



**Conversation over tea: “Globalism: Separating the Ideology
from the Conspiracy”**

Speakers:

Habibul Haque Khondker, Professor, Zayed University, UAE

Faris Hadrovic, Business Development and Government Relations Expert, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Xia Liping, Professor, Department of Diplomatic Studies, China Foreign Affairs University, China

Parvez Karim Abbasi, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, East West University, Bangladesh (Moderator)

About: During the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the World Economic Forum's idea of "A Great Reset" turned from an analysis of optimistic economic change to the poster child of the New World Order Conspiracy theory. What became the most obvious in the discourse that followed was the fact that very few people truly understood what globalisation means. The economic science in favour of globalisation offers an abstract understanding of the process, seen as the ultimate internationalization of commerce, capital, finances and labour. The anti-globalist side perceives globalisation as the engine of a new imperialism, which replaces the old military expansionism with economic instruments. The conspiratorial vision further sustains that globalisation is a subversive process directed for hundreds of years in order to serve the interest of the global elites. In all these differing viewpoints, where do the strands of truth merge to form the real notion of globalism and globalisation?

Parvez Karim Abbasi, "The program, or as the title of our today's program says, is about globalization or globalism: conspiracy facts from fiction or ideology from conspiracy. So, we have a very vast topic. As is the very Arabian way, once you get the mic, you don't want to leave it. What I would do is I'll just give you a primer or the background about what we're going to talk about. This is onto each of the discussions. We'll go about 10 minutes roughly, and then we'll go for a Q&A session, and then at the end, we'll sum it up. So that's the rough plan. Again, globalization, what we claim is a 1980s or early 1990s phenomenon, is also a misstatement. If you go back even along the Chinese Silk Routes or even before that, around 3200 BC, you had ancestors of modern-day Lebanese trading tin from Cornwall and selling it all the way to Afghanistan, or lapis lazuli from Afghanistan being found in palaces in Greece and Egypt. There were global networks. For the first time, after the end of the Cold War, we had globalization as a sustainable integrated

framework where, at least on paper, there was free movement of goods, services, and even people. However, we have seen that at least in terms of free trade, many countries have made rapid advancements: Japan, South Korea, China, and integrated frameworks like the World Trade Organization (WTO) or the IMF have helped bring closer integration. But things went sour ever since the ascendancy of President Donald Trump in the United States of America, or some would say the ascendancy of President Xi Jinping in China. Now, we have parallel chains. Over here, the fruits of globalization are being contested. On one side, you have the new industrial policy followed by the United States of America, whether it's the Inflation Reduction Act or the Semiconductor Act, which many argue is protectionist in nature and is out there to contain China's rise. On the other side, China's integration is often seen as compelling many nations to be forced or fused into a Sinocentric world. Along with this, you have the contestation of ideas: weaponization of democracy, weaponization of human rights. Are those regional-specific or are they universal values? This contestation of ideas includes whether technology should flow freely or be restricted, and whether there should be a free flow of labor. These are issues that are being contested. So it's an economic discussion, a technological discussion, a political discussion, and a cultural discussion. With this broad framework in mind, I'm just telling you the enormity of this, and I don't envy our discussions because they have a tough job. We'd like to first of all listen to each of their experiences or their opinions on this. I've deliberately made it as broad as possible. I hope the discussions will bring in their regional perspective or their national perspective, and how countries that are not within the two blocks are faring in this context. With this, let me go on to the first discussion, and that's again Professor Habibul Haque Khondker, who also has, as he has pointed out quite rightly, three books on globalization. So the perfect person to start the show. On to you, sir."

