

The concept of global village or one world

✓
The Muslim
9-10-94
Dr Salahuddin A Khan

THE WORLD, as the people belonging to the upper strata of society usually say, has now become a global village. However, a village society — and you may agree if you have ever been in a village for a couple of weeks — is characterised by more homogeneity, solidarity, cooperation among the members and relative equality, as compared to metropolises. The villagers have much less complex division of labour, much less specialisations in terms of jobs categorised and hence much less diversity in life style and much less individualistic pattern of action and attitude. On the contrary life in the cities is full of diversities often resulting in conflict and contradiction. It is in a word characterised by heterogeneity. If these are the observable facts can we talk in terms of global village?

Nobody bothers to elucidate as to how the concept of global village is compatible to the definition of village. More often than not the term global village is used to mystify the bitter realities of life and to avoid the real, down to earth issues of injustice, inequalities and double standards both at the international and national levels. Moreover, to turn away from these pinching issues our attention is diverted toward glittering development being carried on by the richest countries and the richest class within the country.

The impression aired by this musical term is that we all are becoming one and all countries that have emerged on the surface of this globe will be one; it will be ultimately one world very soon indeed. This type of impressions have such a sweeping effect that we the simple people are very comfortably lulled by their melodious rhythm. But when some one can spare some time to dig into the very core of this slogan of global village or one world, one

really comes to know with much startling surprise that there is nothing like village life and village culture in the heart of the so-called global village. At the most, people from different countries and even from very remote corners of the globe can now move to and fro and travel through various countries of the world more comfortably and much faster than ever. In addition, the electronic media of mass communication like CNN active round the clock and sending transmissions all over the world are giving information about events taking place anywhere in the world.

IF THIS meaning is to be attached to the term global village then there is no denying the meaning. But such meaning when attributed to the world village it shrinks back from the essential features of the image of the village. Such a meaning does not reflect cooperation, solidarity, egalitarianism and relative homogeneity and equality characteristic of village character. On the analogy of village the concept of global village has to display the characteristics attached to village as mentioned above at the international level. If cooperation, solidarity, relative homogeneity and equality persist to rule the world of global village then we are justified to sing the song of "the global village". But what is happening in the world — relentless violence, gruesome abuse of human rights, unjustified aggression and intervention, amassing wealth by leaps and bounds by the richest of the rich and transnational corporations — is not in conformity with the character of village but are glaring examples of exploitation of the poor and the weak by the rich and the mighty both at the national and international level.

Some Western as well as

Eastern intellectuals did in all earnestness realise the tricks and gimmicks of the exploitative manoeuvring. They do not go harping on the tune of global village or one world in the same manner as the harbingers of global development who are very vibrant, ambitious, glowing with enthusiasm to monopolise development for all. They are very vocal, very eloquent, a man of facile pen, most expert in the art of euphemism. But the honest and sincere intellectuals I am referring to, who still cherish moral values and strive for equality and justice are still resting with reference to human rights, though they love to see the concept of global village be realised in the true sense of the term, they do not see that any sincere and outright attempts have so far been made towards this direction.

Bernard T G Chidzero, Senior Minister of Finance, Economic Planning and Development in Zimbabwe in his article discovers not global village of equalities, cooperation and development for all on equal basis but "a world of political and economic inequalities where interdependence become a euphemism for exploitation of the weak by the strong" (Development, Journal of the Society for International Development, 1991).

THE world is not one, it is not a global village. It is rather divided into North and South. The North, being the richer, claims to be the developer, believer in the free market economy and rapid industrialisation, and hence determined to push and help the South to come into the same fold where the North must play the major role to direct the South to gobble up the fruits of industrialisation along with benediction and permeation of the liberal privatisation but leaving the strings of redistribution in the North's hands. Now in the ac-

tual business of the world saw the industrialised countries become richer at a faster rate ever. A few "newly industrialising countries" were cited as their example; so named countries made it despite the odds; they found themselves moving backward. Developing countries redistributed away from the rich towards the "poor scale" (Nafis Sadiq SID, 1991).

Thus we see that the global village or one world instead of having become a viable world with village like characteristics of solidarity and equality it has shattered. South divide is slower in the development, as the monopolistic market and as the losers brazen community spirit there is a spirit of solidarity and equality but it must be interpersonal cooperation. It is put by G. Land, the Norway in the "In order to have a pact of an industrialised private strong international based on active parts of the world" (SID, 1991).

In the 20th century held in Rome the selected for the world of a world or several papers of renown. Some chose to take the critical thought provoking observations of HRH, the Netherlands, the precursor to SID. In his