

The World to Itself* Open Lecture on Global Transition

Marin DINU

Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies
dinumarin@ase.ro

Abstract. *In this study I aim at designing an image with more shades of difference upon the globalisation, from its ordinary meanings to the institutional type explicative models. There is no doubt that the enterprise is not as temerarious as it is necessary. The confusions as well as the theoretical counterviews have rational determinants. In a vicious manner, the reasoning of the texts about globalisation most often serves non-epistemic causes. The analysis of the ideas that are in circulation cannot be deprived of the critical perspective. And that happens because, truly, the most significant ideas about globalisation are launched from the geopolitics field. The perseverance of the scientific steps seems to be extremely fragile. What puts a scarce mark on the scientific area of the globalisation issue is a politics parameter: the control of the global powers. Therefore, the confusions' perpetuation has become a defining feature in the debates about globalisation. The stake is to strengthen the image that the globalisation does not change but preserves the powers' control in the world. Namely it represents a kind of continuity of essence in the powers' system, though it creates the impression that is something else, maybe even a qualitative change.*

The right hypothesis from which it must be started when understanding the globalisation is the idea of order. The world in itself can be understood only by relating to the idea of order. Thus, the ordering principle is essential for understanding. The world's evolution is explained through the ordering principle. The history's phenomenology has meaning beginning with the ordering principle. In these highlights, my analysis points out the content of the globalisation as a different reordering of the world. The globalisation is a breach represented by the change of the ordering principle. It has, in fact, approximations in the world. The globalisation is hardly knocking off.

Keywords: ordering principle; harmonious cooperation; globalisation approximation; paradigm change; second modernity.

JEL Codes: P17, P27.

REL Codes: 19D, 19I.

* An extensive presentation of the ideas showcased in this article has been made in the Romanian version of the article, which is included in the volume „Economie”, ediția a opta, Editura Economică, București, 2009, pp. 337-356.

Introduction

A more and more obvious reality during the past two decades is represented by the evolution towards another model for understanding and solving the problems of the humanity. The economic events, like the financial crises, as well as the political facts, like combating the conflict statuses, have new causes as well as completely different evolutions. The world itself is facing challenges that are testing its limits.

On a daily basis, for instance, it became a habit for the information to be consumed in real time, practically the tendency is to make the search time disappear, as the content of the documentation operation and the selection of any type of knowledge is a matter of the information technology performance (Gates, 2000). In its turn, the space is less and less time dependent, it is delocalizing, a movement supported by the scientific innovation, removing the physical barriers represented by the territorial distances. The geography as such is spiritualizing, creating the ideal bases for the nature to belong to everybody irrespective of its meridian or latitude where it is positioned. At the same time, the society has strong economicisation tendencies, the return being upgraded to a principle of performance assessment in the non-market sectors; deregulation represents an obsession meant to favour competition. A true battle is being subsidised in order to be on the top of the wave, on the tendency's side (Friedman, 2001). In this way, a new polarisation with tensional potential is being recomposed, parallel to the mobility increase of all the production factors, which in turn generates hopes with regard to the prosperity redistribution, but also social, regional, budgetary and other imbalances. Finally, the political decision increasingly moves away from people through professionalisation and bureaucratic concentration, the democracy is moving towards tribalism (Martin, Schumann, 1999), revitalising the community life, the culture is equalising under the pressure of the consumption culture models, the conflicts trouble the cultural contact areas, thus even creating new types of global dangers (Huntington, 1998).

The mosaic of today's world is continuously shaping and rapidly changing. The classical reference points, primarily of knowledge, loose part of their strength; the rule and habit are forced to recoil in terms of different alignments.

More and more often, we talk about the destructuring of the "old economic mechanism" and the powerful emergence of the "new economy", along with other problems and, obviously, with other solutions, different from the ones suggested by the economic theory over time. In general, the world seems to agree that it is in a stage of a new synthesis of the theoretical and practical experience of human kind, in which, beyond doubt, a sensitive matter must be solved, namely that of the evolution's direction towards a new formula of existence (Korten, 2001).

The acuity of the stage specific is amplified by the profound regional changes defined by the post-communist transition and the Western concerns regarding the world's structure after overcoming the bipolar world order. In fact, the signs of the reality change, spotted on a theoretic level, suggest the road to a new world transition, the post-capitalist transition, that together with the other types of transition form what

it could be called the global transition. In other words, the direction that the world is following, at the beginning of the 21st century, towards itself, towards recreating the existence in terms of what resembles us as humans and peoples: our propensity towards the ideal defined by the intersection of reason and human spirit with nature. That is, eventually, and maybe ultimately, the fulfilment of the humanity's dream, of its great thinkers, regarding reaching the perfection represented by the natural union between human nature and mother-nature.

Box 1. *The need for something else...*

"The future cannot be a continuance of the past and there are signs, both external and internal, that we have arrived to a historic crisis moment... The structures of the human society, including some of the foundations of the capitalist economy, are about to be destroyed by the erosion of what we inherited from our human past. Our world risks both an explosion and an implosion. It must change... Anyway, one thing is clear. If the humanity wishes to have an acceptable future, it will not be able to prolong the past into the present. If we will try to enlighten the third millennium on this basis, we will fail. And the price of the failure, namely the alternative of a modified society, is darkness."

(Hobsbawm, 1998, p. 662)

The ideal state proposed by the global transition is the absolute stake that would have to provide coherence to the gestures, facts and thoughts of humans, will and attitude of peoples for overstepping the limitative experiences and the utopian projects. If the target seems to be somehow clear and, maybe, more and more broadly accepted, about the means and ways to follow there are still controversies, both on an international and individual-human level. It is not irrelevant to notice the fact that the misunderstandings caused by the globalisation and the global transition are related to – or especially to – the promoted explanatory model, the success and failure of braking loose from the spell of the “comet tail” type significances of the economic and political order founded upon the adversity and bipolarism that still determine and justify the official attitudes.