Habibul Haque Khondker, “Thank you very much. I'll take this because it has a kind of dramatic effect and we look more business-like. Thank you, Abasi, for an absolutely brilliant introduction. That's some of the things I was going to say because when you think of globalism and globalization, people think it started only the other day and you get that perception. It's not your fault because some of the most popular writers, and they are well-meaning writers like Thomas Friedman and others in the New York Times, argue that globalization started in the 1990s. When sociologists read that, we basically laughed, and there was nothing better we could do. I was privy to discussions of globalization by the person who actually introduced the term globalization, and you can all go and check. His name is Roland Robertson, a sociologist at the University of Pittsburgh. That discussion began in '79 when I was there. I started my graduate work, but it started earlier than '79 because we have traced the concept of globalization, the genealogy of globalization, and I have been on this subject since my graduate school days. Some of my key publications on this are from the 1980s. In recent years, I have tracked the genealogy and history of globalization. While Roland Robertson was conceptualizing and coming up with this term globalization, coincidentally at Harvard, there was a business professor, T.H. Levitt. He published an article, "Globalization of Markets," in Harvard Business Review in 1983. So, some people actually attribute the start of globalization to that essay. The problem is, and here is the big divergence between academic thinking, reflections, and the popular understanding of globalization, the popular understanding of globalization has been popularized by, as I said, Thomas Friedman, who looked at economic and technological globalization. Economists jumped onto this and started saying, you know, the global market is being integrated, the volume of trade is increasing, foreign direct investment, technology transfer—these are indicators of globalization.

So we can push it back to the post-World War II period when globalization began. Some economic historians go back to the late 19th century and have documented that there was more free trade at that time than after 1945. These were the debates, and at that point, historians came in and said, "Look, let's go back to the Silk Route, let's go back to the travels of Marco Polo, let's go back to the travels of Ibn Battuta. Those were the moments of globalization." Some writers, some historians, pushed it back much farther and looked at Ming Dynasty China. Ming Dynasty China was globalizing under Admiral Zheng He, and suddenly there was an abrupt withdrawal from globalization. They said, "No, we want to build barriers, we want to be nationalistic," and they destroyed the ships, and there were laws against building large ships. So they withdrew, and this is a puzzle for historians. The point that I'm trying to make in this brief introduction is that globalization has a much longer history. And this is a terrible thing for people to do, but I'll do it. You know, if you want to know more about it, I wrote a paper called "Ur-Globalization" where I tracked three phases of globalization: the prehistoric, the Atlantic globalization which began with colonialism from 1500 onwards, and in the 21st century what you see is what I call Asian globalization. A number of writers have used the term multipolar globalization. The point I will make is that the idea that globalism is a conspiracy is like arguing the world is flat. So we can simply say, "Okay, the world is not flat; let's move on to a genuine argument." It cannot be a conspiracy because it's a process that has been going on for millennia, right? And as Professor Basi mentioned, it goes back to prehistoric times, the Phoenician period. Just consider one thing: gladiatorial shows in Rome. You are fighting elephants, I mean, animals like lions. Do you have lions in Italy? No, the lions had to be brought in from Africa, and there were trade routes. So this is exactly what the new generation of historians who are working on global history. They're pointing out Genghis Khan. His time was a moment of globalization. So, when we take this idea

very far back, we see that it has a long history. Now, the problem that we face today is the concept of deglobalization. Here, I'm also shamelessly being self-referential. Just look at the Dhaka Tribune; two weeks ago, I wrote something on globalization, and I ventured this concept of decentered globalization because one of the leading economists at L argued in a recent paper in Project Syndicate that there's going to be what he called fragmented globalization. A top-notch Columbia University professor of history, who is also a big market analyst, used the term "cocktail of globalization" at the last Davos conference, referring to the mixtures of globalization. I developed this concept of decentered globalization. Decentering is a concept in sociology, especially among critical sociologists, for some time. I thought this is exactly the moment we can apply this idea of decentering globalization with regard to what is going on—the return to nationalism in, you know, Brexit, the Donald Trump phenomenon, and maybe the second round of Donald Trump. The irony is that it is Xi Jinping who went to Davos in 2017 or 2018 and said, "We live in a globalized world, and there's no point of return." Now Asia is the moment for Asians to seize. Japan is saying, "No, we are in a globalized world." Singapore is a proponent of globalization, Kishore Mahbubani, and others. So we have entered into this phase of Asian globalization, multipolar globalization. There's no point of return; there's a point of rethinking, retooling, repurposing some of the ideas and some of the technologies. The world of technology—you can have a whole session on how China and America are competing with regard to technology. You know, India—I had never heard of it—is now one of the top 10 corporations in the world, and what do they do? They make chips. The world has entered into a chip war, and the chip war involves three players: China, Taiwan, and the U.S. We haven't talked about it in this conference, and you know that's fine. We're talking about other things. As Professor Abasi pointed out, we should not spend more than 10 minutes. I've done my 10 minutes, but I'll be happy to come back

