CURRENT NEEDS IN THE PROCESS OF GLOBALIZATION

Asistent univ. Lucian SĂCĂLEAN

Universitatea „Petru Maior", Târgu-Mureş

Abstract

Globalization becomes a process of enlargement, acceleration of world-scale interconnections in all aspects of socio-economic life and even of imposing a certain behavior as its beneficiary. There is also the issue of loss and gain for the local civilization and, from this point of view, regionalization is the chance to transform Globalization based on local interests, traditions or needs, keeping its positive integrating features.

Humanity is at a new crossroads, where the previous educational ideals cannot respond to development and integration needs anymore. From knowledge as virtue to knowledge as model or knowledge as national pride and as far as knowledge as necessity, the educational system has managed to keep up with these transformations. Today, education is getting ready to combine two elements: efficiency and global vocation.

The current changes can bring many benefits, if we understand their sense and accept that our vision about the world as civilization must not correspond to a bellicose past but to a future that permits mutual understanding, thanks to common keys for encryption. Schooling and education can play a central role in this approach.

But why should education respond do these transformations? Why should the educational process not continue as it is, answering the challenges only when it is absolutely necessary? The very role that education plays nowadays implies the need to determine transformation and not only passively follow it. The educational result of learning will be developing an awareness of the connections between different components and participants, regardless of the geographical area where they work; this would be the basis of the partnership.

I hear babies cry ..... I watch them grow
They'll learn much more ..... than I'll ever know
And I think to myself ..... what a wonderful world

Louis Armstrong

We are certainly living in interesting times: the internet abounds with conspiracy theories regarding Globalization, the economic crisis helps institutions or organizations that seemed not to find their aim in the new economy; huge fortunes have been swallowed – apparently overnight, states now find themselves sheltering an economy that not long ago used to almost dismantle them, secret organizations come into light and the election show of the first coloured president of the United States captures the imagination of billions of auditors.

How can we then talk about Globalization as a current issue? We surely can, for despite anti-globalization voices, the mad race of global integration continues. The issue here is if we can talk about the phenomenon in its entirety, as having implications on different levels and structures or we need to be talking about a globalizing determination, by the action of various political, economic, social or other factors.

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

We are going through a period of crisis - confirmed by history, if we are to look back at the Roman Empire or, later on, at other European ones. Who can offer the solution? The political class seems to be able to provide only superficial shows and the political crisis is acute, even if we refer to states that are politically established or states that have just entered the world of western democracies.[1] States have all felt this crisis – more or less – an identity crisis, a crisis in legitimacy, participation, penetration and distribution.[2] Is there a new distribution of power and responsibility that can solve the current crisis? The political, financial, economic, moral crises are mere aspects of the same phenomenon, sharing the same roots.

In 1968, the Club of Rome identified a series of world problems: population, food, resources, industrial development and pollution. Later on, the number of problems increased exponentially. We are now facing difficult choices. The political realm cannot respond to this situation as a whole (I may say that it can only to a small extent), the economic realm has clearly shown the limits of welfare[3] and what state selfishness means. The living cost of over 2500 US Dollars per citizen of the Earth (man, woman or child), paid as a result of a series of instruments of greed and economic carelessness, requires a different perspective on the world welfare balance. It is also true that the more intense global interactions have literally saved nations from bankruptcy and have generated a state of hope and welfare that no one had ever hoped for. Despite the fact that we have nowadays identified a wide range of problems on Earth, the most important ones globally remain population, food, resources, development and pollution. Until now, we have not reached a shared vision on how to solve them.

The 2000-year old saying that has become so characteristic of the Christian world, "Give the Caesar what belongs to the Caesar", seems to be as actual as never before, although, as far as we can see, we are not only giving the Caesar the most important part of our lives, but we are also enjoying and tasting all the temptations of a "decadent" but so glittering and promising present. Economy has been the leading voice in what we nowadays call Globalization, it has expanded national borders, created connections, friendships and shared interests; it has combined the roles that both states and individuals had played as far as the redefining of existing relationships.

