



Research Article

EMERGING GEOPOLITICS IN THE EURASIA: A GENERAL PERSPECTIVE THROUGH GLOBALIZATION-IMPERIALISM RELATIONSHIP

Mete Kaan KAYNAR¹ and Gökhan AK*²

¹Institute/Organization: Hacettepe University

²Institute/Organization: Nişantaşı University

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 29th October, 2016

Received in revised form 5th November, 2016

Accepted 3rd December, 2016

Published online 28th January, 2017

Key words:

Globalization, Imperialism, Geopolitics, Eurasia, Great Powers.

ABSTRACT

Recently, what we happen to see in many of the crisis regions of the Eurasia, such as Afghanistan, Korean peninsula, South China Sea, Crimean peninsula, Ukraine, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, Iraq, Syria and many others, it is likely to recount that those crisis get their seeds of origin from the historical pattern of imperialization. Positioning the political construction and 'hegemonic masculinity' of the 'Great Powers' of the world to be an essential factor in the facilitation, hegemonization, and orientation of global interests in line with democratization, human rights and neo-liberal economic policies, the aim of this research is to analyze the complex dilemmas and impasses of state ideologies, national and regional stakes and benefits, great power interests in line with hegemonic geopolitics, and border considerations in Eurasia, which is the most significantly conflicting region having in mind the contemporary world's crisis regions. Analysis of primarily a general perspective as well as mirroring the various actors' views and strategies on myriad mobilities and immobilities emerging in Eurasian territory today licitly or illicitly may allow for a critical assessment of efforts to make mutual interests more humanely compatible and effective among Eurasia, her neighboring territories, and 'Great Powers'.

© Copy Right, Research Alert, 2017, Academic Journals. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

In the world history, it clearly appears that certain civilizations existed as systems of independent states while others evolved into universal empires, in one way or another. In this sense, it is significant to put forward what conditions cause the pendulum to swing one way or the other, what the drawn theory implies for the future of the modern civilization(s), and where we stand now.

Thus, some political units in parallel with patterns of imperialism passion and ambition strove to grow larger in size and fewer in number. Because hegemony is doomed to be alone as it is considered even psychologically. This is also a crystal clear proof of being an inexorable trend which occurred throughout the human history many times. That is to say that those record-breaking empires in terms of both territory and population lay across the eyes of researcher and/or observer strikingly while leafing through pages of historical atlases. It looks as expanding pulsation of 'hysterically' describable social trend (Hart, 1948; Naroll, 1967; Marano, 1973). This trendy implication is obvious and its significance is hard to overestimate. The trend actually represents a process of the ongoing political unification of the world. The projection of the trend into very close future suggests the appearance of a single world-wide empire (Carneiro, 2004; Yu-wei, 1958). This could also be named today as 'Globalization' as the history actually created and called it for centuries with the same nomination.

Globalization through human history actually ran hand in hand with imperialism and colonialism. It is due to the crystal-clear fact that, following their settlement on the soil after agricultural revolution, relatively more speedily and progressively developing societies needed more resources for their own survivability. Actually they were stemming from their unlimited ambitions. Those imperial-oriented states formed their imperialism and empires all over the world by time. This was a geostrategic and geopolitical result. And at the conjunction of two old continents, Europe and Asia, Eurasia geostrategically combined these two continental landmasses (Lewis & Wigen, 1997) and stood like a statue of 'apple-eye' for those empires in line with historical patterns of imperialization. In this sense, our paper will try to explore the connections among imperialism, globalization and conflicts in the Eurasia crisis regions with respect to emerging geopolitics.

Taking form in hydrocarbon conduits, migration streams, drug trafficking routes, trade linkages, and military supply lines, the myriad mobilities emerging in Central Eurasia are commonly characterized as reifications of the fabled Silk Road. This historic reference, however, obscures the contemporary geopolitical complexities of propagating licit mobility in the region. Rather than mirroring the historic networks of city-states surrounded by nomadic frontiers or the shared political space of the Tsarist and Soviet Empires, Central Eurasia is currently composed of sovereign states

enacting varied economic and political strategies (Diener, 2015).