The pressure of the explanatory model

So that the globalisation can become a solution to the great problems that torment the humanity, from productivity and economic growth to quality of life and modernity, meaning overstepping poverty and all kinds of discriminations, it must be thought and understood in terms of principles different from those that favoured the old order.

Unquestionably, the principle ordering the statuses of things of the world called modern for more than two centuries, born from the cleavages of the national and industrial revolutions, is related to the adversity's significances: the whole, as a planetary point of reference, was conceived as a mechanical reunion of the parts accomplished by a more potent part or through an exceptional understanding between parts.

Also, the humanity had to permanently confront the reality structured by the actions of one part, regardless of its name, with the aim of controlling more and more parts, even the whole in its entire. The history so far is largely explained on the basis of this ordering principle. Even what the balance of powers was, be it even inside the system of the bipolar world, controlled by two national super-powers ideologically motivated as adverse, meant an illustration of that principle.

The individual, group, national and supranational problems were solved after their own logic generated by the principle of adversity and control, which the part is succeeding in exercising upon the whole. The undeniable consequences of this world ordering principle were the amorphous confrontation and the ideological mutilation of freedoms.

The last decade of the 20th century revealed the waste of this order and amplified the will to embrace a single explanatory model of the world. In other words, a universal option was expressed in order to overstep the principle in which a part has the possibility to control the whole and to advance towards a different formula, in which the whole is more than the sum of the parts, and the parts tend to behave in line with the whole. Ideationally, it is about defying the limits, something else in a functional way. In fact, we are on the verge of overstepping the last manifestations of the national and industrial revolutions that generated the conflicting cleavages between nations and countries and, inside the nations and countries, mainly between work and capital, on eminently ideological reasons. The new world ordering principle assumed by the globalisation moves the emphasis from the ideologically defined values, like the nation, state or social class, and introduces, on the history's stage, other values and actors. It is clear, even on a common perception level, that in the early globalisation nowadays the main actors start being different from the national economies, the power is held by someone else than a state, the specific economic and political order does no longer rely on the balance of forces and does no longer accept the agreements that limit freedom. The actors are the global financial institutions, the enterprises of global reach, the different investment funds, the unrestrained "electronic herd" (Friedman, 2001) etc. The economies are perceived as an "economic location" (Lafontaine, Müller, 1998), where the markets are already liberalised, the trade is to a large degree unrestrained, entering and exiting the system of the economic agents is an open question and a matter exclusively solved in terms of performance, where the free movement of capital, labour, services and persons takes place.

All these new forces act beyond and often regardless of the rules, claims or agreements imposed by the nation-states, by the borders meant to favour the control on a territory. They are the ones constraining the governments, the countries as a whole, to model their strategies, change their means and conceptions if they want to succeed again. Even the regional decisions are coordinated by the presently deciding factors in accordance with the rules brought by the global actors, as it happened in South-East Asia with the financial crisis in 1997 (Stiglitz, 2003). The ones setting the rule of the game today in the world are the globalisation's actors, and the parts, still mostly nation-states, behave as such, even for surviving. The territory on which it is not manifested, from which it leaves or which the global "electronic herd" avoids,

(Friedman, 2001) is condemned to underdevelopment. In extremis it is about forced adaptation, of reorganising the priorities and objectives, of changing the values beginning with the demands of liberalisation fulfilment aiming at sustaining the global development and modernisation. This is why, even if it is currently an ideal for the general status of things, the globalisation gains ground as a strategic option for more and more regions.

Box 2. A premonition...

"On long-term, the world politics must become more and more unfavourable to the concentration of hegemonic power in the hands of a single state. Thus, America is not only the first and the only superpower truly global, but also, probably, the last one.

This is happening not only because the nation-states gradually become more and more permeable, but also because the notion of power becomes more diffuse, more devised and less limited by the national borders. It is possible that also the economic power becomes more dispersed... Other powers – Europe, China, Japan – will more or less get closer to America's level."
(Brzezinski, 2000, pp. 231-232)

Hence, the globalisation is a tendency of reordering the world so to exceed the limits of the old order. Of course, is not a royal path, all kind of obstacles are at sight. As a matter of fact, we are in the stage where the last consequences of the situation in which the world became a single-pole are consuming, in which they are trying to turn to maximum account the geo-strategic advantages of a single state which is considered a winner of the "cold war", in which the problems of the humanity are being unilaterally handled aiming at "integrating" into an influence area the self-proclaimed single centre, in fact a late reflex of the adversity principle according to which the balance and order are ensured through the dominance of one part upon a whole.

What the globalisation is not

Braking up with history

Paraphrasing Mark Twain who was referring to the impossibility of changing the weather, we can say that everybody talks about globalisation, but nobody does something relevant in order to understand it. The globalisation analysis shows that we are facing faked and ideological perceptions of the phenomenon, but also with conceptions that set the rules of understanding, though they are inadequate, obsolete or just false. We actually are in a stage in which the globalisation is taken for a remedy that begins to be considered worse than the malady, without clear arguments showing that the meanings of both the remedy and the malady were understood. There is not another manner to explain the violent attacks against all the globalisation is supposed to be, the resume of the states' tendency to limit themselves to reaching their own interest, as, for example, there is an excessive debate about competitiveness and less

about free will for example (Friedman, 2001). Globalisation came, in this manner, to be identified with the universalisation of poverty, dependency, and criminality. Also, one tries to assimilate globalisation into the significations' domain of some history practices, derived from the adversity principle, emphasised by the capital-labour cleavages from the 19th century.

Ignoring the explainable globalisation model gives anyone freedom to identify globalisation with the processes from the nearer or more distant universal history, thus is annulling the globalisation specific, its ultimate meaning.