The common perception on Globalization is the one that supports uniformity, homogenization, westernization or even Americanization (Attina, 1999)[4]. The latter is also

[1] See Leonard Binder et al., *Crisis and Sequences în Political Developement*, Priceton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1971
[2] Ibidem
[3] *www.clubofrome.org/docs/**limits**.rtf*
[4] Vasile Puşcaş*, Relaţii internaţionale/transnaţionale – International/Transnational Relations*, ed. Sincron, Cluj-Napoca 2005 p.182

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

mentioned by Thomas Friedman in his work, "Lexus and the Olive Tree": "Globalization is actually Americanization; it has the ears of Mickey Mouse, it drinks Pepsi or Coca Cola, it eats Big Macs and works on IBM laptops. Many societies in this world see it as a good thing, but others as a fundamental threat."[5]

Globalization thus becomes a process of enlargement, acceleration of world-scale interconnections in all aspects of socio-economic life and even of imposing a certain behavior as its beneficiary. The way in which this process impacts on Arab or African states may, however, be different from the perception of the western world – including here an important part of the former Communist states.

If John Gray declares that Globalization is a memorable transformation of Capitalism that has already been made, thus being inevitable and irreversible, Graeme Thompson or Paul Hirst say that its dimensions are being exaggerated and that we are not dealing with a phenomenon, but with an accelerated internationalization of Capitalism and the market. Obviously, the data involved in such a comparison are complex - as the comparison itself – and hard to achieve, precisely because of the high amount of data that must be compared and because of the need to establish a correct matrix for this comparison.

Anthony Giddens describes Globalization as being "not new, but revolutionary" and proves that it is a multifaceted process with different and often contradictory aspects"[6], a contrasting vision that generally perceives current globalization as a second wave of progress, unprecedented from the point of view of its features and the number of countries involved.

Other pro-Globalization authors[7] say that this is a natural, positive and imminent process: "We must be determined when responding to the accusation that globalization is a threat to our values and security. It is absurd to be against globalization; it is as if you were against the weather forecast. Globalization must not fatally cause social injustice and does not mean accepting the American socio-economic model. There are many things to be admired in the United States and the way in which Americans work probably gives the highest growth indicators" (Chris Patten). This may be very true, but it is exactly the way in which Americans work that has shown the limits of the current system. The instruments of American welfare should have stayed handy for the Americans; this is probably one of the causes behind the current world crisis. What welfare model should we choose? If we are to make a comparison, we realize that what we now have is a multi-polar system of producing wealth, dominated by the already established actors who are trying to maintain their status-quo – and

[5] Th. Friedman, *Lexus şi măslinul - Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Editura Fundației PRO, București, 2001, p. 400
[6] Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping Our Lives*, Profile Books, London, 1999, p. 10.
[7] www.interesul public.ro

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

they generally manage to, because of the very dynamics of this system.As far as new actors move in and out of the "welfare top", states such as Germany, France, Italy maintain their welfare within acceptable limits. The balance is, however, fragile and it does not work in the long run.

Globalization[8] is often considered an inevitable historical process, as well as an advantage for the human race. "In fact, all these are myths put forward to justify unrestricted greed and to hide away the degree to which the global transformation of human institutions has become a consequence of complicated, well-funded and deliberate interventions of an elite that has the financial means to live in a world of illusion, apart from everybody else. (…) These forces have transformed financial corporations and institutions that once used to be good into instruments of a market tyranny that is now spreading all over the planet, like a cancer, colonizing more and more of the Earth's vital spaces, destroying ways of life, uprooting people, rendering democratic institutions powerless and devouring life in an insatiable quest for money". (Korten D.C., 1997, p.22-23)

The error is brutal and obvious, say other researchers. Globalization cannot be seen as a necessity of nature or of history. Many of the forces involved in it are led by strongly motivated interests, be they public or private (Gordon Smith, Moises Naim). From the point of view of the political world order theory, Globalization is the growth and fostering of the world culture.[9]

The settling of a mindset about progress, political order, accepted rights that were mainly promoted by western countries gave birth to a common framework for international disputes, therefore for the way of interpretation and action. This culture promoted by transnational groupings does not cohere with the general consensus, being rather more generative of tensions or conflicts for a certain part of the world. If the tendency of the West is to create homogeneity, it will surely hit the strong barriers of civilization (ethnical and religious).