Thus, what we happen to see in many of the crisis regions of the Eurasia recently, it is likely to recount that those crisis get their seeds of origin from the historical pattern of imperialization and globalization. Positioning the political construction and 'hegemonic masculinity' of the Great Powers of the world to be an essential factor in the facilitation, hegemonization, and orientation of global interests in line with democratization, human rights and neo-liberal economic policies, this paper analyzes the complex dilemmas and impasses of state ideologies, national and regional stakes and benefits, great power interests in line with hegemonic geopolitics, and border considerations in the Eurasia, which is the most significantly conflicting region having in mind the contemporary world's crisis regions. Analysis of primarily a general perspective as well as mirroring the various actors' approaches and strategies on myriad mobilities and immobilities emerging in the Eurasian territory today licitly or illicitly may allow for a critical assessment of efforts to make mutual interests more humanely compatible and effective among Eurasia, her neighboring regions, and Great Powers.

METHODOLOGY, LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Research Goal

In this study we aim to analyze primarily an approximate general perspective as well as mirroring the various actors' views and strategies on myriad 'mobilities' and 'immobilities' emerging in the Eurasia crisis regions in general today -licitly or illicitly- through historical globalization and imperialism dilemmatic connection. This approach may allow for a critical assessment of efforts to make mutual interests more humanely compatible and effective among -such as- today's most imminent crisis Syria, her neighbors, and Great Powers in line with our general view on the Eurasian impasse.

Sample and Data Collection

The data collection of the study mainly stands on primary and secondary literature works related to the issues of this study. Thus, data have been obtained from that literature in order to make our conclusions, comments and proposals.

Development of Hypotheses

In the aftermath of the 'Big Wars' of 20th century, nations began to believe that there would be a new-world order which would prevent devastation of the future of humanity. However, there was a great and 'intolerable' hope for peace in the Cold War era. During those periods of peace pacifist theories multiply and swell like mushrooms after rain: "*The end of the Cold War... helped spark a renaissance in the study of ideas.*" (Brooks & Wohlforth, 2000/1) Highly complex theories such as constructivism, liberalism, modernization, combinations of them, and combinations between them and realism appeared to explain the peaceful demise of the Cold War (Ostrovsky, 2007; Wohlforth, 1998). However, these theories today seems not continuing anymore when we consider what was happening in many crisis areas in the Eurasia, particularly in the Middle and Near East. Globalization based modern imperialism and orientalism of current times swept them away as a new large 'war-lord'

phase of imperialism. Our peace does not prevail longer. Today we hit to a new a sort of imperialism. There are no long discussions whether war remains profitable in an economically interdependent world which was taken place during the late 1930s: "*A triple Alliance faced a dual Alliance and neither had much reason for attacking the other.*" (Wells, 1940). Force overwhelmed law (Ostrovsky, 2007): "*War is an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will... Force -that is physical force... is thus the means of war...*" (Clausewitz, 1832-34) Homer Lea (1909) emphasized: "*Ideals, laws and constitutions are but temporary effulgence, and are existent only as long as the strength remains vital...*" In this context, the argument that;

1. Warfare is the exclusive mechanism of political unification, since this had been the rule in the times of Shang Yang (d. 338 BC) as the 'most ancient',¹ and this rule outlived him two millennia (so far) by Hitler who softened his criticism of British Empire considering the same rule.²
2. And imperialism as being the determining factor of global hegemony has long been object of interest for global hegemony literature, and thus many studies have suggested that all the phenomena of the present have the appearance of a preparatory struggle for the points of departure of the final battle for the planetary order and foresaw cataclysmic war which will erupt at the forthcoming historical juncture and then a new super-system mentality will be in place (Jaspers, 1949; Bundy, 1988; Herwig, 1999).

