out the high number of illiberal democracies.

1. INTRODUCCIÓN

La última cesura en la historia mundial ocurre en el año 1989 con el desmoronamiento de las dictaduras comunistas y el imperio de la Unión Soviética. Comienza así una nueva etapa en el proceso mundial de *globalización* en el que la mayoría de los países del mundo —es decir, los Estados democráticos— son acusados de ser gobernados por determinadas personas. El aumento creciente de países democráticos, 40 en 1972, en la actualidad se calcula que 123 países son democráticos de los 192 Estados registrados en las Naciones Unidas. Las especulaciones de las diversas teorías, entre las que destacamos la propuesta por Francis Fukuyama en su libro titulado *El Fin de la historia y el último hombre* (1992)¹, en la que se postula que los estados-nación liberal democráticos son la forma estándar y universal de la sociedad humana ha sido desmentida por el proceso de globalización que diluye los límites y generó en las democracias liberales una cierta sociedad mundial supranacional. La transformación en esta democracia universal amenaza los principios fundamentales de la antigua democracia liberal del estado-nación.

El proceso moderno de globalización, de hecho, fue concebido a principios de la era Moderna con el descubrimiento de Colón de la India occidental en 1492 y la expedición de Magallanes, que zarpó de Sevilla en 1519 y regresó al mismo puerto tres años más tarde después de demostrar que la Tierra era, de hecho, un globo. En los últimos cinco siglos se han ido incrementando las conexiones de la esfera terráquea a través del comercio y la guerra, la tecnología y la

¹ En el famoso libro *El Fin de la Historia y el último hombre* (1992), Fukuyama afirma que el desarrollo de la democracia liberal occidental puede designar a la fase final de la evolución política de la humanidad y el fin de la historia: «Lo que podemos estar presenciando no es sólo el fin de la Guerra Fría o el paso de un período particular de la historia de la posguerra, sino el fin de la historia como tal: es decir, el punto final de la evolución ideológica de la humanidad y la universalización de la democracia liberal occidental como la forma final de gobierno humano».

industria, la ciencia y las comunicaciones, los satélites e internet. Los problemas mundiales y las organizaciones internacionales mostraron sólo la cara y cruz de una forma diferente de globalización.

Desde los años ochenta y principios de los noventa del siglo pasado, tras el derrumbamiento de la estructura bipolar del mundo, el proceso unificador de un mercado mundial único y de la sociedad mundial ha sido muy acelerado. Así pues, el término «globalización» en sí ha sido debatido significativamente en el ámbito económico, filosófico y sociológico como una noción que se refiere a la integración económica, cultural y política de las economías nacionales y los procesos en el mercado mundial y del nuevo orden mundial.

Después del establecimiento de la democracia representativa en América en 1776, la época posterior está simbólicamente delimitada por dos importantes revoluciones democráticas: en Francia por la revolución de 1789 y la denominada revolución «Velvet» de 1989. Esta época estuvo dominada por el modelo del Estado nacional y la construcción de representantes constitucionales y sociales en el marco de una democracia liberal. Por esta época, Huntington presenta su distinción archiconocida de las tres olas de democratización:

La primera, la transición de un país no democrático con una forma democrática de gobierno entre el periodo que comprende la centuria de 1828-1926; segundo, la renovación gradual de los regímenes democráticos en Japón y en el Centro Europa (República Federal de Alemania, Austria e Italia) y que comprende los años de 1943 hasta 1963; y, finalmente, la democratización de sur de Europa (sobre todo en el área mediterránea: España, Portugal y Grecia), y las consecuencias que ha tenido para la democratización de América del Sur (Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia) y que va de 1974 a 1989².

² Véase: Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, p. 16, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman 1993.

litical integration of the national economies and processes into the global market and new world order.

After the founding of the first modern representative democracy in America in 1776, the previous political epoch was symbolically delimited by two significant democratic revolutions – the French in 1789 and the ‘Velvet’ revolution 1989. This era was dominated by the model of the national state and building of the representative, constitutional, social, and liberal democracy under its frame. For this epoch, Huntington introduced his well known distinction of *three waves of democratization*:

1. The transition from a non-democratic to a democratic form of government – 1828-1926;
2. A gradual renewal of democratic regimes in Japan and in the Middle Europe (West Germany, Austria, Italy) – 1943-63;
3. The foundation of democracy in Southern Europe (notably the Mediterranean Area: Spain, Portugal, Greece), South America (Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia) – 1974-89.³

After the fall of the Berlin wall, democratization spread to Middle and Eastern Europe countries where the model of liberal democracy grew to a global form of government. Aside from that, in the contemporary epoch of globalization, the frame of the national is overstepped and the supranational and global area is opened. Democracy has been designated as the ‘last form of government’.

However, some people are afraid that the globalization process would diminish the area of authentic political acting and transform the public landscape. Democracy is not only a distinctive set of political institutions or a social and economic order but firstly a specific process of making collective and binding decisions with equal and free citizens in the center. As well, the question ‘Is the nature of democracy compatible with the global trend of society?’ must be observed. Proponents of democratic globalization, such as David Held⁴ claimed that it was necessary to create democratic global institutions. Their final goal

³ See Samuel P. Huntington, *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, p. 16, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman 1993.