Judging from the perspective of the theory of world culture[10], Globalization refers to the "compressing" of the world and the consolidation of a world view that sees the world as a whole. The promoters of this theory consider that, at the end of the 20th century and even earlier, globalization has transformed the world order into a problem. As we have already

[8] Dana Pop *Globalizare şi teorii ale globalizării – Globalization and Theories of Globalization* , UBB Cluj Napoca, 2005, p.45
[9] Alexandra Sarcinski, *Globalizarea insecurităţii: factori şi modalităţi de contracarare – The Globalization of Insecurity: Factors and Ways of Counteracting* – Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii Naţionale de Apărare „Carol I", 2006,p.9
[10] Ibidem, p.10

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

said, the current perception on Globalization refers more to its economic aspects, being a rather recent historical phenomenon (25-50 years old). We can explain the origin of Globalization by using several main features, such as the configuration of economic blocks, the end of political bi-polarity (with an effect upon economic polarity), the integration of national economies on the world market and last but not least, the transition to the high value economy, as compared to volume economy. The phenomenon of Globalization has been facilitated by the creation of international organisms like the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank, which appeared as a result of a need to facilitate commerce, investments and the circulation of capital. All these facilities were favorable and effectively used by developed markets – i.e. by rich nations – with negative effects in the less developed or transitional countries. The fall of the iron curtain not only facilitated the access of capital on new markets, but it also accelerated the international movement of capital.[11]

It has also been said that Globalization offers a higher degree of freedom to the individual than to the state, who once entering a global competition, will valorize its creative talent and so the result will be beneficial on a wider scale. The state is also criticized for the often ineffective management of resources or for the production of wealth; on the contrary, a private enterprise is able to generate wealth in a more effective way than the state. Still, we forget that often the wealth managed by privately-owned companies has limited beneficiaries and that in a situation when globalization reaches an acme, the responsibility of resource management and wealth production moves on another level – but acting in a similar way to the current state, it can even become directed just like in the Communist economic system. If we remember Karl Marx's Capital, we notice the irony of fate in that, after the implosion of the Communist system, the state was called to save private companies by using tools that kept going the unjust system created by Marx. How else could we say this when, immediately after receiving "juicy" infusions, the directors of certain American companies decided to pay themselves primes and celebrate the success of "salvation", in fact being covered by well-defined contracts? I think we are forgetting the lesson of solidarity and the current face of global expansion suffers from the same habits as the civilization that generated the phenomenon in the first place.

Far from being nostalgic for an egalitarian discourse, still I believe that the global society has the resources to solve the moral dilemma through responsibility and civil sense, characteristics of a superior level of the human consciousness which is found both in individual action and in collective action – here we include any form of social manifestation: from political parties to unions, companies or non-governmental organizations.

[11] George Soros, *Despre globalizare – About Globalization,* Ed. Polirom, Iaşi, 2002, p. 23

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

However, what do we do when the system which theoretically proposed the globalizing wave, reaches its limits? Can we consider that, one way or another, the Communist system was preparing a similar if not parallel course of action? To refer to the first question, we can suppose that the capitalist system represented the engine used until the present moment, but that the phenomenon in itself demonstrates the capacity of not depending strictly on a phenomenon or economic system. Moreover, the leading role can be played by different structures at different times, be they economic, political or else. Without going into detail, Communism – characterized by the internationalization of its political message (regardless of the nationalistic or ethnic aspects that were found in certain regimes) leaves room to integrating globalizing manifestations.

However, its tendency towards accepting/rejecting an integrating current is not as new as we would like to believe. Without thinking as far back as the old empires (Babylonian or Roman), we may take the examples of the colonial empires of France, Great Britain or Spain, which exported their languages, educational systems or other aspects of "modern civilization", thus creating the path that was to be walked by American colonialism at the very end of Globalization itself.