On the other hand very few surveys found no direct link between imperialism behavior and globalization performance. As a result, many authors are not skeptical anymore about attempting to establish a direct link between imperialism and globalization have began to seek the factors that mediate the relationship between the today's geopolitics developments and Great Power performances and attitudes (Bodde, 1967; Blouet, 2001). Following this view, we focused on learning orientation and sought the mediator effect of this factor on the relationship between imperialism behavior and globalization performance. Many authors have asserted relationships between imperial attitudes and globalization learning over increasing gravity of Eurasia in the world geopolitics -due to a world out of order (Brzezinski, 1997; Gray, 2002; Spykman, 1942).

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Globalization vs. Imperialism

Globalization as a term seems innocent enough if considered as "*the process of international integration arising from the interchange of world views, products, ideas and other aspects of culture.*" (Albrow & King, 1990) In line with the globalization, advances in transportation, such as the steam locomotive, steamship, jet engine, container ships, and in telecommunications infrastructure, including the rise of the telegraph and its modern offspring, the Internet, and mobile

¹ "*What is the reason that the name [of a certain ruler] is honored, [] lands are vast, and he even imposes his dominion over the All under Heaven? [The reason is] that he wins in war... Since most ancient times till the present say it never happened that someone reached rule in All under Heaven without gaining victories.*"

² "*By whatever means Great Britain may have gained its colonial possessions - and I know this entailed the use of force, the use of most brutal force in many instances- I nevertheless realize that no other empire has ever been created by different means.*"

phones, have been major factors in globalization, generating further interdependence of economic and cultural activities (Wolf, 2014; Guyford, 1972). In 2000, the International Money Fund (IMF) (2000) identified four basic aspects of globalization: trade and transactions, capital and investment movements, migration and movement of people, and the dissemination of knowledge. Globalizing processes affect and are affected by business and work organization, economics, socio-cultural resources, and the natural environment.

Some thinkers try to explore the non-innocent sides of globalization. For example, Fotopulos (2001) defined 'economic globalization' as the opening and deregulation of commodity, capital and labor markets that led toward present neoliberal globalization. He used 'political globalization' to refer to the emergence of a transnational elite and a phasing out of the nation-state. 'Cultural globalization', he used to reference the worldwide homogenization of culture. Other of his usages included 'ideological globalization', 'technological globalization' and 'social globalization'.

Steger (2009) identifies four main empirical dimensions of globalization: economic, political, cultural, and ecological, with a fifth dimension -the ideological- cutting across the other four. The ideological dimension, according to Steger, is filled with a range of norms, claims, beliefs, and narratives about the phenomenon itself.

James and Steger (2014) asserts that the concept of globalization emerged from the intersection of four interrelated sets of "communities of practice": academics, journalists, publishers/editors, and librarians by noting that the term was used "in education to describe the global life of the mind"; in international relations to describe the extension of the European Common Market. James (2005) has also argued that four different forms of globalization can be distinguished that complement and cut across the solely empirical dimensions. According to James, the oldest dominant form of globalization is embodied globalization, the movement of people. A second form is agency-extended globalization, the circulation of agents of different institutions, organizations, and polities, including imperial agents. Object-extended globalization, a third form, is the movement of commodities and other objects of exchange. The transmission of ideas, images, knowledge and information across world-space he calls disembodied globalization, maintaining that it is currently the dominant form of globalization. James (2014) holds that this series of distinctions allows for an understanding of how, today, the most embodied forms of globalization such as the movement of refugees and migrants are increasingly restricted, while the most disembodied forms such as the circulation of financial instruments and codes are the most deregulated.

In the history of globalization, 19th century comprises a unique place. During this century, globalization approached its modern form as a direct result of the industrial revolution (O'Rourke & Williamson, 2000). More nations embraced international trade. Globalization in this period was decisively shaped by 19th-century imperialism such as observed violently in Africa and Asia (Gittins, 2006). That's why, reactions to processes contributing to globalization have varied widely with a history as long as extraterritorial contact and trade. Proponents of economic growth, expansion and development,

in general, view globalizing processes as desirable or necessary to the well-being of human society (Sen, 1970).