From this point of view we identify at least *three inadequate approaches*:

Firstly, there is the interpretative model through which *the globalisation is considered a problem of progressive concentration of the national economies with the aim of creating a coherent world economy*. The explanatory support is obviously inspired by the mechanical trick from Lenin's theses on imperialism. Namely, relentlessly, the interdependencies between economies are increasing, the international division of labour deepens, a global market is created, on which, somehow controlled, the national economies are competing. This model's agent is represented by the national economy. The aimed economic order depends on the national control of the international competition. The state is powerful if it has a competitive economy. The development model is based on export, rendering valuable the Ricardian competitive advantages.

Nevertheless, history cannot be, as this interpretative model suggests, an additional collection of economic national entities. The understanding proves to be a perfect utopia for a global economic unit. If this true monad shall exist, it cannot be the expression of the rationalistic principle according to which the whole is the mechanical sum of its parts. The conclusion is that the globalisation cannot only be internationalisation, not even sublimation of the internationals, as it neither can be imperialism, be it called Americanisation or, in the French version, mondialisation, victory of one state's exclusive interests. On this path we cannot overstep the history neurosis, and the solutions come to infinitely repeat the systems of global organisation based on adversity, enforce a global mechanism of new imperialisms reinvention, exclusively conflictual. The world economy designed in this manner contains in itself the anti-globalisation essence, and until now it generated rules and institutions blocked by adversity.

Secondly, *the globalisation does not prove to be a trend of a purely cross-national nature enforced by firms or transnational companies that knew how to render valuable the technological advantages*. The inspiration of this interpretative model does not move away from the Marxist origin of interpreting the development of the production forces. In fact, almost without exception, what is now being written on the world economy topic aims at this interpretative model. The theoretical obsession of progress is the engine of this vision. The countries are powerful if they have strong companies elsewhere in the world. The national economy justifies itself only as an economy of the transnational companies and generating commercial flows in the world economy.

The national emblem is the transnational company. The chance of success in development is the currency contribution of the transnational companies. A country is powerful if it has transnational companies that import domestic product from other countries and regions. It is the economy of the super-profitable mass production. Anyway, this direction represents the foreshadowing of the fact that only the return justifies any energetic effort. On this direction the modern utopias were born, in which man is replaced by the machine, the economy becomes inhuman or the mass-gathering collectivise the individual tastes, and the professions fail in specialisations. The whole becomes an attribute of the elite, the freedom puts no price each on individual's judgement.

The supreme principle is that the parts must rationally reconstitute the whole.

Though it stimulates, this interpretative model does not justify the understanding of globalisation as an effect of interdependencies' increase because simply the globalisation is not that, as the cross-national phenomena, like poverty for instance does not reside in globalisation. Additionally, the globalisation is not only the cross-border freedom.

And thirdly, *the globalisation cannot be the excess of a single mega-trend*. The expansion of the capital markets, for example, even the autonomisation of the financial markets, does not represent the normal globalisation model. The French speak about mondialisation, imposing the interests of the American capital, the Anglo-Americans speak about globalisation as supremacy of the model centred on financial speculations and the extreme mobility of the financial capital. In this views, the national economies become investment emplacements, deregulation becomes a condition, the monetarist-type distance governing is claimed as the ideal recipe, the most capitalised is the most powerful and for this it dictates the rules of the game. The economicisation begins to be aggressive, the social protection looses ground, the state becomes minimal, the supra-state agreements are eminently economic, and the evolution's direction is towards the "off-shore" economy. The results is that the market triumphs and the society always looses, the extremes risk having no mediation, the game of freedom and judgement, as structure values, is taken by power and prosperity, the pragmatism quickly joins the political fairness and together they push matters towards the social engineering and the decision control, as the democracy becomes useless giving space to the dictatorship of the elite minorities. We find here the sum of the economic crisis determinants that began in 2007 as a simple "turbulence" of the financial markets (Greenspan, 2008).

Box 3. *What globalisation is not*

- Globalisation is not a new imperialism.
- Globalisation is not a world Americanisation.
- Globalisation is not mondialisation.
- Globalisation is not a sublimation of yesterday's or today's internationals.

- Globalisation is not just internationalisation.
- Globalisation is more than the effect of the interdependencies' increase.
- Globalisation is not just the answer to the problems considered to be global.
- Globalisation is more than the product of the need to unify the markets.
- Globalisation does not explain any cross-national phenomenon (poverty, criminality etc.).
- Globalisation is not the triumph of the deviant forms of liberalism.
- Globalisation is not just cross-borders freedom.
- Globalisation is not a new socialisation, this time on a planetary scale.
- Globalisation is not a structure to ultimately save the universal vocation of the collapsed communist project.
- Globalisation is not at all the product of the history's neuroses thoroughly unconsumed.

It is clear that in this manner the essential ruptures between the economy and the society take place, the field of utopian structure is reopening, hence the humanity is polarising. There is, on one hand, the inclusion (namely wealth, centre, power, culture, 20% versus 80%) (Martin, Schuman, 1999 etc.) and, on the other hand, the exclusion (namely poverty, periphery, dependency, ignorance, 80% versus 20% etc.).

The logic structure of this model emphasises the fact that the globalisation cannot be, unless it risks to be a new failure, a structure meant to ultimately save the universal vocation of failed projects of collectivism and ideological constructivism, it cannot even be the strategic answer to the identity crisis of post-capitalism. The globalisation's quintessence does not represent in any way the product of the fully unconsumed history's neuroses.

The globalisation has a logic of its own that it has not learned in any preliminary stage because it could not have applied it, as it is not a practice of the past.

Beyond ideologies

The three above approaches have each raised theoretical counterreactions. In fact, the three interpretative systems, being ideologically build, received, as it was normal, the same kind of retorts. This is how we explain, for example, the theoretical structures about globalisation meant to exhibit the fears through the paroxistical critics of all models.