The two twin aspects of Globalization (it makes the problem visible and gives the solution) suggest that, on the one hand, Globalization is the tendency towards the universal in humanity's view about itself – a rather cultural view -, underlying its common sides or aspects that impact upon it entirely and on the other hand, that evolution naturally lead to an irregular distribution of power on our planet – creating dependence on a center that manages this power alone and ensures the functioning of the international regime.[12] This center suffers mutations, because it is not necessarily a superpower, a coalition, a coordinating organism but it can also take the form of any of these means of expression.

The current moment proves the weaknesses of the Capitalist system, which belong rather to the greedy foundations of economy and not necessarily on the system itself. The current crisis may be an ally of Globalization. The need for a global solution – difficult to understand and accept by nation-states – may feed the supporters of conspiracy theories. Either if we talk about world governance or about some of its elements[13], the impact of the expanding phenomenon creates new possible ways of acting on both sides. The protesters of Globalization use the instruments that helped its construction when they fight the world government or those hiding behind often terrifying actions or scenarios.

[12] Dinu Marin, *Modelul explicativ al globalizării – The Explicative Model of Globalization*, în Economie Teoretică şi aplicată – in *Theoretical and Applied Economics*, nr.3, 2006, p 58
[13] Conspiracy theories *http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8460877224268567651&en*

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

The globalization of information and culture, the expansion of television, internet and other forms of communication, the increased mobility of ideas commerce[14] are concrete indicators of the power of Globalization, of the great influence and pressure that it exercises upon the people who have access to these resources.

We may say that the paradigm of socio-spatial development - with its two opposing terms: individuation and globalization - in a system where the American exclusive economic hegemony does not exist anymore and the socialist alternative is obsolete, is rather determined not by the classical ideological aspect – left-right – but, at least for the 90s, by Nationalism or Ethnicism and their forms of manifestation. From this angle, nationalistic or ethnical individualism does not exclude globalization; on the contrary, it can find the necessary niche to develop it in a globally integrated society. As the main objective of current civilization, welfare only surpasses these barriers in imposing or building a new world reality – and under the current conditions, world welfare remains a long-term objective, very difficult if not impossible to reach.

We can define the contemporary world by its coexisting international and global relations[15] – and if we still define international relations from the sovereign stance of state actors, global relations, on the other hand, have already crossed state borders into the economic, social or cultural fields. Is Globalization a potential state or has the future become present and we are those who feel the transition?

One effect that we can better observe, out of the multitude of effects of Globalization, is probably the one related to the homogenization and standardization of the human lifestyle – unanimously and strongly seen as negative. Its critics have been extremely vehement, considering that we can see leveling in all the aspects of social life – be it material or not. The process of wiping out state borders generates the fear of losing one's cultural identity and of reaching the same level of lifestyle and the same mentality as everyone else.

We may thus see Globalization as a jump of international organization, with new rules and paradigms, a process led by economic, technological and political forces for quite a long time, a process that involves new risks and opportunities, stressing the interdependence of the contemporary world.

Globalization certainly implies interaction and integration, but it is extremely important if this interaction occurs only in the benefit of certain actors or if there is generous access to benefits. There is also the issue of loss and gain for the local civilization and, from

[14] George Soros, *op.cit*, p. 23
[15] Vasile Puşcaş, op.cit., p182

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

this point of view, regionalization is the chance to transform Globalization based on local interests, traditions or needs, keeping its positive integrating features.

The world is changing and the cause of this change is the interaction between economy, the political system, social institutions and culture[16]. We are living the full effects of globalization – good or bad, black or white, although nowadays more than ever, black and white have become relative. If economic standards have become more and more common and accepted by the international community, in some cases bringing along the permission to intrude or penetrate different cultural or civilization standards and habits, they do not suffice in themselves to determine a world-level change. The fact that different cultures react and act sometimes surprisingly clearly demonstrates that the mere economic field is not the universal key to achieve this process. Education, the educational system (with its integrated role of justifying and strengthening a system) has all the chances to complete this set of keys.

