

## **THE ECONOMIC DIPLOMACY IS NOT ENOUGH TO AVOID THE CONFLICT AND TO ENBROAD THE LIBERAL ZONE IF IT IS NOT ACCOMPANIED WITH THE DEMOCRATIC VALUES OF EXPORT**

**VILMA SPAHIU, PhD.Candidate**  
Faculty of Social Sciences & Education  
European University of Tirana  
**ALBANIA**

### **ABSTRACT**

One of the most important elements of the national power to a state is mainly considered the economy. Different countries use economic instruments to meet national objectives. State actors use the economic power of waging war, to influence the regional and global events. An important element of national security is the ability for collection, transformation and use of resources. Many of the human activities, including those pertaining to national security, may be restricted or grow significantly by economic factors. The purpose of this paper is to analyse the economic diplomacy, conflict and exporting democratic values. A very important part of this work will be a combination and also the impact of culture on economic cooperation, to continue further the understanding of the relationship between economic freedom and political freedom. The question is: Is it enough economic diplomacy to avoid conflict and to extend the zone of peace liberal if fighting is not built on exporting democratic values? Or this kind of diplomacy is successful only if coupled with the proliferation of these democratic values. All this will help us to understand if these concepts or variable is operating separately from each other, or between them is a kind of dependency, they go hand in hand.

**Keywords:** Economic diplomacy, conflict, democratic values.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, we conclude that the diplomacy is influenced by a number of factors, which are interconnected with each other. One of the most important factors that had an impact on diplomacy is the relative decline of the role of the national states. Today states are competing mostly by other actors. The private sector, religious groups, immigration, media and other parts of civil society, demand that their interests must be taken into account, by having a voice in policy formulation and implementation of outside help. One of the factors that affects the modern diplomacy are nongovernmental organizations. Another important factor that complicates or hinders the functioning of classic diplomacy is economic diplomacy, which is more and more consolidated. Nowadays important decisions of private economic sector strongly influence the policy choices of governments. "Diplomacy remains an instrument of communication and international negotiation" (Cici, 2009: 33).

### **WHAT IS THE CONFLICT?**

Nature has made people equal by the ability of body and mind. From this equality of ability arises the equality of hope in achieving our goals in the manner that if two people want the same thing, but you cannot enjoy the one after the other they consequently become enemies and to achieve their goal, which is mostly just maintaining themselves to be in pleasure sometimes, they try to annihilate each other. No man is no other way more reasonable to ensure oneself than to undertake preventive measures, namely, by "the force and the wiliness

become master of the subject of all those who can, as long as he is satisfied that there is no other power greater than put it at risk" (Hobbes, 2000: 77).

In human nature we come to identify three factors that may cause a conflict or war: 1. Rivalry (drives people to attack for profit); 2. Distrust (individual does not trust the other); 3. Thirst for glory (fame). As long as people live without a power which curbs "their condition is what is called war, and this is the struggle of all against all" (Hobbes, 2000: 29-83). War is not just battles, or the act of the game, but a period of time in which expressed willingness to clashing in battle. All this is explained by what people live without other security power but what guarantees their strength and mind. They constantly feel unsafe. People not only can cause damage to each other, but often for different reasons, they should do so. In the natural state there is a "colorful and eternal suspicion, mistrust and impatience to overthrow the power of others, a desire to come out on top of others or to add power thanks to their destruction" (Pufendorf, 2000: 162). Nature has given everyone the right to everything, that is, in the state of nature, or before people engage in agreements or obligations to any person it is legitimate to do what it wants and against what he thinks is appropriate and to possess, use and enjoy everything that he wants and can. So, the reason why people want to hurt each other, arises from the fact that at the same time many people want to do the same. It is "ambition that puts them among all these dangers and in opposition to each other" (Stumpf, 2006: 202).

For others, "the war is fundamentally a disease" (Stoessinger, 2007: 341). Although "aggression can be born, the war is learned behavior, and as such can be learned and could eventually be cast out" (Stoessinger, 2007: 350). If we look at history we can distinguish quite clearly that human nature has changed and starting from this data we can say that the war may disappear in the future. On this issue there are views which assume a sort of "sociability of people in their natural state, sociability which enable the natural law" (Kullashi, 2005: 191). They do not look at the natural state as a state of war. In the natural state, there are sociabilities between people, the feeling of friendship and common moral norms.