The general characteristic of the interpretative models, destined to reject any alternative, deny change and accept old comforts, is that they hide the ideological subordination. Obviously, in essence, on this line a real explicative model is not obtained, but one that critically falsifies the three above presented models, and they are in fact ideologically endorsed approximations.

From the alternative models we mention the theoretical structures that presented zero growth as the global order solution to the demographic explosion to resource exhaustion, as a sign of the death of capitalism, culture's uniformisation, as the apocalyptic conflict's reason and so on. We must notice that in the ideational benchmarks of these theoretical structures is impossible to design the world's

interpretative model, define the functional trends, and approximate the coherent strategies. The critical, alarmist models are originated in the mind obsessed by contraries and irreducible counterposition. This approach manner points out the fact that something durable can be built not only through critical separation from an alternative, because the activity is exhausting and failing if it does not refer to the entire complex of evolutions. The globalisation will be a reality or will not be at all, only if, as a theoretical referential, will be protected against the contamination with the malady of the partiality replacing the whole. The globalisation is destined to overstep the “nor-neither” variant of the ideological options, as it is a new synthesis, a global one, which has the anti-fragmentation character in its first stage. It is known that alterity to part, as the alternatives’ critique to the above explicative models, is also the part; the whole, the global as alternative is not to the part, but to all the parts with functional claims in themselves. Values like the state, nation, sovereignty are dared to recoil; they are even called into question in view of the globalisation. The globalisation functions as a whole of the polycentric diversities, and not of the centrifugal and autonomous parts.

Of course, the anti-globalisation attitudes are also ideological, often supported by representative circles of one deviant explicative model. Additionally, the anti-globalisation attitudes aim at the institutional manifestations supported by these models. Surprisingly enough is that the reaction against globalisation identifies exactly the absence of globalisation or the globalisation’s deviations.

An equally delicate aspect is confusing the globalisation with its technical-informative supports, thus developing a type of teleology of the production forces, destined, in the view of its coryphaeus, to multiply someone’s economic power – usually a country’s – until it is received as global (Friedman, 2007). Nothing more misled for the simple fact that the economy is globalising through the action of its specific agents, as we have seen these being other than the national states. Neither the communications, nor the transports etc., with all their spectacular evolution, create globalisation, these simply being consequences of the global actors that have global financial power, global ideas and global practices. The globalisation seems a stage of the world economy’s integration only for those hanging on to the national state as an exclusive actor of the global market and to the sovereignty as a matrix of the territorial, ethnical, cultural etc. identity.

Finally, the globalisation cannot be an economic fact unless it is of the consequence’s nature because something else is explaining and favouring it, something that it is, as we will show below, the main aspect. At most we can accept that the globalisation can be the expression of the triumph of the economic liberalism, but in order to admit this truth we must exclude the deviant forms of liberalism, the ones that have generated the casino or the “off-shore” economies and have transformed the economy into an objective in itself, out of the social (Krugman, 2009).

What globalisation is

Removing the fundamentalisms

So many things about globalisation are being said and written so that anywhere in the intellectual world an understanding blockage is about to happen. The visible sign of this truth is the very management crisis, of any perspective, the globalisation's project. In fact, it is about a deformation of the understanding mechanism, so that the globalisation has a double deviant meaning: it is either limited to what everybody believes it is, namely a kind of line of chaos, or it is the approximation of what it is "officially" said that it is, namely a model that makes any other model useless, except the politically "correct" one. It must be underlined that in between the total freedom of interpretation, as a stake of the uncertainty that represents the rule of the recent world, and the freedom sublimation in the interpretation of the model without alternative, which announces itself as the world's variant that wants with no rest possible in the future (as a last consequence of the adversity principle based on which an ambitious part rules over the whole), the hypotheses of an always ideologically deformed globalisation find room. This is an explanation for why we are witnesses of the reproduction of a multitude of perceptions regarding the globalisation, contradictory, but also contrary, exclusive, but also centripetal, fragmentary, but also emergent.

The analysis shows a curious thing: the two interpretative extremes, as it happens in fact with all the theoretical and attitudinal extremisms and fundamentalisms, do not definitely block the understanding and do not plainly open the ultimate dispute for imposing the globalisation model as the world's accepted constitution. Obviously, in can be talked about an apparent neutrality, deceiving anyhow, because the extremes easily become inflamed due to dissatisfactions in relation to the solutions attributed to the globalisation.

The special situation, in which Romania is standing, in an alert transition to another economic mechanism and to another formula of power management, aiming at overstepping the avatars of the communist model and exiting the post-communism, registers quite many conceptions adhesive to the epistemological consequences of the successive explicative models of the global order in the last century. It is a reality that in our country inertia can be seen when overstepping the generational models inculcated to education, the model's propensity being thwarted by the formulas of imitation. There is no doubt that this feature feeds the deviant visions, including upon the globalisation. The theoretical convictions, but especially the ideological concept that operates *post factum* feeds the adherence reserve to an interpretative model into one direction or another. In a suggestive way, confirmed in our country by the historical attachment for form and the institutionalised decline of the fond, as now also marginal vectors of the globalisation are consuming, no different than like an explicative model of the contemporary world, but significantly with ingredients and of a Marxist evolutionism, and a neo-liberal fundamentalism. The political passions for concepts like "the third way", "mixed economy", "the middle way", "the Swedish model" or the extreme alignment itself ("the Chinese experiment" versus deregulation,

“interventionism versus indirect governance”) betray the potential of contamination with scientific debatable ideas of any explicative model.

Despite of a broadly spread belief among the intellectuality, including the academic environment, the globalisation is not a logical consequence, as it is neither the conclusion reached by the history dispute, namely that the theory and the knowledge, so far, about the society’s course do not compose neither logically, nor mechanically the explicative model of globalisation. For this we cannot state, like it customary is, that the globalisation is expressed in its essence by the sum of parts because the sum of parts is simply more than the whole.