Globalization may thus be understood as the totality of processes that define the global integrating relations comprising the social, economic and political fields, as well as the one of trans-continental interdependency, as well as the re-organization of all these interactions in inter-regional or trans-continental networks or streams. We cannot thus only understand it strictly through the economic, as for example George Soros sees it: "Globalization is the free movement of Capital, accompanied by the increasing domination of global financial markets and multinational corporations over national economies"[17], or to reduce it to what Anthony Giddens offered as a definition, comprising mainly sociological elements: "Globalization may be defined, he says, as the intensification of social relations all over the world, which connects communities from far-away in such a way that local events are seen through the lens of other events that occur at a great distance and the other way around"[18]. The thesis according to which Globalization, seen through a technological determinism and the generalization of certain economic policies (without considering the circumstances) solves the problems of humanity, simplifies and underestimates reality[19].

Others such as Giorgios I. Mantzaridis, see the difference between globalization and universality. From a formal point of view, these would be two related but essentially opposed notions. The first expresses authoritarian union and homogenization, while the second expresses spiritual unity but simultaneously, human diversity as well. Globalization moves away the particular aspects and transforms people and societies in a shapeless mass, while

[16] Daniel Chirot, *„Societăţi în schimbare – Changing Societies,* Bucureşti, Editura Athena, 1996, p.54
[17] George Soros, *op.cit.,* p.15
[18] Ioan Bari, *„Globalizare şi probleme globale*" – Globalization and Global Problems, Ed. Economică, Bucureşti, 2001, p.7
[19] Postelnicu Gh. *Globalizarea economiei – The Globalization of Economy*, Editura Economică, Bucureşti, 2000, p255

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

universality respects the particularities of people and societies and cultivates their harmony and fulfillment"[20].

The common perception on Globalization is the one that supports uniformity, homogenization, westernization or even Americanization (Attina, 1999)[21]. Is this perception correct or is it only valid for what we call western civilization – including here the former Communist states in Europe? What is visible today demonstrates the quasi-failure in implementing formulae of western civilization in the Arab or Asian spaces only as a result of the economic, military or other type of domination.

Economic Globalization cannot meet the need for affirmation of a really global society and neither can it solve the inequalities and disputes; it cannot unite as long as the common language is not entirely consolidated. The speed of growing global is faster if the streams are less material and they refer more to services, information data, telecommunications, audio-visual messages, electronic mail and online consultations[22].

The educational need is almost unanimously recognized, even if we speak of Islamic, Christian, atheist communities or European, African, South-American, Arab or Asian nations. A shared educational standard could thus add more speed to global integration but it could also – more importantly – offer closer opportunities, regardless of the individual's origin. The informational revolution has modified the role and way in which governments create policies[23] – the quantity of information available is now much higher, so it is necessary to separate relevant from non-relevant information; the political decision-making process can be centralized or de-centralized, but governments prefer the first. Still, the political person is tempted to manage different situations apart from the central power, for the plain reason that it is possible (in opposition with the private environment, where decision-making is de-centralized); the global network of information has eroded the government's monopoly, so that journalists, economic actors, NGOs often have access to information before the government does. Politicians often support their decisions with public information and the transparency is better in the global network. Also, certain issues are more stressed and so their impact is bigger on the global level, making it difficult to take unilateral decisions.

Why should we not accept the idea that the same revolution can have a major positive impact on national or regional educational systems? What would be the stages of such a process and how would the quality of the educational act be affected?

---

[20] in *Globalizare şi universalitate. Himeră şi adevăr – Globalization and Universality. Chimera and Truth*, Editura Bizantină, Bucureşti, 2002, p.20

[21] Vasile Puşcaş*, Relaţii internaţionale/transnaţionale – International / Transnational Relations*, ed. Sincron, Cluj-Napoca 2005 p.182

[22] Ramonet, I., *Geopolitica haosului – Geopolitics of Chaos*, Bucureşti, Editura Doina, 1998, p.50.

