

finance or speculative capital) could be profoundly destabilizing. As a result, a million of people and 21 million in Indonesia were pushed below the poverty line. This crisis was qualified as the "Stalingrad" of the IMF due to its *structural adjustment*. **Structural adjustment** programs are designed to accelerate deregulation, trade liberalization and privatization (globalization is there tinted by Capitalism and Liberalism). This institutionalized stagnation worsened poverty and increased inequality.

- The **collapse of the Third Ministerial of the WTO in Seattle in December 1999**. Indeed, the WTO has hailed in the establishment press as the gem of global economic governance in the area of globalization. It represented a comprising set of multilateral rules that would eliminate power and coercion from trade relations by subjecting both the powerful and the weak to a common set of rules backed by an effective enforcement apparatus. Conflicts about **developing countries** rebelling against the Northern Diktat, massive **popular opposition**, and the **trade conflicts** between the EU and the USA.
- The **collapse of the Stock Market and the end of the Clinton Boom in 2001**, a reassertion of the classical capitalist crisis of overproduction. The stagnation of the real economy led to capital being shifted to the financial sector, resulting in dizzying rise of the share values. However, since the profitability in the financial sector cannot deviate too far from the profitability in the real economy, a collapse of the stock values was inevitable, the crisis led to a prolonged **stagnation** and the onset of **deflation**.

These examples prove that Globalization as a sub-phenomenon of Capitalism backed by international governance, can become deleterious for the countries with developing status, or alternative national constructs.

The Globalism trilemma & smart globalization

Globalization is often idealized as the **process to merge and blend within the world economy**, assuming that the raise to the standards will occur almost naturally. For example, in **Latin America**, **Carvalho** envisioned globalization as both a harness and an engine for Argentina's economy. He believed that it will not only discipline but provide also an effective shortcut to credibility in economic policies, unleashing the powerful forces to propel the economy forward. He thus accelerated the **privatization, deregulation** and **opened up the national economy**. Following situation led to believe that such policies are blinding by the **investing myopia**: the interest on short-term rather than the vision on long-term.

There is an inevitable clash between **politics** and **hyperglobalization**, behind this, the **political trilemma of the World Economy**: hyperglobalization, nation state, domestic politics. It is possible for decision makers, to pick two, only two, any of the two.

- a mix of nation state and hyperglobalization is what the neoliberals support, as the **golden straightjacket**
- integrating democratic politics in the hyperglobalism movement leads to a **global governance** and the commitment in the institutions.
- keeping the nation state and democratic politics lead to the **Bretton Woods compromise**, which can nowadays be emulated (to a certain extent) by the **pegged exchange-rate regime**.

The Rise of Populism, a comeback of the 1930s ?

Globalization is seen as the accelerated integration of capital, production and markets globally, a process driven by the logic of corporate profitability (Bello, 2002).

< Ending comments upon the News Fact on Brexit, the rise of extreme right parties in Europe, Frexit in France, and banned far-right parties in Germany >