Apodictically, it can be said that the globalisation opens a breach in the way of accumulating history: the whole is more than the parts, while the parts tend to imitate the whole. It is a new mechanics of the rebalances between the competition forces, in and between justifications and responsibilities, between majority and minority etc. That is the true power of the globalisation, which practically is unlimited. In the pluridimensional space structured in this way, with multiple tensions and far away from balances, the logic of the Manichaeistic thought and ideological vision upon the world loose their relevance and this happens because they cannot anymore ensure the cultural perceivable structure of the explicative model.

We are, beyond doubt, on the brink of a conceptual deadlock, so that we cannot explain anymore what is happening: the globalisation resembles the relentless sensation about something that has sent into the present its substance, which is significant only in the future time, but is assaulting us as if the present were irrepressible. It is known that the epistemic situation between what truth is and what conjecture (futurological) is complicates man’s conceptual relation. In practice, it is another interpretative model that includes both the truth and the conjecture as fully complementary operational values (Popper, 2001). The relationism seems to extend on directions in which the error is minimised with complete chances. Essentially, the human nature becomes total because it includes all the intermediary or approximated cognitive stages in order to complete the explanation and to operationalise the implementation.

The fact in itself is not a theoretical improvisation but it is just the state of grace of our conscience that the human existence assumes the global convergence of the irreducible diversity of man towards a redefinable whole through formulas of individual discernment harmonization. Without resuscitating the extremes, be them collectivist, or individualist, the new ordering of the existential values, moral, political, economical and institutional, represents something absolutely different for the human experience and tends to be, if the alternative would be accepted, the experience without an altered rest.

This is why the globalisation becomes the way of functioning of the global economy in a global society that establishes global decision structures in order to solve the global problems. All the parts are conditional, and the primordially ratio is naturally reinstalling, the society regains its decision power, and the economy returns to the middle natural condition. The long period of decline of the hierarchies into

human values, also through the transformation of the economy and the degree of spending in a purpose in itself, do not represent anymore a nightmare because it lost its excesses' algorithm through the reinclusion of the economic into the social.

Conceptual delimitations

The meanings induced to the globalisation – all against the value options – are abundant but do not fully clarify. Exceptionally, in highly active intellectual circles, the globalisation becomes globalation (Friedman, 2001). Namely, everything is conceived as a process of value extension to a single model attached to the centre, progressively including the systems' peripheries by exporting tradition replacing standards, meant to culturally and behaviourally standardise. It is obvious that such a vision fits the American projects of global hegemony enforcement (Chomsky, 2003).

The options of seeing globalisation as glocalisation (Beck, 2003), namely a functionalist interference of powers in their global and local constitution, with the intention of not completely annulling the democracy's valences, keeping responsibilities for both levels, in the "and-and" way, tries to moderate the hegemonic vision, mediate between uniform and diverse, between the invariable rule of political correctness and individual freedom and judgement.

Both the globalation and the glocalisation are formulas that emphasise some conceptual aspects, which unfortunately are captive to the pre-global paradigm. We could say that, relieved of the ideological connotations, these visions approximate defining elements for the globalisation. In the same category we also find the metaphorical definitions of globalisation, of the "global village" type (McLuhan, 1997).

Ulrich Beck's (Beck, 2003) venture to operate distinctions between globality, globalisation and globalism deserves to be remembered.

If the globality, as a trans-historical concept, in which there can be found, among others, mutual problems of the humanity, like poverty, criminality, pollution, development etc., but also something related to the mutual content of the human action field (industrialisation, scientific and technical revolution, knowledge based economy etc.), seem to be often mistaken for globalisation, globalism is essentially a deviant globalisation, with fundamentalist features (market's imperialism, hegemonism, mondialism etc.). The globalisation is more than globality, especially in its dimension of managing the global powers, meant to provide real solutions to the global problems on another channel, of a post-nationalist or supra-state nature. It is known that, in the pre-global status of humanity, solving the global problems – as the globality's content – was tried through the international, the intergovernmental cooperation, underlined by the observance of the sovereignty principle as a generating support of adversity. The globalisation addresses global problems as instruments and agents belonging to supra-state structures of post-nationalist type. The globalism – as an altered expression of globality, as well as globalisation – leads to the last consequences of the adversity principle, when one part controls all the other parts of the global system, subliming the adversity principle. The globalism's ideology seizes the globalisation's meanings, and even manages to present itself as real globalisation. It is certain that the globalisation consumes the manifestation forms of the adversity principle. It proclaims a new

ordering principle, of the inclusive harmonic competition in a whole that is more than its parts (Dinu, 2004).

Hence, the globalisation is a historical type, essentially different, of global power management (economic, ecologic, scientific, military, cultural, political etc.). It can be said that, with regard to globalisation, we are in the situation of reordering the world aiming at overstepping the old order's limits (Dinu, 2004). Essentially, it is being passed from what is destroying by force with the aim of conquer, subdue, purge, exterminate or hegemonise, to the creating destruction aiming at freeing, unchaining, allying, diversifying, developing or consensualising. The globalisation has the deep meaning of resignification of human's specific difference, and the harmonic competition principle is meant to maintain alive the world's natural talent of being performant. The harmonic competition principle between the parts of a whole that is permanently in a progressive change makes unity, understanding, solidarity, cohesion, parts' convergence possible, namely it re-establishes the meaning of globalisation, its profound reason. The principle of competition in the global world's benchmarks does not let the victory be definitely confiscated, but it grants it through the constantly resumed dispute, thus ensuring the strength of the coexistence of the parts and of the whole. The global transition brings a new world ordering principle – harmonic, inclusive competition, another manner of powers' management – polycentric, another formula of combining of some new productive factors – the new economy, another stake of the progress – the second modernity, another economic and political order – the globalisation.