Antagonists view one or more globalizing processes as detrimental to social well-being on a global or local scale (Sen, 1970); this includes those who question either the social or natural sustainability of long-term and continuous economic expansion, the social structural inequality caused by these processes, and the colonial, imperialistic, or hegemonic ethnocentrism, cultural assimilation and cultural appropriation that underlie such processes. Critiques of globalization generally stem from discussions surrounding the impact of such processes on the planet as well as the human costs. They challenge directly traditional metrics, such as GDP, and look to other measures, such as the World Bank's Gini coefficient or the Happy Planet Index, and point to a "multitude of interconnected fatal consequences-social disintegration, a breakdown of democracy, more rapid and extensive deterioration of the environment, the spread of new diseases, increasing poverty and alienation" (Capra, 2002) which they claim are the unintended consequences of globalization. Others point out that, while the forces of globalization have led to the spread of western-style democracy, this has been accompanied by an increase in inter-ethnic tension and violence as free market economic policies combine with democratic processes of universal suffrage as well as an escalation in militarization to impose democratic principles and as a means to conflict resolution (Sorrells, 2013).

Eurasia and Historical-Imperial Impasse

"Eurasia is the chessboard on which the struggle for global primacy continues to be played, and that struggle involves geostrategy - the strategic management of geopolitical interests." Zbigniew Brzezinski (1997) wrote in *The Grand Chessboard*. Only a year before the legendary U.S. geopolitical analyst published his classic treatise on Eurasian power, the leaders of China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia and Tajikistan founded a Eurasian political, economic and military organization called the Shanghai Five. After the inclusion of Uzbekistan in 2001, it was renamed the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) (Steinbock, 2013).

Many nations have received observer status at the SCO summits, including Afghanistan, India, Iran, Mongolia, and Pakistan. The United States has applied for observer status in the SCO, but it was rejected in 2006. Then again, all observer states are located within Eurasia. Since 2008, the SCO has also gained a number of 'dialogue partners', including Belarus, Sri Lanka and Turkey, a member of NATO. Today, the SCO's six full members account for 60 percent of the land mass of Eurasia, which is home to a quarter of world population.

For half a millennium, world affairs were dominated by Eurasian powers and peoples who fought with one another for regional domination and reached out for global power. Again, as Brzezinski (1997) argued, *"Now a non-Eurasian power is preeminent in Eurasia - and America's global primacy is directly dependent on how long and how effectively its preponderance on the Eurasian continent is sustained."*

By considering 'heartland' and 'rimland' in the history of geostrategy, Eurasia is a unique geography in terms of new opportunities which guide world economy and economical

conditions and rules (Meinig, 1956). For example, from the standpoint of China and the SCO, the world economy is at a crossroads. This situation drives two main reasons on us. First, no large emerging economy is immune to the negative impact of this huge shift. It will contribute to economic, political and strategic risks not just globally, but regionally as well. Second, as the presence of the United States in Asia overall will gradually wane in relative terms, China's role is steadily increasing in the region. In the past decade, the U.S. role has been predicated on largely military and security concerns in the Middle East and South Asia, and it came with substantial defense assistance sweetened by aid packages. In contrast, Chinese rebalancing in Asia seems that it is based increasingly on economic, trade and investment concerns (Brooks & Wohlforth, 2008).

Thus, regarding the landmass of Eurasia as the center of global power, Brzezinski (1997) thought it was imperative that no Eurasian challenger should emerge capable of dominating Eurasia and thus of challenging America's global pre-eminence. But these threat scenarios were defined by fears associated with the Cold War, not by the realities of emerging multipolar order. In this sense, the rise of China and Asia, and the concomitant emergence of Eurasia and the SCO do not signal a challenge against America. Rather, it reflects the growing pre-eminence of several multipolar power centers worldwide. These future scenarios are defined by opportunities associated with the emerging multipolar world (Steinbock, 2013).