whenever. If you have any questions, anything you want to know about globalization, please ask me. Thank you very much.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Ahead of time. Thank you, sir. As always, I am a big fan of your audit lectures. Thank you for weaving seamlessly historical narratives with sociological interpretation and economic analysis. With that background being said, I would now move on to our next speaker, again a friend from Bosnia. Mr. Faris, if you would kindly take the floor.”

Faris Hadrovic, “Good morning, everybody. Thank you for the introductions and the overall perspective. I’d like to share my views, perhaps from a part of the world that you’re not as familiar with. And that’s also, I think, a result of globalization or globalism. As we can see, we’re all part of one conference in different parts of the world. I would rather agree with the professor earlier that globalization started much earlier than when we started talking about it or once we started enunciating it as globalism and globalization. We can trace it back centuries to the trade routes of the Silk Road and military expansionism, with empires spreading culture, trade, and influence. We’ve seen a huge increase in global trade, economic growth, and prosperity in many parts of the world. As a result, we’ve seen the shift from production-based economies to services and now digital sectors. Now, an important question is sovereignty versus globalization, and I think that’s a top topic that we can just briefly touch upon at this session. The role of, in particular, major powers in each of the historical segments. I would argue also that globalization is a result of regionalism, and regionalism is a result of globalization. In Europe in particular, I come from a small country called Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is probably the size, in terms of population, of a neighborhood in Dhaka. It’s about three million, three-some million people, and it has a very tumultuous past. The country was part of what was known as Yugoslavia previously, and it went through a devastating war in the '90s. The '90s was a time when we witnessed significant changes

both in terms of increased international cooperation but also the advent of technologies and interconnected services, and most importantly, the internet. Bosnia, as a result of its tumultuous past and the Dayton Peace Accord, which stopped the war in the '90s, is a country that's made up of, believe it or not, 14 governments. We have one state government, which is the top-level government. We have two entities, one of the entities is subdivided into 10 cantons, and then there's a district. We have about 150 ministers or more than 150 ministers. On top of that, it's a huge administration. Bosnia and Herzegovina is an aspiring candidate of the European Union, and the European Union is perhaps a great example of regionalism and globalization. It is based on four primary tenets, which I believe the professor mentioned earlier, which are the free movement of goods, services, people, and capital. The European Union has put that in place as an aspiring member state. The question is, why is Bosnia an aspiring member state of the European Union? It's because mechanisms of cooperation such as the European Union provide additional advantages and opportunities for countries to both reform, advance, and integrate with larger economies in order to be able to reap its benefits. That's perhaps a microcosm of globalization because globalization and the resulting institutions such as, for example, the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund, were at least initially established with the goal of creating more interconnectedness and exchange of goods, services, and people across the world. We can also argue that tourism, or the increase in tourism in the last several decades, is also a result of globalization and the spread of information and desires of people to see, meet, learn, exchange, and connect. However, we also need to touch upon some of the anti-globalist perspectives. Here we have concerns about primarily job losses, fear of cultural erosion, and loss of national identities. We've witnessed that nations who are much more successful economically and politically have been able to export their culture to other parts of the world so that we now have a much more