The paradigmatic horizon of globalisation

From the above meaning given to globalisation we distinguish four levels of significations: a) relations between the economy, society, institutions, problems and global power management; b) classified breakthroughs and pragmatic stakes; c) the specific agents' identity; d) strategies and previsions.

a) In the category of the relations between the functional policies of the globalisation's construction the most important signification regards the very essence of the globalisation: ensuring the social finality of the performant economy. This confers to the globalisation the integrative character and ensures the adherence as long as it doubles everything with the corrective character, especially for the organising system's deviations, which can verge either the left wing fundamentalism, by exacerbating the interest for satisfying the social need, or the right wing fundamentalism, leaving everything in the hands of the market's virtues. The significance of the level of the relations between the economy, society, institutions, problems and global power management is eminently political, meaning the creation of the global politics. The most delicate problem, which must be solved, assumes the invention of the main political instrument in order to create the global society, presumed to be the centre of the global political decision. Other delicate aspects of this level are counted for in the area of the institutions specific to the globalisation, as at this level regaining the Bretton Woods institutions' role is searched for through

reforms (Stiglitz, 2003, 2008). It is certain that the institutional reform specific to globalisation must target somehow or another the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB) together with the institutions forming the WB Group, as well as the World Trade Organisation (WTO), United Nations (UN) etc. These institutions will be able to support, being reformed, the globalisation process, though their visions, especially IMF's and WTO's, are in favour of some market's fundamentalisms, even some deviant aspects, of an ideological nature, regarding the economic strategies to be applied. Certainly, in institutional terms, the globalisation remains a wish that could come true sooner rather than later depending on the interests of the globalisation's real agents.

Box 4. Global institutions

- World Bank (WB)
- International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- Bank for International Settlements (BIS)
- World Trade Organisation (WTO)
- Group of Developed Countries (G7/8)
- United Nations (UN)
- World Health Organisation (WHO)

Attached to these aspects is the effort of creating good practice for solving the problems with global variables. As the establishing and functionalising of a global decision centre will be reached, namely after the critical weight had been reached for creating a global society, only then it should be expected to have solutions to the global problems like development, for instance, but also pollution, combating discrimination etc., including coherent strategies of managing the consequences of global problem solving (Stiglitz, 2008).

It is important that the areas' relationship assumes the reorganisation of the relation between the economy and the society in the sense of maintaining the principle of economy's social finality.

b) It is obvious that the globalisation registered a success with regard to the financial markets, though their finality seems to be still controlled by the business segment fascinated with the performance in itself. In general, the globalisation has generated the premises for the free movement of the production factors. Unfortunately, the liberalisation, in any area, remains captive to the intentions of comparative advantages' rescue, on the whole of what it could support performance' maximisation assumed by replacing formulas of the globalisation, which came on the channel of one part's ambitions (usually a state) to dispose of the entire global system. The WTO regulations reveal just this fact. The experts think that the liberalisation's success, true breakthroughs that belong to the globalisation model's essence, was supported by the attachment of some to neo-liberalism, in the variant practiced by the Thatcher and Reagan governments (in Great Britain, and USA, in the 8th decade of the last century),

inspired by IMF and WB, assisted by the Federal Reserves – the Central Bank of USA – a formula that also substantiated the reforms in the post-communist countries and that it is known as the Washington Consensus.

Certainly, there are important elements to be taken into account when the role of liberalisation is being judged as a political initiative in some states, primarily because it is the role of experiment which allowed the first assessments. Nevertheless, the liberalisation assumed by the globalisation does not limit itself to the neo-liberal precepts, eminently found at the monetary level, but to all the dimensions, from the movements of capital to the movement of persons. It is not less important to underline the fact that the globalisation is not a victorious liberalisation in the libertarians' sense, but a harmonisation of the liberation's rules, so that these aim at reaching the social finality of the economy. In fact, it is the sole variant due to which the globalisation does not fall into the trap of the tittytainment suggested by Zbigniew Brzezinski (Martin, Schumann, 1999), that of the polarised society: 20% (with access to the resources' production) versus 80% (which must be supported with dummies and entertainment, namely with bread and circus, as we know from the Roman culture).

Frankly speaking, the globalisation assumes the logic of overstepping the traps represented by utopias, even the ones practiced by the social experiments of the collectivism because it has pragmatic stakes, contrary to those reached by the new man, for instance, like all the stakes specific to the social engineering of any colour. There is no other way to explain the slowness sensation in the course of globalisation because the purpose is that people convince themselves that the old order's values are obsolete and that they must opt for the project in which the freedom is a confirmed expression of the general performance, reached by individual judgement. Returning to the individual, as human nature, is the absolute stake of the globalisation, and not understanding this objective throws the project into a global imitation of the failed ideological experiments, even in the area of the absolute danger, where the man is against the human nature.

Box 5. *Global factors (agents)*

- Global firms
- Supermarkets (usually financial)
- Risk funds
- The virtual space operators ("the electronic herd")
- Nongovernmental organisations (ecologist, antipoverty etc.)
- Associations of intellectual environments or spiritual practices
- International standards' bodies
- Personalities of global reputation

c) Like any idea or any action, natural or caused, the globalisation becomes real through what its agents think and act. In order to identify them one think is clear: the