[23] Jonathan Aronson, *The comunications and Internet Revolution*, în The globalization of World Politics, p548

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

Europe has tried to establish a common standard for its members, one that is accessible to states that have privileged relations with the Union. Beyond the inherent disputes regarding various malfunctions, Lisbon or Bologna[24] are concrete steps in this direction. However, we must see Bologna as an intermediary stage and not at all as a final result. Without going too much into detail right now, we can say that Europe has tried to find an answer to several questions: what do we study, for how long, what are the common elements and the skills achieved, how do we fill in the base with a coherent "lifelong learning" program but especially, how do we ensure the same quality and, if you wish, universality (expressed in the recognition given to the study cycle). The ideal is to establish a universal model that would clearly state the limits, qualities, requirements and final results. I say that this would be ideal because we have different traditions, perceptions and often different needs. Also, it should be very clear what we aim at by rendering such a system universal and what are the short, medium and long-term objectives. One of the major objectives would be universalizing understanding, the access to shared database/knowledge, thus contributing to the development of a set of shared skills. Local needs cannot obviously be ignored, but they cannot replace the global vision either. The most they can do is bring additional contributions to the existing knowledge, strictly based on local references.

The opponents of Globalization would see that a new component in the plot of the "world government" appears, namely in the shape of one of the sui generis components of the educational system that I had mentioned in the beginning of that justification article. What would now be the benefits, would the "poor of the planet" have the real chance to sit at the same table with the "rich", thus changing the power balance for a while?

Skeptical people will object, saying that poor nations will not have the financial power to implement required changes, that they will lack the qualified personnel in order to provide the additional value needed and that, ultimately, the system would still give advantage to the richest of the world by the intensification of brain migration at a lower cost. I admit that these suppositions may be very real, but in the short and long run, they would benefit many parts of the globe. They could facilitate a short-term leap – even if a certain society could not keep up with it in the beginning, be it for economic reasons or because of different traditions that could not immediately integrate the implicit opening-up. In the long run, beyond the incurrent leveling, it could lead to profound changes in local communities, having a decisive role in the global integration.

[24] http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc1290_en.htm

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

But why should education respond do these transformations? Why should the educational process not continue as it is, answering the challenges only when it is absolutely necessary? The very role that education plays nowadays implies the need to determine transformation and not only passively follow it. The educational result of learning will be developing an awareness of the connections between different components and participants, regardless of the geographical area where they work; this would be the basis of the partnership[25].

Why would nations accept a universal educational system and to what extent would the ego of certain actors speak up? If the answer to the first question considered the advantages of the access to information/training and implicitly resources, the various state pressure groups would certainly tend to express their opposition towards such a system. This opposition would come from different spheres: political society, civil society, media, all of them quantifying the "irreparable loss" implied but actually only aiming to protect their own group interests. There could be opposition from the states that go through considerable economic and educational progress; thus the access to a universal system could in their vision create disturbances in the welfare system and especially in hierarchy, including in their own societies. What would the impact of migration be, if emigrants had followed a universal educational system – maybe at a lower cost than in their own countries of origin – thus becoming more easily adaptable or even more competitive on the labour market, in its well-paid sectors?

Globalization "increases interaction and thus creates the premises for lifelong learning, as according to Giddens, we cannot nowadays speak about permanent knowledge structures anymore, under the conditions of technological evolution and the dynamics of Globalization"[26].

Creating universal education does not impose limits or narrow standards. ON the contrary, it should generate diversity by the very understanding and communication between different cultures and societies. The economy – or better said the business world – has a major impact upon the educational system and it is not seldom that talented managers who probably have less understanding of the educational system become its leaders[27]. In the case of Romania as well, we can notice the serious financial implications on the educational system, whenever the government refuses to establish and respect common educational standards, imposing its

[25] Mircea Cosma, *Globalizarea şi educaţia*, http://www.armyacademy.ro/reviste/2_2004/r5.pdf
[26] Nelly P. Stromquist, Karen Monkman, *Globalization and education, Integration and contestation across cultures*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000, pp11
[27] Nelly P. Stromquist, *Education In A Globalized World: The Connectivity Of Economic Power, Technology, And Knowledge*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002, p.40

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

model that promotes the quality of educational business rather than the final results of the educational act.