global understanding of certain concepts but also of certain trends. Particularly with the use of modern technologies such as social media, we are much more connected and we can follow each other's trends online in real time. Perhaps just to touch upon the economic perspective as well. Briefly, we have to highlight in particular the role of small and medium enterprises, but also global corporations, which have brought certain concepts, products, and services all across the world and have made the world a much more interconnected place. This, as a result, has also translated into much more public-private partnerships, which has in effect also caused governments to be able to, or to have to, cooperate amongst themselves. We can also touch upon diplomacy, which perhaps is also a result of increased diplomacy, and a different type of diplomacy that we have now as a result of globalization and increased trade. I guess that would be all for the introductory remarks from my side, and then perhaps we can have more of a discussion afterwards. Thank you.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “This is probably—thank you very much, Faris, for very neatly encompassing all the aspects. This is probably the only session where the discussions, despite being extensively knowledgeable, are finishing way ahead of time. So we have 6 minutes of surplus time which we can all use in the Q&A discussion. But now on to Professor Liping for her own unique perspective and especially the Chinese view on globalism. Thank you.”

Xia Liping, “Good morning. Yeah, thank you. I'm very glad to have this opportunity to share with you my understanding of globalization. There are many definitions of globalization. I believe in general, globalization refers to the continuous strengthening of global connectedness and interdependence between countries in politics, economy, trade, and human development on a global scale, and the rise of a global consciousness. I think people use the word globalization in different contexts. First, we use this word to describe the feature of the era in which we are in. Globalization has firmly woven each country into the network of the world system, making it

impossible for any country to seek development without being involved in globalization. The second context in which we use the term globalization is as a tool and means of development. Globalization is often linked to modernization. The reason why many countries actively participate in the process of globalization is to accelerate their modernization. For example, through globalization, increasing flow of goods, services, capital, and labor can promote the economic development of a country. For less developed countries, globalization can allow them to enter overseas markets to sell their goods, attract foreign investment, and manufacture goods at lower costs. It also can open up their borders, allowing people to study or work abroad and return the money they earned abroad back to their home to support their families or even start a new business. But now, recently, the globalization process is showing a slowing trend. In reality, there is an anti-globalization trend in which the flow of goods, labor, capital, and labor slows down or even stacks globally. I will give two examples. First, international trade is an important indicator of economic globalization and a major driving force behind global economic growth. In recent years, the data from the United Nations Commission on Trade and Development shows that the growth rate of international trade has steadily increased since the global financial crisis broke out in 2008. The average growth rate of global commodity exports from 2000 to 2007 was as high as 12%, while the average growth rate of global trade exports was only 3.4% from the financial crisis in 2008 to the eve of COVID-19. Under the influence of the three-year pandemic, the growth rate of global trade has shown a precipitous decline. This is the first example. The second. Let's look at the international direct investment before COVID-19. The growth rate of global foreign direct investment was far lower than the historical level. According to the 2019 BO Investment Report of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the average annual growth rate of global foreign direct investment (FL inflows) was only 1.5% from 2008 to 2018. In comparison,