However, for some analysts, this multipolar approach against a 'telltale' Chinese pattern of unification presents the reverse scenario of increasing warfare. The overwhelming impression given by the Warring States sources is that of intensifying warfare (Twitchett & Loewe, 1986). The vaster and complex the world as potential conquerors know it, the more they hesitate to march to its end and the less developed are its principles of the 'balance of power' or 'concert of powers' and 'collective security' (Ostrovsky, 2007). Thus, in the modern world states' system, we see interstate/international peace conferences, interstate/international meetings, peace agreements, condemnation of offensive warfare, agreements of disarmaments, the League of Nations, the United Nations, the NATO, and the European Union.

To sum up, high degrees of unique geopolitical circumscription and circumstances in the Eurasia, global systems caused their similar political and imperial patterns. Today, it is mainly shaped through globalization and neo-liberal economic policies. This implies strangely that we should not become in a position to take as a model of imperialization in the Eurasia crisis regions the American rather than the Russian or the Chinese model. This is a problem of international and intercontinental model of modern abuse, exploitation, colonialism, orientalism and inter-dependency policy. One can call as he/she wishes.

It is due to the crystal fact that the political power of the modern world is traditionally concentrated today in the temperate zone which mostly stretches in the Northern hemisphere. Within this zone lies a millennia-old imperial belt. The imperial belt is naturally separated by two vast Oceans – the Atlantic and the Pacific. These two natural barriers are most likely to define the forthcoming geopolitical divisions of the imperial belt. To conclude, the most probable

future confrontations seem to be Eurasia versus the North America; that is, in the foreseeable future, the United States versus a combination of Eurasian powers (Ostrovsky, 2007).

Eurasia is -in the term of the geopolitical tradition- a 'mega-continent'. Furthermore, large part of its huge land mass is rainy temperate zone. Hence, the Eurasia is always capable to agglomerate an overwhelming political power. In 1941, Karl Haushofer foresaw the gravitation of Eurasia after the war; "*Thereafter, a veritable cornucopia of space-related, economic and geopolitical tasks will be showered on Eurasia*", one of the vast dimensions of which not even the guardians of the new world order "*can fully fathom*" (Herwig, 1999). Both Hitler and Stalin shared the assumption that he who controls Eurasia controls the world (Brzezinski, 1997). Therefore, immediately following the World War II, the United States definitely discredited her policy of Isolationism and totally abandoned it to cope with a potentially menacing imbalance of power in Eurasia (Gray, 2002).

For the Russia of today, Eurasianism plays a key concept through both the regional and global geopolitics. For the Russian Empire, through the history which geopolitically and geostrategically reached its peak following the World War II, the theory of a multipolar world played a decisive role in line with her foreign policy. Actually that theory simply does not exist, although it has been fully developed in Eurasianism. That is why; it is likely to emphasize that Russia, back in the past or today, sees Eurasianism as a multipolar world theory, not simply the imperialistic desire for multipolarity. As the Russian Empire was different from the USSR, so today's Russian Federation is different from both the USSR and the Russian Empire. For the Eurasian Union envisaged by the modern Russia as well as modern China, India, there is a different ideological base, different mechanisms, different actors and different integration models in play. But, if we mainly focus on the basis of the political Eurasian project for the Russian Federation, we can claim that it dictates a single strategic management and polyphony of ethnic cultures. Thus, Eurasianism for modern Russia contains answers to all questions: from housing and utilities reforms to healthcare. In social politics, Eurasianism leans towards the Left, towards the socialist position. Russia's Eurasianism is not dogmatic. She has always called into question some elements of her programme. What matters is that economics must be organic, fair and holistic -that is, based on the principle of integrity (Dugin, 2014a).