Humanity is at a new crossroads, where the previous educational ideals cannot respond to development and integration needs anymore. From knowledge as virtue to knowledge as model or knowledge as national pride and as far as knowledge as necessity, the educational system has managed to keep up with these transformations. Today, education is getting ready to combine two elements: efficiency and global vocation.

Education thus becomes an effective instrument in tracing the direction of humanity. It can bring nations together – now more than ever before – and it can amplify the will too cooperate and to find mutually accepted solutions. However, education should not only stop to that. A universal system means understanding and acceptance, in time, of shared values. The failure of the United States of America in Afghanistan and possibly Iraq – not to mention other countries in Asia, Africa or South America – comes from a lack of shared vocabulary. The differences between societies, with customs and cultures that often contradict the expansive American system, have caused failure. The armed form o expression has confirmed the failure. That is why education becomes the key to understanding, knowing and bringing together different values in different societies – in a more imperialistic manner of speaking.

Education is called to solve a series of problems of the future global society; it becomes "a coherent and harmonized complex of those new educations that have a major impact upon shaping the international dimension of man, more precisely of a real openness in understanding and supporting his/her fellow human being, regardless of the geographic, ethnical, religious or economic space where the latter lives"[28].

Far from seeing the sign of the devil in Globalization, we may say that there is a chance to produce another more optimistic "revolution". However, as any revolution does, it would bring about major risks involving the system. Therefore we have, on the one hand, the temptation of the system to provoke and promote everything that belongs to the phenomenon of Globalization and on the other hand, the same system will naturally react to the changes involved. If we admit that this is not a Brownian movement, that we can establish its direction or at least adjust it, then we admit that we partly control it and this can become a major advantage. The current changes can bring many benefits, if we understand their sense and accept that our vision about the world as civilization must not correspond to a bellicose past but to a future that permits mutual understanding, thanks to common keys for encryption. Schooling and education can play a central role in this approach. Obviously, "strong" nations must not only encourage such an evolution, but also give up part of their characteristic

[28] Mircea Cosma, *op.cit.*, p6

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

selfishness, the same element that has made them successful in favor of a common regional/global decision. As a result, the decision about education cannot belong to the state, which often acts arbitrarily and is fast in cutting down budgets. Until finding keys that are generous enough to meet the various existing needs, regional construction in the educational field may be a factor of success, especially if this type of construction leaves room for further harmonization on a global level. Nowadays, any construction of the sort implies an extended dialogue between all the elements that compose the global society, in an uninhibited approach that follows no prejudice. Even if we want it or not, the level of technological development requires taking into consideration such a scenario; the faster we do it, the more we avoid spending precious resources, while possibly reducing the current tensions between the components of the system.

Bibliografie

Appadurai, Arjun, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalizations*, University of Minnesota Press, 1990

Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping Our Lives*, Profile Books, London, 1999

Aronson, Jonathan, *The comunications and Internet Revolution*, în The globalization of World Politics, Oxford University Press, 1998

Beck Ulrich., *Ce este globalizarea? Erori ale globalismului-răspunsuri la globalizare*, Editura Trei, Bucureşti, 2003,

Bari, Ioan, ,,*Globalizare şi probleme globale*", Ed. Economică, Bucureşti, 2001

Bauman,l Zygmunt, ,,*Globalizarea şi efectele ei sociale*" , Antet, Bucureşti, 2002

Bădescu Ilie, *Globalizare, comunicare interculturala, identitate si integrare europeana,* ed Universității Bucureşti, 2002,

Benichi, Regis, *Histoire de la mondialisation*, Vuibert, 2003

Brezezinski, Z. *Marea tablă de şah. Supremația americană şi imperativele sale strategice*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, Bucureşti, 2000

Carlsnaes, Walter, Risse, *Handbook of International* London: Sage Publications,2002,