globalisation's agents are those producing the globalisation and reproducing themselves for globalisation. As it could be said, the gate is opened, and the one who understands what is going on in the yard can get in. Nowadays, the real globalisation's agents seem to be invisible and the ones contesting the globalisation seem to be very exposed. Somehow anecdotic, the globalisation's agents are positive and negative, with the mention that the positives keep silent and perform, and the negatives protest against what they believe it is ... something else. The confusion regarding the agents is, in fact, the confusion regarding the values promoted by the globalisation. The values that do not enter into the option lattice of the globalisation, precisely because it means a new order of values for solving the problems defying the old order, even the neuroses induced by the permanent postponing of problems' solving, as well as the forced, ideological solving of the situations related to human nature, are revenging, creating dissensions, supporting the anti-globalisation campaign etc. Certainly, qualifying for the values and the agents of globalisation is a matter of option, as a matter of being compatible with the principles. Besides the devoted agents of globalisation, like the global firms, supermarkets, risk funds, virtual space operators (Godeluck, 2000), nongovernmental organisations etc. the states that understand to render valuable the globalisation's advantages, as a first stage, can also dedicate themselves especially with regard to the option for productivity, speed, prosperity, modernity etc. (Friedman, 2001). If we were to say what essentially the option for globalisation is, it means saying that it is an option for the world's course into the future. The still shy evolutions are heading towards a new power management system, the decision being either influenced, or taken by the global agents. It seems a "science fiction" scenario, but it is like that only for the naives and nostalgic trapped in the benchmarks of the value system of the model proposed by the national and industrial revolutions, namely for more than two centuries. The global revolution has started, has already registered victories, both in the East and in the West, has started with the post-communist and post-capitalist transitions, the globalisation is already on everyone's street (Dinu, 2000), and we only have to become aware of this fact.

The processes specific to globalisation are of a post-national nature. In fact, the globalisation completes the modernity cycle centred on the national and coagulates the trends of the second modernity (Beck, 2003) in view of which the values, action principles, institutions, as well as post-national moral guidelines are defined. From now on, the history is divided into the pre-global stage and the global stage (Dinu, 2004).

d) It is natural for the globalisation to be perceived as something that comes like a storm. Nevertheless, many of the events we assign to the globalisation (G8 decisions, WTO reunions etc.) and that are accompanied by anti-globalisation reactions have only mediated on long-term the link between the essence and the globalisation. The decisions taken by the most industrialised states regarding a general interest problem refer though to the interests defined by other types of reaction, international, interstate, regional, cross-borders etc., but not truly global. Frankly speaking, the condition of industrial power, in known terms of positive reactivity of a state to the industrial revolution, do not really have the consistency of the globalisation's agent, light on

other dimensions: information, services, innovation, software, consultancy, derivatives, securities etc.

Box 6. What globalisation is

The definition of common sense

Globalisation is the process through which people everywhere understand to accept what resembles them, and put on mute what separates them.

The positive definition

Globalisation is a transition process that includes all the social organisation formulas as finality of both the post-communist transition, and of the post-capitalist one, namely exactly what would give meaning to both processes, the global transition.

The conventionalist definition

Globalisation is the new economic and political world order, as a multidimensional and correlative system in which the coherence is given by the global governance.

The openness definition

Globalisation is the expression of a world's system in its highest degree of integration and permanently opened to integration.

The main definition

Globalisation is a system in which the objective-function regards the whole aiming at removing the adversity, and the competition aims at generating the creative destruction.

The teleological definition

Globalisation is a potentiality and a tendentiality of the coherent structures of the world, as a progressive materialisation of rationality and universal human reason.

The instrumental definition

Globalisation is the process of ordering the world, as an estrangement from chaos, based on the occidental technology, permissive finances and free information, namely liberalising the access to efficiency and modernity, to building up wealth and to power.

The integrating definition

Globalisation is the functioning process of the global economy, which, inside the global society, becomes able to create the global decision structures for the global problems solving.

The globalisation runs its intentions more and more obvious, thus becoming the expression of a system integrating in its highest degree and permanently remaining opened to integration (Friedman, 2001). The exclusion from the system is an exceptional possibility, and the admission is liberalised, as the whole is meant to absorb the extreme variations, including the failures, even if the option belongs to one part. Certainly, the globalisation presents itself like a new world order, one that has a

multidimensional and correlative feature. As a strategy, the globalisation is the direct expression, verifiable and argued, of the rationality and reason. The globalisation has, undoubtedly, the forecasting feature, it operates with significant proportions of conjecture next to the science's classified truth, even being the stake of an on-the-go forecast. The globalisation is, definitely, an ideal where the truth meets freedom and justice, against the general production of individually assumed prosperity. It is not however the best of worlds, it is just a long prepared possible world of human reasoning. It is the mediation between the normative and the positive, where the human self-governing experience gains a meaning beyond adversity. As the globalisation is built in a Manichaeistic manner, it has the vocation of minimising the failure and broadly distributes what is resulting from managing the effect.

Approximations of the globalisation

Counterweights to the part that dominates the whole

The present system of world organisation, of a single-pole nature, resulted from overstepping the bipolar system based on ideological adversity, is not a real globalisation formula. The literature in the field analyses the new economic and political world order, with the USA at the steering wheel, as a stage of a generalised imperialism (Brzezinsky, 2000).

Justifying this system is a delicate problem in view of the rationality performance of which the humanity is capable. In a justified manner, USA are forced to pose as the guarantor, from an economic, political and military perspective, of the world order balance. Unfortunately, the USA behaviour tends to grow indistinct any manifestation contrary to the state interests and even block the globalisation idea, eminently a formula of democratising the distribution of complementary powers in order to favour the development and modernisation (Dinu, 2000).

USA is today the part that dominates the whole, even with the possibility of remodelling the whole according to the American unilateral rules and interests. Certainly, it is not imperialism in an aggressive manner, but one built on seductions, from the cultural until the ones regarding the human models (Friedman, 2001). The global order guaranteed by the USA bears the absolute seal of the USA, created with all the ingredients like Hollywood and McDonald's, but also with the "Special Force" arsenal. The USA's reactions are today specific to the project of perpetuation of the bias position in the world economy, even the economic integration promoted on the North-American continent, together with Canada and Mexico, being rather initiated with the intent of rendering valuable the USA's comparative advantages.