⁴ British political theorist David Held from the London School of Economics is one of the leading authors and key figures in the development of the modern cosmopolitanism and globalization. He’s written several works on that topic e.g. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (1995), *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order* (with Daniel Archibugi) (1995), *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, co-author (1999), *Globalization/Anti-Globalization*, co-author (2002), *Cosmopolitanism: A Defence* (2003), *Global Covenant: The Social Democratic Alternative to the Washington Consensus* (2004).

Globalization and Democracy

In the contemporary process of globalization, we can observe the collision of forces which show marks of both philosophical approaches. There is a tendency to a peaceable world republic of united people through an international law, human rights, and international institutions similar to the United Nations. It is very interesting when you consider the idea of the founding of the *League* or *Concert of Democracies* with “more than 100 democracies”,⁴ which deems the new ‘global system’ as a means to protect human rights, enforce peace, and achieve global prosperity. This idea can be seen as a continuation of Kant’s League of People with universal republican state forms.

Conversely, we can see clashes and conflicts of sovereign wills in the global economical and political world market in the way Hegel described it. It is remarkable that democracies do not fight wars with one another. Robert A. Dahl claimed that “of thirty-four international wars between 1945 and 1989, none occurred among democratic countries”.⁵ But democratic countries fight wars with non-democratic countries and interfere sometimes in the political life of

4

The *concert of democracies* or ‘League of Democracies’ is one of the most talked about concepts for the American foreign policy community. This idea was put forth by Democrats and more notably, by prominent Republican presidential candidate John McCain. The philosophical basis is Kant’s idea of ‘perpetual peace’ with the argument that democratic governments are less likely to go to wars – particularly with fellow democracies rather than autocratic regimes. The assumption is that a grouping of about 100 democratic nations would be able to protect human rights, enforce peace, and achieve prosperity around the globe – and even possibly influence nations under dictatorial rule to move toward democratization – and more importantly, circumvent the power of

authoritarian states like China and Russia in the United Nations Security Council. The belief is that the ‘League of Democracies’ could respond to global humanitarian crisis. In the past decade, the idea of the league of democracies had been promoted mostly by Democrats, including such figures as President Obama’s foreign policy adviser, Anthony Lake and Ivo Daalder of the Clinton Administration. Cf. Stephen Schlesinger, “Can Democracies be Organized?”, *Maxim News Network*, 11/6/2008. [Footnote amended afterwards.]

5

Robert A. Dahl, *On Democracy*, p. 57, Yale University Press, New Haven & London 1998.

Philosophy and Democracy

Review Article UDC 316: 321.7
Received December 21st, 2007

Pavo Barišić

Institut za filozofiju, Ul. Grada Vukovara 54, HR-10000 Zagreb
pavo@ifzg.hr

Does Globalization Threaten Democracy?

Abstract

The topic of this article is the correlation between the modern process of globalization and democracy. The agenda starts with the concept of globalization, its different meanings and various layers, traps and paradoxes, consequences and effects, advantages and disadvantages in the horizon of contemporary life. Following a brief theme introduction, the article

The screenshot shows a Windows Internet Explorer browser window displaying the 'Taking Note' website. The page title is 'Taking Note: Can Democracies Be Organized?'. The URL is 'http://takingnote.tcf.org/2008/06/can-democracies-be-organized/'. The page features a header with the 'Taking Note' logo and 'A Century Foundation Group Blog'. The main content is a blog post dated June 10, 2008, titled 'Can Democracies Be Organized?' by Stephen Schlesinger. The post discusses the concept of a 'League of Democracies' and its potential to influence global peace and prosperity. A sidebar on the right lists 'Recent Posts' and 'Archives'.

Taking Note takingnote.tcf.org
A Century Foundation Group Blog

Public Says It's OK to Meet with Iran | Main | Time Mag Sniffs At Obama's Economic Plan »
June 10, 2008

Can Democracies Be Organized?

by Stephen Schlesinger

 One of the most talked about concepts for the American foreign policy community lately is the notion that the United States should organize a concert of democracies or "League of Democracies" to help reorder the world. This idea has been put forth both by Democrats, including such figures as Anthony Lake, Barack Obama's foreign policy advisor, and Ivo Daalder, of the Clinton Administration -- and, most famously, by Republican presidential candidate, John McCain.

The belief is that a grouping of perhaps about 100 democratic nations would be able to protect human rights, enforce peace and achieve prosperity around the globe -- and even perhaps influence nations under dictatorial rule to move toward democratization -- and more importantly, circumvent the power of authoritarian states like China and Russia in the United Nations Security Council, who have blocked intervention of various sorts in places like Zimbabwe, Darfur and Myanmar (Burma).

But can such a proposal really work? On paper, this sort of experiment sounds plausible. If countries with like-minded constitutional systems can cooperate on economic and environmental matters and governance, and

Recent Posts
2010 Year in Review: Maggie Mahar on Health Care Reform
Best and Worst in Education of 2010
What Does the Tax Cut Deal Mean for Medicare, Social Security and Health Care Reform?
Glad Tidings for E-books
Slouching to the Brink: The Coming Economic Crisis
Making Invisible Students Visible
The Risky Payroll Tax Holiday
The Great WikiLeaks Mashup

Archives
December 2010
November 2010
October 2010
September 2010