In conclusion we can say that different views on human philosophical nature join at some point in what people in the natural state are equal by nature, equality and freedom emerge as integral features of the state of human nature. The point at which they shared conception related to freedom. Freedom for one party can not be understood as an act of unbridled freedom of another condescending. Also they are shared in terms of common norms and laws. For some of the philosophical standpoint of natural law in the natural state has no rules and laws, for others there are common norms and laws, in terms of life, health, liberty, property, so no one can subjugate another.

## **WHAT IS LIBERALISM?**

Liberalism is a stream of philosophical, social, political and economic, the essence of which is individualism (protection of the rights and freedoms of the individual against the oppression of the state or political power) and the establishment of a government minimalist as liberals see authority government as a restriction on the freedom and rights of the individual. The best way, according to the liberals to be protected from political power, is private property and the free market. The state in turn should ensure the rights and freedoms of individuals, to maintain order, to oversee the international monetary system and provide national defense.

Liberalism, as a stream of political thought, has its roots in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by John Lock. He is regarded as one of the first liberal thinkers, followed by Smith, Berlin, Hayek and Friedman. Liberals are convinced that the free market will create an effective competition, which is the best way to give a direction individual efforts. In a free market individual can choose among many alternatives that include cost and different qualities. In free trade disappears and the concept of "slave owner" (Hayek, 2003: 81) because as the owner and his employees are dependent on each other in the sense that the worker is not just an employee but a customer, client You may choose and obtain material goods.

At the core of liberalism is the belief in reason and opportunity for progress. Liberals see the individual as a hotbed of moral values and defend the idea that human beings should be treated as a goal and not as a means. They think that human beings act rationally to achieve their interests, thus improving their welfare. In conclusion we can say that liberals think the republican regimes are less likely to wage war among themselves. This is the essence of the theory of democratic peace. They argue that "Democracies are peaceful because democratic norms and culture hamper the leadership to undertake actions leading to war" (Mingst, 2008: 300).

## **CULTURE AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION**

In the early 1990s there was talk a lot about regionalization and regionalization of world politics. Regional conflicts replaced global conflict. The major powers, such as Russia, China and the United States, as well as second-class power, such as Sweden and Turkey, the redefined their security interests in terms of regional express. Trade between the regions grew rapidly, causing many researchers to predict the emergence of regional economic blocs: the European, North American, etc. easterner Asiatic . But the term "regionalism" does not report accurately what was happening. Markets are entirely political and not geographical or cultural. As was the Balkans or the Middle East, they can fall apart through inner cities conflicts. Regions are a basis for cooperation between States only to the extent that geography coincides with culture. Economic alliances require the cooperation of their members, and this cooperation is based on trust, which stems from shared values and culture. The relationship of culture with regionalization is clearly linked to economic integration. We may be mentioned here that the European Union an economic alliance, which serves to increase the welfare of the Member States and only through their cooperation, and strengthening their economic joint which also strengthens the whole European continent. (Huntington, 2004: 202).

## **THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND POLITICAL FREEDOM**

It is widely believed that politics and economics are separate and largely unrelated. Individual freedom is a political problem, and material well-being is an economic problem. In order for markets to function with much more efficiency, economy and politics should be separated as much as possible from one another, that markets should be free. So we can say that "economic freedom is a necessary means to achieving political freedom" (Hasimja, 2009: 47).

However many analysts oppose the division of spheres of trade and policy, claiming that they are related not only organically, but also because the forces and "deep economic practices

constrain political universe" (Holst, 2008: 144). World imperialist system continues to create economic conditions and other conditions that force groups, communities and other groups jostling for limited assets, which sometimes lead to war between them.

## **INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT**

In terms of international conflict problem, liberals highlight this problem in the conditions in which people live. Reforming these conditions, they argue, will broaden the hope for peace. So they point enterprising of political reforms, to build a stable democracy. Democratic government will do much less wars. "Maintaining and continuous improvement of democracy constitutes the most important guarantee for the democratic peace" (Charles W. Kegley Jr., 2009: 31). Based on tolerance, compromise and civil liberties, democratic political culture serves as a stabilizing tool and diverting conflict. In accordance with the liberal theories, conflict resolution practices applied within the country can be used in connection with international disputes.