Antagonists view the 'Eurasianism' as 'Neo-Eurasianism'. They believe that neo-Eurasianism utilizes the methodology of Pareto's school, moves within the logic of the rehabilitation of the notion of organic hierarchy, pick up some Nietzschean motives, and develops the doctrine of ontology of power, or the Christian Orthodox concept of power as katechon. The idea of an elite leads us to the themes of the European traditionalists, who authored studies of the caste system in ancient society and of their ontology and sociology, including Guenon, Julius Evola, Georges Dumezil, and Louis Dumont. Gumilev's theory of 'passionarity' also lies at the roots of the concept of the 'new Eurasianist elite' (Dugin, 2014b).

Therefore, during the Second Big War, Spykman (1942) wrote current main principles of hegemonic and unilateral policy of the United States against the whole World for she

implements diligently and indifferently since then; *“If the New World can be united or organized in such a manner that large masses of unbalanced force are available for action across the ocean, it can influence the politics of Europe and Asia. And if the Old World remains divided and balanced that external force can play a determining role in its political life... There is no safe defensive position on this side of the oceans. Hemisphere defense is no defense at all. The two World Wars will be lost or won in Europe and Asia. The strategic picture demands that we conduct our military operations in the form of a great offensive across the oceans.”* Following Spykman, Brzezinski saw the Cold War as a geopolitical struggle for control over the Eurasian land mass. The Soviet Union would prevail if it could eject the West from the western and eastern fringes of Eurasia. The West would be preponderant if it contained the Soviet Union (Blouet, 2001). Although not a historian, Brzezinski correctly emphasized the main development of the imperial belt in the modern time. For instance, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Brzezinski (1997) stated; *“The last decade of the Twentieth century has witnessed a tectonic shift in the world affairs. For the first time ever, a non-Eurasian power has emerged not only as a key arbiter of Eurasian power relations but also as the world’s paramount power.”* But most of the imperial belt is still Eurasia. Even though the United States emerged in the world geopolitics as a single super power after the Soviet collapse, that was true. After the United States’ unipolar world order, the next six largest economies and the next six biggest spenders on military weaponry are located in Eurasia. All but two of the nuclear powers are there.

But, as Brzezinski (1997) stresses; *“Cumulatively, Eurasia’s power vastly overshadows America’s. Fortunately for America, Eurasia is too big to be politically one.”* Eurasia, therefore, retains its crucial geopolitical significance today in general through world geopolitics (Ostrovsky, 2007). Because the chief geopolitical prize for the United States is ‘Eurasia’, as her global primacy for imperialist hegemony and interests drawn by those ‘tell-tale’ globalization dreamy-discourses dictate so. Therefore, for instance, in connection with the crisis and wars in Afghanistan in 2003, two US bases were introduced in the former Soviet Asian republics of Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. This was an example of containment of the Eurasian rim around the Russian Federation.

CONCLUSIONS

In 1944, American geopoliticians, Fifield and Percy (1944) stressed that although the war is global, *“the fighting on land has centered around the world island of Europe, Asia and Africa.”* That is why, this survey, having the spirit of this affirmation and foresight, which is conducted on high performing approaches, views and strategies of Great Powers of the world today, which survived in series of interstate, regional and international global crises, highlighted the relationship and direct link between imperialism behavior and globalization performance. As a result, we attempted to establish a direct link between imperialism and globalization which had began to seek the factors that mediate the relationship between the today’s geopolitics developments and Great Power performances and attitudes ‘in’ and ‘towards’ the Eurasia. Following this view, we focused on globalization and imperialism historical impasses and relationship, and by learning orientation and sought the

mediator effect of this factor on the direct linkage between imperialism behavior and globalization performance. We tried to assert those relationships -through our hypotheses and literature survey between imperial attitudes and globalization learning over increasing gravity of Eurasia in the world geopolitics -due to a world out of order.

