GLOBALIZATION – A NATURAL COMPONENT OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Brigadier (ret) Professor Mircea UDRESCU, PhD

Broadly speaking, globalization represents the general process of development of the social and economic environment including liberalism and norms. Globalization is naturally perceived as a benefit in the fields and contexts where it is supposed to trigger social content. Where it is about the reversed situation, globalization is perceived as responsible for all the evil and suffering which others are guilty of. Mankind has undoubtedly made great progress in accordance with the technological, economic and social growth. In this context, globalization is perceived both as cause and effect of the contemporary advances, becoming outstanding provided that the general moral values are taken into account. If thought of as useless, these general life principles intentionally accompany the social present and future world.

Keywords: *Globalization; society; state; political forces; national institutions; global institutions; global phenomena; global interests; global norms; quality standards.*

Preliminary remarks. Some words are believed to have been frequently used lately. By means of these words, some people are trying to explain, in many cases, situations and statuses that are only suggested and less explained. From this perspective, globalization and logistics are two notions of everyday use.

According to Zigmunt Bauman, „the word GLOBALIZATION is in everybody's mouth; an obsession that soon became a buzzword, a magic incantation, a *passepartout* able to open the gates of all present and future mysteries. For some people, globalization is something we must achieve if we want to be happy; for others, the source of our unhappiness is precisely globalization. However, everybody is certain that globalization is the implacable fate of mankind, an irreversible process affecting all of us, equally and similarly“[1].

Logistics in its turn is considered to cover the technical and material aspects underlying important human actions. We speak of the logistics of education, military logistics, marketing logistics, logistics of negotiations, logistics of the criminals, etc. Famous experts in economics try to persuade us that „successful managers of logistics will be those who will have an overall vision of the strategic plans of their own companies and will understand the role of logistics in implementing these plans… logistics will have a significant strategic role in the companies’ gaining competitive advantage on a competitive global market“[2].

Globalization has economic effects not only upon individuals, businessmen, but also upon nation-states and state unions, with clear impact upon labour markets, financial markets, economic growth and convergence of national economies. As any political-social process, globalization cannot be either seen as an unlimited source of happiness for mankind, especially in sectors where labour productivity and labour efficiency are very low, or blamed for all the evils that certain social structures face.

The main features of globalization result from the main findings: significant decline of the mass production because of the location and because of the increased diversification of markets; increased importance of services within the framework of economic activities; more and more percentages of the value of individual products are represented by design, marketing, legal and financial consulting; standardization of products associated with widely spread economies is replaced by increased differentiation from the point of view of the local demand or of the specific demand; the national level of economic organization losses importance while the global levels of organization expand because of the global nature of finance and technologies; more and more governmental activities are regulated through international agreements; significant development of non-governmental and informal cross-national networks etc.

Attempts to define the term. Undoubtedly, the history of mankind means the history of evolution of the trinomial space-speed-time set. Big and small social events are both cause and effect of the combination of the three components in the equation of becoming.

Given this context, globalization has become not only one of the trendy words for academics, politicians, businessmen, but for any participant in the performance staging the human transformations.

In the latter's case, globalization fills their life, for better and worse, especially for worse. It comes from nowhere and acts implacably, especially when the time comes for the many to tighten their belt and accept new sacrifices. They wonder who causes it, for what and for whom, in whose name, and why it comes up in all discussions justifying the decisions that are made without them and especially against their interests.

Globalization has become ubiquitous; for some people, it equals general progress, while for others it has become a scapegoat, the cause of everything that goes wrong, especially in areas where poverty expands. Economic and financial crises start taking place because of globalization. It is not human actions, speculative capital and governments that trigger crises, but globalization.

Some governments blame globalization for the loss of national sovereignty, others justify their political actions of giving up their national sovereignty by integration into supra-state entities, justifying that local power diminishes when the confusing influence of financial markets and supra-state structures increases. For many political leaders, globalization is to blame because it drastically cuts the number of jobs, increases social inequity and the working conditions become sadistic.

Many people, even if they do not fight against globalization, fiercely oppose to the United Nations Organization, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the World Trade Oorganization, the G7+1, the G-20, etc., but their actions become chaotic and destructive.