the average annual growth rate of global foreign direct investment flows in the 30 years before the global financial crisis in 2008 was as high as 18%. In addition, globalization has been disrupted by political factors. The main manifestations are as follows: First, the degree of diversification with trading partners has decreased. The United Nations report entitled Global Trade Update shows that priorities were given to countries with similar political stances. Second, geopolitical tensions are triggering a large-scale reallocation of global capital flows. According to the IMF's Global Economic Outlook Report, published in April 2023, the proportion of foreign direct investment flows between allied economies has been continually increasing, surpassing the proportion of the countries with closer geographical locations. There are also many other challenges facing globalization, such as global aging and deteriorating environmental protection. In the last part of my presentation, I would talk about China's experience. China is both a beneficiary and a contributor to economic globalization. Over the past 40 years of reform and opening up, we declared reform and opening up at the end of the 1970s. The People's Republic of China was founded in 1949. We had several decades of twists and turns, and China decided to adopt the policy of reform and opening up. China's own experience shows that globalization is an opportunity for development rather than an engine for something else. China has achieved rapid economic development by actively participating in globalization. The percentage of China's GDP in the world economy has risen from 1.8% in 1978 to 18% in 2022. Both urban per capita income and rural per capita income increased over 100 times, and 99.98 million people have been lifted out of poverty. I think globalization is a good way to realize modernization, but the extent and the way a country should be involved in globalization should be determined by its own national conditions, and you should find a way suitable to yourself. Thank you.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you, Professor Liping. Just some time, so we have the happenstance of again serendipitous circumstances of actually having roughly over 32 minutes still left on our hands. So thank you to all the discussants because you left a lot of time for the most interesting part of this, which is Q&A. Of course, the discussants themselves said that they're just giving a summarized version and again, they'll be happy to discuss different facets. How it's going to probably work, because we'll be finishing at 10:40 (we started 10 minutes late), is that I'll open up the floor and we'll take a bunch of questions, two or three, and then we'll redirect them amongst the discussants, or we can also have a wide-ranging discussion amongst the discussants themselves in a fireside chat-like setting. We'll see how it goes. So, if you have any questions, show of hands, please. Oh, okay, I see one, two, three. Okay, we'll go this way. Please introduce yourself. The only one thing that I will do, which is the death of any Q&A discussion, is please kindly try to be brief. Again, sir, we'll start with you. Kindly introduce yourself, though we all know who you are. But again. Then we will...

Question one, “Thank you very much. My name is Ashok Sajjanhar. I'm a former ambassador of India to a few countries. I also had the privilege of serving in Bangladesh many years, many decades ago. Today, I lead a public policy think tank. So my question is, maybe two questions, brief questions. One is to Professor Khondker, and if he could respond because he is both into academics and into the actual implementation of policies. My question is that the World Trade Organization is an institution that has always been at the forefront of liberalizing trade and promoting globalization. But the effectiveness and activities of the WTO have been stymied since 2019 when we had this dispute settlement body and the Appellate Body that has not been able to function. So what do you see as the future of the WTO? The second question I have is, you know, we have been talking about... I've heard two presentations from the two speakers. Unfortunately, I

wasn't here for Professor Khondker's presentation. We have been extolling the benefits of globalization, but of course, globalization is not all advantages and benefits. That's why there is an anti-globalization drive around the world. While globalization has had the capacity to lift hundreds of millions of people in different countries above the poverty line, it also has impacts on climate and increasing the inequity and inequality between different segments of society. The distance between the haves and the have-nots has increased. What would be the middle point as far as globalization is concerned so that both developed and developing countries can partake of the benefits rather than this gap between the developed North and the developing South increasing as time goes by? This is a general question. The first one was to Professor Khondker, and the second one he or any of the others could also please take.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Yeah, question. Okay, thank you, sir. Take your time.”

Question Two, “I am Ashik. I am pursuing my undergrad degree at the University of Dhaka, majoring in international relations. So my question is, during the fall of the Soviet Union, the victors of the Cold War, the West largely demonstrated that the world had now stepped toward the era of globalization. But in the last few years, the perception regarding globalization has changed a lot. Trump initiated a trade war against China, Trump's withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, and immigration policies in Europe, such as Britain's Rwanda Plan and Hungary's Stop Soros Act to deter the flow of immigration and refugees, can be referred to as examples. So my question is, are Westerners shifting their perception from globalization to de-globalization, and has the dynamism of globalization went in the West?”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you. Okay, so it's more about changing perception about globalization from the West. So I think we'll take the third question with the next round. Again,

just give it. So the first question, I'll give it focus for two minutes, and then we give the other two discussants two minutes.”