The most striking result to emerge from data of this study is that preventing of a seeking for a sort of consolidation in Eurasia is the main aim of the United States and the European Union. Thus, ‘hegemons’ always preferred and still prefer to deal with small separated states in the Eurasia than with those states wielded into ‘one bloc’. Thus, the United States attitude towards the Eurasian Union is without a doubt radically and expressly hostile. The creation of the Eurasian Union directly contradicts the adopted strategy of the United States national security apparatus, which aims at possibly at unipolarity.

Another result we reached in this study is that the Eurasia is a worthy scale by which to measure worthy notions. We must learn how think in a Eurasian fashion, and then we will be able to easily comprehend the nature of East and West, progress and tradition, steadiness and flexibility, and loyalty both to the past and the future. But, in addition to this will, it is likely to us that globalization is a challenge to the nations and civilizations of the Eurasian continent. Because globalization comes from the West, but increasingly influences the East. This process is very complex and contradictory; it constantly raises new questions, sometimes quite dramatic and tense ones in direct relation with humanitarian crisis in the Eurasia. The impacts on Eurasia have been particularly acute (Dugin, 2014b). Thus, today in the era of globalization, a Eurasian dialogue between the East and the West seems more significant than ever before.

Will all those conflicts of the Eurasia be immediately resolved? Of course, not. They can spring up at any time. Nevertheless, we recommend that there are always ways to avoid them. Instead of wars and conflicts, we should start a peaceful dialogue. The clash of civilizations is not fatal in itself. One must learn to build an international system on the basis of broad and thoughtful social and cultural anthropology and not on the basis of Western-style American-European cultural racism, colonialist liberalism or totalitarian universalism through globalization based on purely Western values (which are individualistic, market-oriented, and capitalist) (Dugin, 2014a). To achieve this, we need a new kind of political philosophy: dedicated, humanistic, humanely conscientious, and morally sound.

However, this survey is conducted on highly-imperialistic interests of world hegemony performing national, regional and global diplomatic and/or warlord policies in many of the crisis regions of the Eurasia, such as Afghanistan, Korean peninsula, South China Sea, Crimean peninsula, Ukraine, Nagorno-Karabakh, Palestine, Iraq, Syria and many others. Positioning the political construction and ‘hegemonic masculinity’ of the Great Powers of the world to be an essential factor in the facilitation, hegemonization, and orientation of global interests in line with democratization, human rights and neo-liberal economic policies, this study claims the complex dilemmas and impasses of state ideologies, national and regional stakes and benefits, some Great Power interests in line with hegemonic geopolitics, and border considerations mainly in the Eurasia. In this sense, its

findings might not be transferable to all types of globalization-imperialism relationship theory. Thus it is also recommended that further researches can be conducted on small-scale interstate and/or regional organizational initiatives and, also in different crisis regions of the world -such as Africa or the Poles- for the generalizability of findings.