On the other hand, there are many politicians and economists who defend globalization, but question the practical way in which global organizations and advanced countries act in order to impose the requirements of globalization. Although the peoples affected by globalization were presented it as actions meant to increase their general living standards, the attempts to impose total freedom of movement of capitals in developing countries, where institutions able to manage the huge financial flows did not exist, resulted into financial crises, followed by increased poverty and general discontent. Thus, in many developing countries in Asia, Europe, Africa and South America, people's hopes in a better life created by global policies of global institutions crashed. People realize they live worse than before, or at least similarly, and they are at the same time unable to fight the overwhelming pace of globalization which becomes ubiquitous as local power combines with the globalizing power, everywhere and in all social sectors.

Consequently, many voices have been heard, not necessarily against globalization but definitely against the way in which the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank exported globalization in many developing countries where the initial purposes were deviated from as a result of financial engineering actions accompanied by corruption.

At the same time, many theoreticians and organizers of the socio-economic practice are on the side of those who claim that, in general, globalization has positive effects for the world's population because of its social convergence; they strongly believe that costs and benefits will not be the same for everybody: some people will gain more, others will lose more, but they hope that most of the people will be satisfied. These points of view start from convictions that globalization undoubtedly carries high efficiency and productivity requirements combining beneficial effects with the negative effect of all those disregarding the laws of quality and morality. Consequently, the globalization process currently undergone is believed to have more positive than negative effects and to comply with the general laws of economic and social progress. For the supporters of globalization, „in fact, the main losers of globalization are those people and countries that are not able to join the globalization process and lag behind, mainly because they do not possess credible institutions – political, legal, economic or social. On the other hand, the winners are those who enjoy the consequences of the fact that they have been able to be open towards globalization and attracted trade, capital and foreign technology"[3].

Globalization followers claim that markets, supra-national institutions and companies with global interests are the frontline of globalization expansion much more than most governments. For them, it is easy to understand that markets develop efficiently where governments interfere less; however, the significant role of the governments in maintaining a certain economic stability and ensuring social protection is still admitted. That is why „globalization and technology nowadays are an unfinished revolution. They lack social regulations. Until a new global framework of social rules is established, the current concerns will exist"[4].

When we try to define the agent responsible for the general framework of social rules, everything becomes general, without excluding the existence of a global government, above all governments. The speeches of two important statesmen at the Davos summit in January 2000, Tony Blair and Bill Clinton, are significant in this respect, as they supported globalization without involving their governments.

The press insisted at that time that Tony Blair was a supporter of an open global economy and of a global society, a view possible only in the next century if the world wisely makes use of the benefits of globalization and ethical rules are created to involve all countries in this effort while, through an international ethical involvement, countries will help the poor, remove the causes of genocide and the main environmental problems.

According to Bill Clinton, „it is essential that workers and families in advanced countries and those in developing countries make use of globalization. Industrialized countries should make sure that the poor and all those who face difficulties during the changes are not neglected and all workers have access to the benefits of education and professional training for the application of new technologies. The leaders of developing countries should reduce the gap between the rich and the poor and make sure that both governments and institutions are open and transparent. This is crucial to attract foreign investments in order to improve the development parameters and to solve social problems. Industrialized economies can help developing countries that do not take the necessary measures up to a certain limit. They can, however, reduce the burden of debt of these countries, make trade with these countries, invest in these countries and support education and training policies in these countries"[5].

For the representatives of the big economies of the world, globalization is obviously needed; its objective is a sum of pragmatic ideals, excluding any dogmatic, ideological ideals. For Tony Blair and Bill Clinton, globalization is the "direction of the water to flow"; all progress-incurring countries will go along this direction; the others, if they want to be helped, will have to make sustainable efforts themselves in order to reduce the differences between themselves and the top countries.

Globalization seems to be practically a certainty with a lot of uncertainties. It is certain that we now speak of globalization, of a globalized economy, of a global environment, of global policies, of global terrorism, etc. Consequently, the definitions of globalization are as many as the various approaches to globalization that determined these definitions.

Thus, for the Romanian economic environment, globalization is, as the case may be, „a long-term way or system to receive and deal with the crucial contemporary problems, caused by the interaction of multiple economic, technical, political, social, cultural, ecological processes and phenomena and the forecasting of the solutions to these problems, in a broader perspective, by the international community. In such a globalist approach, the whole acquires properties and features that the components do not possess"[6]. The definition suggests the intricate process of inter-related planning of the big problems of mankind by the international community, understood as an important international „actor". The biggest difficulty is the fact that the international community does not act in a synergetic way, in an optimal way, but as a sum of entities, in many cases having various interests and very often, divergent interests! It is however obvious that the object and the subject of globalization are represented by states, some of them initiating and supporting globalization phenomena that are favourable to them, others only suffering from the negative effects of these phenomena.