Leaders socialize with democratic culture share a similar outlook. Seeing the international policy as an extension of internal policy, they can widely apply the applicability of norms to regulate international competition. Economic diplomacy is a very important element, because the network of trade between the countries increased communication, destroys national selfishness and encourages the parties to avoid any clash between them. Consider important liberalist economic actors as well as economic power. With an emphasis on building an international community of open societies, this approach also reveals the role of international institutions and private international groups in the development of this community. Their efforts include the promotion of democracy and human rights, environmental protection, increasing welfare, combating corruption or the peaceful resolution of conflicts. The debate between democratic governments rarely escalate into war, because each party recognizes the other's legitimacy and expects him to resort to peaceful means to resolve a particular conflict. We may be mentioned here, little difference between the use of economic diplomacy of the European Union and the use of economic diplomacy of the United States. The first follows a policy like this: try to use economic diplomacy acting as a soft power, which does not use the power of force to impose the spread of values, it tries to spread these values do slowly without pressure, so it aims to benefit a term or longer. Unlike the case with American politics it uses cost-benefit strategy fast, so economic diplomacy and imposition or exercise of force to spread or exporting democratic values. Yet in both cases it is observed that economic diplomacy and exporting democratic values in parallel, the only difference lies only in the tactics or strategies used.

## **CONCLUSIONS/ RECOMMENDATIONS**

You answer the question whether or not the economic diplomacy enough to avoid conflicts and to expand liberal area, if it is accompanied or not by exporting democratic values is not a simple thing. It requires a well thought response and definitely time to rethink how you will be confronted with the seductive elements and this necessarily makes the analysis of this issue difficult and more complex. To arrive at this answer required a feasibility study. There is a great debate about the use of economic diplomacy, conflict and the export of democratic values. Some see it as linked together, while for others they are separated from each other and act independently.

However, I am of the opinion that economic diplomacy may not be enough to avoid conflicts and to expand liberal area, if it is not accompanied by exporting democratic values. The process of economic diplomacy and exporting democratic values are linked together, they go hand in hand. Only a combination of them can do to avoid many conflicts and expanding liberal area. Referring to the democratic peace that democracies do not fight each other will never conclude that economic diplomacy used in conjunction with the spread of democratic values to increase in this way the more the number of democratic countries, with the intention of avoiding many conflicts, building a world much more confident and achieve a livelihood or "happiness" for all individuals of the world.

Economic diplomacy and proliferation or export democratic values cannot do without each other, but it is precisely the combination of democracy with an open economy and society. In conclusion I can say that democracy is not simple, but combining it with the economy what is the essence of democratic peace.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Charles W, Kegley JR. (2009): *“Politikat Botërore”*, UFO Press, Tiranë.
- Cici, A. (2009): *“Cikël leksionesh “Diplomacia dhe Protokolli”*, UET, Tiranë.
- Hasimja, E. (2009): *“Nocione të shkencave politike”*, UET, Tiranë.
- Hayek, F. (2006): *“Udha drejt skllavërisë”*, Botimet Toena, Tiranë.
- Hobbes, Th. (2000): *“Leviatani”*, Dita, Tiranë.
- Holsti, K. (2008): *“Shteti, lufta dhe gjëndja e luftës”*, Instituti i Studimeve Ndërkombëtare, Tiranë.
- Kullashi, M. (2005): *“Mendimi politik modern”*, Akademia e shkencave dhe e arteve e Kosovës, Prishtinë.
- Mingst, K. (2008): *“Bazat e Marrëdhënieve Ndërkombëtare”*, Instituti i Studimeve Ndërkombëtare, Tiranë.
- Pufendorf, S. (2000): *“Detyra e njeriut dhe e qytetarit sipas ligjit natyror”*, Dita, Tiranë.
- Stoessinger, J. (2007): *“Përse kombet shkojnë në luftë”*, Instituti i Studimeve Ndërkombëtare, Tiranë.
- Stumpf, S.: *“Filozofia, historia dhe problemet”*, Botimet Toena, Tiranë.