Chirot ,Daniel, ,*Societăți în schimbare,* Bucureşti, Editura Athena, 1996

Chris Patten *WHAT NEXT? Surviving the Twenty-First Century*, Penguin UK ,2008

Cosma, Mircea, *Globalizarea şi educația*, www.armyacademy.ro

D. Crystal, *English as Global Language,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997

Friedman, Thomas, *Lexus şi măslinul. Cum să înțelegem globalizarea*, Bucureşti, Editura Fundației PRO, 2001

Gardels, Nathan, *Schimbarea ordinii globale*, Editura Antet 1998

Giddens, Anthony, *Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping Our Lives*, Profile Books, London, 1999,

Gordon Smith, Moises Naim *Altered States: Globalization, Sovereignty and Governance,* IDRC Books, 2000

Held David, McGrew Anthony, Goldblatt David, Perraton Jonathan– *Transformări globale. Politică, economie şi cultură*, Polirom, Iaşi, 2004,

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

Held, T. & A. McGrew. *Globalization and the liberal democratic state*, *Government and Opposition,* Stanford University Press1993

Held, D. and McGrew, A. (2002). *Governing Globalization: Power Authority and Global Governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge UK

Korten DC *When Corporations rule the world,* San Francisco, Berret-Koehler Publishers, 1995

Fukuyama, Francis, *Construcţia statelor. Ordinea mondială în secolul XXI*, Bucureşti, Editura Antet, 2004

Nelly, P. Stromquist, Karen Monkman, *Globalization and education, Integration and contestation across cultures*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000,

Nelly, P. Stromquist, *Education In A Globalized World: The Connectivity Of Economic Power, Technology, And Knowledge: The Connectivity Of Economic Power, Technology, And Kn*, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2002

Puşcaş, Vasile*, Relaţii internaţionale/transnaţionale*, ed. Sincron, Cluj-Napoca 2005

Postelnicu, Gh., C.Postelnicu, *Globalizarea economiei*, Editura Economică, Bucureşti, 2000,

Ramonet, I., *Geopolitica haosului*, Bucureşti, Editura Doina, 1998

Robertson, Roland, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture,* London, Sage, 1992

Smith, Steve, and John Bazlis ed, *The Globalization of World Politics* Second Edition, Oxford University Press, 2001

Soros George, „*Despre Globalizare*", Polirom, Iaşi, 2002

Toffler, Alvin, *Al treilea val,* Bucureşti, Editura Politică, 1983

Waters M., *Globalisation,* Routledge, London,2005

Surse electronice

www.global-culture.org

www.globalenvision.org

www.globalisationguide.org

www.globalization101.org

www1.worldbank.org

www.europa.eu

www.armyacademy.ro

www.actrus.ro

www.dadalos.org

www.globalizare.ro

www.global-culture.org

www.globalenvision.org

www.globalisationguide.org

www.globalization101.org

www.guardian.co.uk

www1.worldbank.org

www.wto.org

www.credo.md

www.interesul public.ro

http://video.google.com/videoplay

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)

Articole/reviste

Dinicu, Anca, Globalizarea Contemporană şi Formele sale de manifestare, Revista Actrus, nr 4,2004

Dorina Cucu, *Occidentul şi obsesia revoluţiei*, în Sfera Politicii nr. 126-127

Galtung, Johan, *Globalizarea şi consecinţele ei*, în Mileniul III, nr. 2/1999

Marin, Dinu, *Modelul explicativ al globalizării*, în Economie Teoretică şi aplicată,nr.3, 2006, p 58

Rothenberg, Laurence E, *Globalization 101 The Three Tensions of Globalizationhttp* Revue Générale de Droit International Public, vol. 100/1996/2.

Simionescu C., Florin Gheorghe Filip, Bogdan Iuliana coord. Fenomene şi procese cu risc major la scara naţională, Spiridon, ed. Academiei Române

Muller Ragnar*, Dimensiunile Globalizării,* www dadalos.org

Chris Patten *Free for All,* http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/sep/19/globalisation.globaleconomy

Rapoarte

Human Development Report 1999, UNDP, New York, 1999,

Raportul Mondial de Investiţii (The World Investment Report 2000)

BDD-A23662 © 2009 Editura Universităţii „Petru Maior”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:47:17 UTC)