From another perspective, „globalization is a dynamic process of liberalization, openness and international integration into a wide range of markets, from labour markets to goods and services and capital and technologies. Eventually, globalization is based on freedom: freedom to make trade with the rest of the world, and to capitalize to the relative advantage of each and every country, freedom to invest where capital profits are high at a tolerable risk level, and freedom to open businesses in a country you can choose, for higher profits or for larger percentages of the markets, or, at the individual level, for better salaries and/or better working conditions"[7]. The definition insists on liberalization, openness and international integration; freedom of action is the key word; the object of globalization is the large global geographical areas covered by states while the subject of globalization remains undefined: it can be successful companies from anywhere.

In our view, globalization is the international institutional framework through which companies promote their own interests with no need of protective and mediation actions from the states. Given such a context, capital can move freely, companies can do business everywhere, citizens can move freely, the national legislative framework is subordinated to the global legislative framework, and the fundamental principles of human action are subject to criteria of efficacy, efficiency and profit.

The current globalization is the expression of enhanced multiple inter-connections, i.e., political, economic, cultural and, last but not least, military. The globalization trend noticed after 1980 is perceived as a superior progress of social evolution, a consequence of the real revolution of IT and data processing. This process of aggressive intensification of inter-connections has a contradictory nature, implying both integration and fragmentation, the process of rendering homogeneity as well as diversification, globalization and localization, enrichment, and rendering poor, of course, only some to the advantage of others.

Looking back into history, we can state that global ideas and actions have always accompanied the evolution of society. For any individual, global actions are those that go beyond one's concrete space and time. We believe that, for the primitive human being, the regulations regarding the hunting areas and the areas to pick up fruits and roots were the preliminary conditions of „ globalization". Making vassal the population of the feuds was also a preliminary condition of globalization. The great empires of ancient times and feudal times can be understood as trends to expand and strengthen the power of a state over large territories because of global interests – globalism according to the times lived in. during the large process of global expansion, as a proof of balance, states and boundaries imposed themselves and the global power belonged to well-determined individuals, like the king, the emperor, etc., in their capacity of recognized representatives of national entities. In ancient and feudal times, the state, represented by its leader, had unlimited power over citizens, properties and goods that were placed within certain boundaries and frontiers. Even wars in those times were waged as a result of the will and in the name of the emperor, the king of the military leader.

The dawn of capitalism appeared when the private property in workshops, factories, big enterprises and companies strengthened, and financial property increased as well; big owners and central public authorities started cooperating, especially with respect to property. However, these economic-political entities, becoming aware of the need of a central protective authority, initiated the removal of the state run by an *autocrat,* in order to replace it with a representative state, a regulatory state, based on democracy understood and enforced at their level of big owners: the so-called „bourgeois-democratic" stage, in order to give an image and to justify their political advance and to remove the autocrat and the big feudal masters, their supporters (e.g. the stage of the revolutions led by Cromwell, Robespierre, etc). From now on, national states become instruments of the private and financial property, meant to ensure the legislative framework to develop property. The wish to remove external competition and to develop their own business in peace made the domestic companies expand their activity from a certain local range towards a national one, under the protection of the state, which constitutes a form of manifestation of the monopolist interests of companies and their expansion to the the latter's national level; afterwards, through colonial wars and domination, they became ***inter***national – expressly helped by the national state – then acquired a ***trans***national nature, but this time to the detriment of national states which they turned into their economic vassals.

Beneficial consequences of globalization. Globalization is, at the same time, a process and a state of affairs. It is a process which incurs major quantitative and qualitative changes in time, and is a state of affairs because it allows comparison of the constituting components for each evolutionary moment.

Beyond its political reasons, globalization can be justified through two major components: technological development and evolution of the exchange markets.

Technological development caused major mutations in all sectors of activity, while development of transport and communications (telecommunications) resulted in spectacular reduction of costs. Generally speaking, we can say that „not only the price of transport decreased, but also the importance of goods trade in the global economy. Transport of raw materials and of raw food products has been replaced to a large extent with finite manufactured goods, made from light materials and taking less space. In other words, the products traded currently have a higher value per unit while the cost of transport decreased, thus reducing the proportion of the previous items as against the following items. The natural barriers of time and space between countries diminished and the costs of delivery goods, services, people, capital, technology or information from one country to another has decreased as well. Global distances diminished through internationalization of economy and the level of interdependency increases"[13].