What is worth to be taken into account are the counter-reactions of other regions to the American attempts of imposing its rules and which determine the main trends that identify for quite a while with globalisation. Lately, this aspect boils down to something undesired, namely to the fact that the regionalisation, with approximations of globalisation, is produced under the American adversity principle. Europe is preparing with its single formula because it must face America's irrepressible power,

as Asia is searching for its regional value only through an analysis that could underline the identity of its present economic and political power in relation to America. As long as the present economic and political order is structured on the principle that the part must control the other part or even the whole, the regionalisation risks to be a path for continuing certain anti-globalisation attitudes or at least throw again the global order structuring in the area of disputing the relations between the opposite parts. Thus, approximating the globalisation through regionalisation cannot break loose from the environment generated by the economic and political order built on spatial limitations disputing their power balance.

In practice, today a globalisation blockage is taking place, as both the European and the Asian model are built on the political need to not have an American globalisation; both models are primarily based on the American adversity. This truth means that the two regions, European and Asian, are in an obvious inadequacy with the American project of globalisation precisely because Europe and Asia persists in proposing other centres that would temper, counterbalance the power of the American centre. Frankly, the fact that other centres appear is not an anti-globalisation signal, but a signal that these centres are built according to adversity algorithms (Dinu, 2000). The idea of multiple centres is compatible in the globalisation with the globalisation project when it is not aiming at adversity through territorial imitation, as the globalisation is not a interconnected problem of the territorial entities, but it even means the creation of the global entity.

Multiplying the power centres on the Globe, when there are currently three, North America, centred on the USA, Europe, with the European Union project, and Asia, with the Japanese dynamism and the Chinese pivot, seems rather created from the need to preserve the diversity, identity, to establish *échafaudages* for a dispute, diffuse for the moment, of the hegemony. Not otherwise are the Africa and Australia, as well as South-America preparing to evolve. The commercial exercise that led to creating intersected free trade areas indicates the fact that the perspective of overstepping the regional fragmentations is taking shape.

Also in the case of regionalisation, the explicative model that is dominant is based on additionality, on the belief that the parts could form a functional whole. It is known that all the internationalist conceptions have walked this line, those of the interdependencies growth between countries, and anyway through here the imperial ambitions from the Romans until the Americans have also walked through here. This is the road where a providential part must dominate the whole. Still looking at things in this manner means making the history hold still or at most to take beyond the last consequences an economic and political order build on the balance of powers of the component parts of a system controlled by a privileged part.

America defends its self-assumed right to control the whole, in the same time trying to minimise its responsibilities (Kissinger, 2002). The sand skilfully slipped into the European integration gear by the Americans, on the military and financial path, says a lot in this regard, another approximation of the globalisation besides the American one being a danger for the status of the part controlling the whole, suggesting that the power could be democratically diffused on the globe, as well as prosperity.

References

- Beck, U. (2003). *Ce este globalizarea. Erori ale globalismului – răspunsuri la globalizare*, Editura Trei, București
- Brzezinski, Z. (2000). *Marea tablă de șah. Supremația americană și imperatiivele sale strategice*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București
- Chomsky, N. (2003). *Hegemonie sau supraviețuire. America în căutarea dominației globale*, Editura Antet, București
- Cowles, G., Smith, M. (editori) (2002). *Starea Uniunii Europene, vol. 5, „Risc, reformă, rezistență, relansare“*, Editura Club Europa, București
- Coyle, Diane (2000). *Guvernarea economiei mondiale*, Editura Antet, București
- Dăianu, D., Vrânceanu, R. (2002). *România și Uniunea Europeană*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- Defarges, Ph. M. (2002). *Instituții europene*, Editura Amarcord, Timișoara
- Dinu, M. (2000). *Economie contemporană. Ce este globalizarea?*, Editura Economică, București
- Dinu, M. (2002). *Economia României. Întreprinderile mici și mijlocii. Cu ce ne integrăm?*, Editura Economică, București
- Dinu, M., Soicol, C., Marinaș, M., (2004). *Economie europeană. O prezentare sinoptică*, Editura Economică, București
- Friedman, L. Th. (2001). *Lexus și măslinul. Cum să înțelegem globalizarea*, Editura Fundației Pro, București
- Friedman, L. Th. (2007). *Pământul este plat. Scurtă istorie a secolului XXI*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- Gates, B. (2000). *@faceri cu viteza gândului*, Editura Amaltea, București
- Godeluck, S. (2003). *Boom-ul neteconomiei*, Editura C.N.I. „Coresi“ S.A., București
- Greenspan, A. (2008). *Era turbulențelor. Aventuri într-o lume nouă*, Editura Publica, București
- Hen, Ch., Léonard, J. (2003). *Uniunea Europeană*, Editura C.N.I. „Coresi“ S.A., București
- Hobsbawn, E. (1998). *Secolul extremelor*, Editura Lider, București
- Huntington, S. P. (1998). *Ciocnirea civilizațiilor și refacerea ordinii mondiale*, Editura Antet, București
- Kissinger, H. (2002). *Are nevoie America de o politică externă?*, Editura Incitatus, București
- Korten, D. C. (2001). *Lumea postcorporatistă*, Editura Antet, București
- Krugman, P. (2009). *Întoarcerea economiei declinului și criza din 2008*, Editura Publica, București
- Martin, H.-P., Schumann, H. (1999). *Capcana globalizării. Atac la democrație și bunăstare*, Editura Economică, București
- Popper, K. R. (2001). *Conjecturi și infirmări. Cercetarea cunoașterii științifice*, Editura Trei, București
- Prodi, R. (2001). *O viziune asupra Europei*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *Globalizarea. Speranțe și deziluzii*, Editura Economică, București
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2008). *Mecanismele globalizării*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- Strange, Susan (2001). *Retragerea statului. Difuziunea puterii în economia mondială*, Editura Trei, București
- Tsoukalis, L. (2000). *Noua economie europeană*, Editura Arc, Chișinău, 2000
- *** *Documente* www.mie.ro
- *** *World Bank Report* (2000), Washington D.C.
- Lafontaine, O., Müller, Christa (1998). *Nu vă fie teamă de globalizare. Bunăstare și muncă pentru toți*, Editura Inter-Graf, Reșița