Habibul Haque Khondker, “Thank you, Ambassador. Can I use some of my unspent time here? No, the question that you raise is an absolutely brilliant question: what's the future of the WTO? Now, in order to know the future of the WTO, we need to know the past of the WTO. As you may recall, the economists here would know better that the Bretton Woods Conference that took place in New Hampshire, USA in 1945, planned three international organizations: IMF, World Bank, and ITO (International Trade Organization). Now, who killed ITO? And surprisingly, China at that time, China of 1945, was one of the founding members of that. Now, ITO was killed by the US Congress because the United States has always been suspicious of anything international, anything global. They killed the League of Nations despite the president's force backing it up, and they killed ITO. Once ITO was a dead issue, a dead on arrival issue, they went for GATT. GATT is a replacement. So, in 1995, GATT was transformed or retooled as WTO. And again, you know that it took a number of years for China to enter the WTO in 2001. So, with that brief history, you know that there are protagonists of WTO, there are protagonists of free trade, and there are forces, including the US, sometimes in favor, sometimes against. We really need to take that into account, the reality that there are certain forces in the world that would turn on and turn off depending on their national interest. The USA has been playing that game, against the advice of many OECD countries. They say, look, this is not something that we should be doing, and despite that, we are really on very uncertain territory. So, as long as we have—I mean, unless we have a stable USA—I see a lot of instability in the US in terms of policy shifts. We cannot predict what's going to be the future of the WTO, but these tensions will always be there. I want to emphasize the second point, which is the contradictory nature of globalization. We talk about the free flow of capital,

talk about the free flow of technology. I mean, that's a joke. Think of superconductors, think of high-tech. There is no free flow of technology. And think of labor, there's no free flow of labor. Although some famous anthropologist at BLE wrote a book called Flexible Sovereignty or Flexible Whatever, and that's a joke. If you're an IT specialist from the Indian Institute of Technology, you can go to Silicon Valley. But if I'm a poor Bangladeshi migrant worker, I cannot go anywhere. So there's no flexible citizenship, absolutely not. It depends on where you stand, your class location, your nationality, your education, your gender. Multiple factors intervene in the process of the so-called free flow of people. That's a joke. "Thank you", sorry I took more time than allotted."

Parvez Karim Abbasi, "The second question that was raised about basically income inequity, which is rising between developing and developed countries. Faris, would you like to answer that again? And again, this gap between developing and developed countries, what is your idea about that?"

Faris Hadrovic, "Sure, I can touch upon that question and also the second question. Perhaps I'll start with the second question if you don't mind. That's the shifting perceptions on globalization, particularly in the West. I think that what we need to understand is that despite some of the benefits of globalization that have been brought to different parts of the world, and those benefits are different depending on which part of the world we're looking at, there are definitely shifts in perceptions on globalization. In particular, because of the rise of migration in Western Europe and North America, migration is seen as a threat to local populations, as a threat in particular to their economic well-being and jobs, and perhaps more importantly, culture and religious identity. With the rise in right-wing politics around the world, particularly in the West, we see an exacerbation of that, and it's extremely visible in Western Europe. There's a rising trend; the economic, migratory, and other pressures will not wane, and the prediction is that the perceptions will not change, and

that the perceptions will continue in this direction, unfortunately. So there will be a rise in discontent in the West. In particular, North America has a different type of issue with migration, and that's both a policy and a perception issue. In terms of policy, the countries of Western Europe and North America, particularly Western Europe, have a low fertility rate, replacement rates. In order for the economies to grow and to have substantial economic output, they need migrants. The population at large does not necessarily always see it that way, and they see it as a threat, and therefore you have these cultural tensions. Now, to the question of rising inequality, I think we can look at it as both rising equity and inequality. We've seen a huge rise in international world standards of living. I think you've mentioned China. We're in Bangladesh now. India is also a great prime example of amazing transformations and continuing. India is now being touted as the next global superpower in the future, following China's example. So we have to look at the last three decades and see the tremendous progress that has been made worldwide in raising a lot of people out of poverty, raising educational standards, literacy rates. We're all interconnected. Almost everybody is using smartphone technologies now, we're using computers, we're connected, we can communicate on a regular basis. The minute I go back home, I can get on the phone or WhatsApp and we can talk, which is something that wasn't possible 30 years ago. But that has also brought the advent of new technologies, which has definitely helped increase the welfare of populations, but it has also unfortunately contributed significantly to disparities across the world. The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer, particularly because the wealthy, in economic terms, are able to get a larger chunk because they have the financial means to influence their economic activities in certain countries, exploiting, of course, local populations and a lack of local laws and regulations protecting their populations and workforces.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you, Faris. I do not want to stop you over there, but again, we are running against time. Professor, we'd like to have your opinion on this again for a minute or so, or take two minutes, and then we have, I think, two more questions lined up for you people.”