References

- Albrow, M. & King, E. (eds.). 1990. *Globalization, knowledge and society*. London: Sage.41
- Blouet, B.W. 2001. *Geopolitics and globalization in the twentieth century*. London: Reaktion Books.9-17
- Bodde, D. 1967. *Peking diary: 1948-1949 / a year of revolution*. New York: Fawcett.18-21
- Brooks, S.G. & Wohlforth, W.C. 2000/1. Power, globalization, and the end of the cold war: reevaluating a landmark case for ideas. *International Security*, 25(3): 5-53.
- Brooks, S.G. & Wohlforth, W.C. 2008. *World out of order: international relations and the challenge of american primacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brzezinski, Z. 1997. *The grand chessboard: american primacy and its geostrategic imperatives*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bundy, M. 1988. *Danger and survival: choices about the bomb in the first fifty years*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Capra, F. 2002. *The hidden connections*. New York: Random House.
- Carneiro, R. 2004. The political unification of the world. *Cross Cultural Survey*, 38(2): 162-177.
- Twitchett, D. & Loewe, M. (eds.) 1986. *The cambridge history of china, vol. I: the ch'in and han empires, 221 B.C.-A.D. 220*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clausewitz, C.von. 1832-34. *On war* [originally Vom Kriege] (3 vols). Berlin.
- Diener, A.C. 2015. Parsing mobilities in central eurasia: border management and new silk roads. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, 56(4): 376-404.
- Dugin, A. 2014a. *Putin vs. putin: vladimir putin viewed from the right*. UK: Arktos.
- Dugin, A. 2014b. *Eurasian mission: an introduction to neo-urasianism*. UK: Arktos.
- Fifield, R.H. & Percy, G.E. 1944. *Geopolitics in principle and practice*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Fotopoulos, T. 2001. Globalization, the reformist left and the anti-globalization 'movement', democracy & nature, *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, 7(2): 43-55.
- Gittins, R. 2006. How the invention of a box changed our world. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 June (retrieved 17 April 2016).
- Gray, J. 2002. *Straw dogs*. London: Penguin.
- Guyford, S.H. 1972. Science, systems, and society. *Journal of Cybernetics*, 2(3): 1-3.
- Hart, H. 1948. The logistic growth of political areas. *Social Forces*, 26: 396-408.
- Herwig, H.H. 1999. Geopolitik: haushofer, hitler and lebensraum. In: C.S. Gray & G. Sloan (Eds.), *Geopolitics – geography and strategy*, London: Frank Cass, pp. 218-241.
- IMF (The International Monetary Fund) 2000. *Globalization: threats or opportunity*. Washington D.C.: IMF Publications.
- James, P. 2005. Arguing globalizations: propositions towards an investigation of global formation. *Globalizations*, 2(2): 193-209.
- James, P. 2014. 'Faces of globalization and the borders of states: from asylum seekers to citizens. *Citizenship Studies*, 18(2): 208-223.
- James, P. & Steger, M.B. 2014. A genealogy of 'globalization': the career of a concept. *Globalizations*, 11(4): 417-434.
- Jaspers, K. 1949. *The origin and goal of history*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Lea, H. 1909. *The valor of ignorance*. New York & London: Harper and Brothers.102
- Lewis, M.W. & Wigen, K. 1997. *The myth of continents: a critique of metageography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.88-93
- Marano, L.A. 1973. A macrohistoric trend towards world government. *Behavior Science Notes*, 8: 35-40.
- Meinig, D.W. 1956. Heartland and rimland in eurasian history. *Western Political Quarterly*, 9: 553-569.
- Naroll, R. 1967. Imperial cycles and world order. *Peace Research Society*, 7: 83-101.
- O'Rourke, K.H. & Williamson, J.G. 2000. When did globalization begin?. *NBER Working Paper No. 7632*.
- Ostrovsky, M. 2007. *Y = arctg x: the hyperbola of the world order*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America.
- Sen, A.K. 1970. *Collective choice and social welfare*. San Francisco, CA: Holden-Day.
- Spykman, N.J. 1942. *America's strategy in world politics: the united states and the balance of power*. New York: Putnam's Sons.
- Sorrells, K. 2013. *Intercultural communication: globalization and social justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Steger, M. 2009. *Globalization: a very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steinbock, D. 2013. The opportunities of the eurasian chessboard. Sept. 13, http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2013-09/13/content_30008210.htm.
- Tulsiram & Patnaik, A. (eds.) 2013. *Eurasian politics: ideas, institutions and external relations*. New Delhi: KW Publishers.
- Wells, H.G. 1940. *The new world order*. London: Secker&Warburg.15
- Brooks, S.G. & Wohlforth, W.C. 2000/1. Power, globalization, and the end of the cold war: reevaluating a landmark case for ideas. *International Security*, 25(3): 5-53.
- Wolf, M. 2014. Shaping Globalization. *Finance & Development*, 51(3): 22-25.
- Yu-wei, K. 1958. *The one world philosophy*. Lawrence G. Thompson (tr.). London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.33