Xia Liping, “Okay, thank you for the question about the inequality among countries, among rich countries and poor countries. Just as Prof Faris mentioned, globalization overall has brought benefits to countries actively participating in this process. But of course, coins have two sides. There are disadvantages, but I think the most important thing is that a country should independently choose a policy to adjust the way it is involved in globalization. Inequality is not only an international phenomenon between countries but also a domestic issue. The gap between the rich and poor is also widening. In China, before reform and opening up, most people were poor, we did not have money. But after the reform and opening up during the past decades, the richer people get richer. We have billionaires like Ma of Alibaba, many billionaires. We also have poor people, but overall, people's living standards have improved, and millions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The government has also adopted policies to try to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor. Thank you.”

“Thank you, Professor. I believe that frees up our time for two or three more questions. So, I believe the lady over there, then Professor Shahiduzzaman, who also showed interest, and the young lady over there. These are the last three questions, and we'll take them. Kindly be as brief as possible so that we can hear the responses. Thank you. Introduce yourself.”

Question Three, “Hello, my name is Farah, and I am from Eastern University Debating Club. My question is specifically to Professor Xia Liping. As we have heard from our first two speakers, Professor Habibul Haque and Mr. Faris, they referred to two civilizations: one is Asian globalization and the second one is the European Union. As an expert, I want to know your

comments on this. Do you agree with them, or do you want to add additional information about these two civilizations? Thank you.”

Question Five, “Thank you, most esteemed professors. I've just retired two years back after 42 years of teaching security studies at the International Relations Department of Dhaka University. Now, my point is in the form of a question. I just flash back to 1976 when I was a resource person in a group discussion at a three-day conference of the Northern World Affairs Council of Northern California. The theme was how should the US deal with global demands for a larger share of the world's resources. As usual, being from the Third World, I sat down as the resource person in the midst of typically rich Californian millionaire elder citizens who wanted to see that America should be looked at as a patronizing power. But then I decided to whip the United States as passionately as I could. That was 1976, the time of the end of the Vietnam War, and the Americans were really getting a big deal of criticism worldwide for all the things that they did wrong in Vietnam. So, I would also follow the same line and blame the United States for taking away most of the world's resources and denying the rest of the world. Obviously, people were glorified and they did not like it, and I was also committed to my views. But then, over the last 50 years or so, I have matured to the level of realizing that this is not true. The United States, undoubtedly, despite its limits, has done certain things which are unparalleled. For example, I would agree with what Habib said. The United States really killed the League of Nations. In fact, the United States saved the League of Nations when President Woodrow Wilson decided that, despite the opposition of Congress, he would support the birth of a League of Nations and had it included as a point in the Treaty of Versailles. Most of the European powers took it with a lot of skepticism, and the American Congress decided to take the US out of the league, not to allow the US to be in the league. But despite such an American position, the European powers showed respect to President Wilson and

accepted the idea of a League of Nations. The United Nations, of course, would have never emerged without the Americans. They contributed so much to the idea. It's just the way that when the idea came up, they wanted to shape the world according to their own desires. They introduced the theory of deterrence in the '50s, and the Russians—who would know that the Soviet Union would emerge as their biggest rival? Right now, as I look at the—I'm sorry, just the last point—my Bosnian friend had talked about, for example, in the same vein, very anti-Western about their policy towards migration. But look at the reality: Russians, Chinese, huge spaces, and they're absolutely adamant not to allow migrants. They define nationalism in such a way that it's unthinkable. Compared to that, Americans and Europeans have always been very lenient towards migration. They had to put their checks. Because when you look at the Mexican border and the situation in the Mediterranean, any country with minimum civilized anticipation would oppose that type of migration. Thank you.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you, sir. Thank you very much again. You would want to stop it. It's just a matter of time. Apologies. I believe this one young lady, and then we'll give you a minute each to respond as best you see it. Please kindly introduce yourself and be brief.”

Question Five, “Hello, I'm from East West University Debating Club. My question is, how can societies and governments navigate the complexities of globalization, as it has some drawbacks, to maximize the benefit? Also, what could be some practical steps toward a more sustainable and equitable global system? Thank you.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you. So, let me time this right. We have one minute for each of you to respond, sir, whatever you think from the questions. We'll start from the lady first, then go the other way around, then Faris, then the professor, one minute each, and hopefully 2 minutes to sum up and let you go.”

Xia Liping, “Okay, yeah. Thank you for the question about the different civilizations. Unlike Mr. Habib, who is an expert on globalization and has published two books, globalization is not my focus of research, but I can answer this question. I think generally, there are different, the world is diverse, there are different civilizations, but there is no better civilization or worse civilization. So, China advocates dialogues and communication among different civilizations. We learn from each other so that we can promote progress together. And also to the word, I think the last question, how to achieve a more equal society, I think the world is progressing towards that direction. For example, you know, the BRICS is expanding now. We are talking about the concept of the Global South. I think that all the efforts we are making are toward a society of more equality. Thank you.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you. Brilliant. Faris, on to you. Your minute.”

Faris Hadrovic, “Thank you. I'll just say perhaps an overall comment. I'll say that from my perspective, and I've lived in different systems, political systems, so I've been in a communist socialist system and now in a democratic system, and I've lived in multiple countries across the world. I'll just say this: I'm glad that I live in this time and age, in the post-World War II era, where whoever you want to say the dominant power was, and it's obvious that it was the United States, and that those values were promoted. Those are the values of human rights, democracy, and interconnectedness. Those who haven't experienced other forms of government and other forms of being able to project your views or not, perhaps do not understand, particularly the younger generations. And I'll also just add a thought: there is a reason why certain countries are more lenient or welcoming, and why most migrants want to go to those parts of the world. Fantastic. I'll just leave that as a thought.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you. Thank you, sir. Your last minute.”

Habibul Haque Khondker, “Yeah, I think I'll address the last question asked by the student of East West University. Thank you for your question. Where do we move? How do we move forward? And to answer that question, if you follow the World Economic Forum, which is always in the headlines, sometimes you might have missed that there's something called the World Social Forum, where they talk about an alternative globalization. Thank you for your question. There's a book called "Another World is Possible." If you can't read the book, you can read my review of it. In this book, serious sociologists, economists, political scientists, and philosophers suggest that another world is possible. The anti-globalization movement itself is global. You cannot fight globalization with nationalism; you have to fight globalization with globalism. A new concept developed by my professor, Roland Robertson, and which I have advanced globally, is called "glocalization." The future of globalization is glocalization. My time is up, but I can provide more commentary outside of this seminar. Thank you very much.”

Parvez Karim Abbasi, “Thank you. Please give me a minute to sum up, and then we can conclude. Let me go to the podium because I need to appear presidential. Thank you for a wonderful discussion from all three of our very learned and knowledgeable experts and for the lively Q&A. I apologize for having to cut you off, as we are running against time. My 30 seconds of summation, or else you could have just gotten an AI chatbot. Charles Dickens started off "A Tale of Two Cities" with "It is the best of times, it is the worst of times." Globalization right now is undergoing change, whether it's technological change, economic change, the need for reforms and regulations, or climate change-induced mass migrations, which is posing pressure on reforms addressing rising inequality and social justice. But what we can all summarize from this discussion is: globalization is dead, long live globalization. It will continue to evolve and live on. As the global South continues

its inexorable rise, the narrative of globalization and its challenges will be forcibly refined, redefined, and reinterpreted. We only live in interesting times. Thank you again.”