The second parameter, liberalization of the exchanges of goods, services and capital took place worldwide through the General Agreement of Trade and Tariffs, resulted from the coordinated action of the World Trade Organisation, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and the International Monetary Fund and is implemented through many bilateral and regional agreements.

The neo-classical economic models consider that internal financing is the major engine of development. Countries that make more savings can invest more and, consequently, can develop faster. The well-desired convergence is reached to various degrees however, because social productivity and the ratios of the saved amounts of money are not the same everywhere: they differ from one region to another, from one country to another. In these models, trade liberalization can indirectly speed up economic growth, thus generating higher economic efficiency by allocating productive resources to those sectors that have a higher advantage; international competition makes companies become more open to innovation and assimilation of foreign technologies, while closed economies lack the basics needed for innovation and enhanced productivity[14].

We can therefore understand why globalization does not cause the same levels of satisfaction, since technological and scientific knowledge is not the same. Consequently, the income per capita of the countries included in the waves of globalization does not necessarily tend to converge towards equilibrium since the countries do not possess technical knowledge to the same extent; however, we can establish a link between the progress of the endogenous productivity and the external influence. If goods are manufactured in a country that is better placed from the economic point of view, those goods become assets for the global market in terms of quality and costs. Examples in this respect are the microprocessors, cars, planes, mobile phones, etc., goods whose quality has increased in time but whose prices decreased proportionally with experience.

Most theoretical and empirical analyses however reveal a strong positive correlation between the financial system and economic growth in time. Consequently, loans are considered to have a major role and to be an engine of research, innovation and entrepreneurship; this engine becomes very useful when investment opportunities promise profit. In principle, the growth rates of developing countries are subject to two kinds of constraints: their own ability to save and to invest and their ability to attract foreign money to finance imports meant to support economic growth. It is worth noting that in the case of these processes, capital savings are inevitably directed towards profitable sectors of activity where countries and companies that accumulated more and invested more can make more money. The capitals available in developing countries can be attracted in these flows; thus, poor countries can become creditors of advanced countries, which means more freedom for capital flows, instead of rendering homogenous the various living standards, on the contrary, which will increase discrepancies [19].

More and more opinions about the benefits of globalization are being heard anyway: "Global capitalism is the most promising institutional arrangement for the world's prosperity that mankind has ever seen. The long expected hopes of convergence between rich and poor regions are eventually about to come true. Mankind will need wisdom and diligence to enjoy the big potential benefits. Mankind must be prepared to deal with the regions lagging behind with honesty and courage by paying attention to the critical issues, still unsolved, of the tropical development. Mankind must learn how to run an open system based on the rule of law, in virtue of the common principles across the world"[20].

Obviously, globalization, real convergence and allocation of income depend on technical progress which underlies labour productivity and inter-relates salaries and profit. That is why globalization is seen as a mechanism to spread technical progress across the world. Through the goods and services imported from advanced countries once trade becomes liberalized, the developing countries adapt themselves to the new technologies thus becoming more productive and yielding higher performance. Through liberalization of capital, direct foreign investments are facilitated in less developed countries a transfer of high performance technology towards these countries being thus achieved. Through liberalization of the labour market, immigrant workers acquire new knowledge that can become useful for them in their countries of origin. This judgement leads to the conclusion that globalization can help global convergence, especially because the less developed countries are given the chance to import and export competitive goods through an appropriate technological transfer.

Basically, convergence, justified by globalization, supports the mirage of eradicating poverty and generating incomes similar to the incomes of the populations in economically developed countries.

Globalization has consequences upon the territorial distribution of the economic activity according to the comparative advantage of countries and companies. Undoubtedly, redistribution leads to changes in the workforce management, especially in salaries, with implications in understanding the impact of globalization upon the labour market. In most cases, theoretical models claim that globalization causes mankind to get involved in international competition thus inducing a better allocation of the labour force, capital and technology, by giving the chance to each state involved in the globalizing competition to specialize in production by adding value to comparative advantages that are typical of the production factors. In developed countries, the demand of highly qualified workforce is increasing, while the demand of low qualification workforce is decreasing. Consequently, the chances that less qualified workers receive lower paid jobs are increasing and this can cause growing discontent and unemployment.

At the same time, the demand of workforce in developed countries, both qualified and less qualified, is increasing and, although foreign and domestic investment companies have the capabilities to compete on the international market, in the sense of attracting workforce at lower salaries, unemployment is decreasing which reveals a convergence trend. By liberalizing labour and increased international competition, the strength of national markets diminishes, and employers can react faster to the changes in the labour costs. This means that higher mobility of capitals makes it possible to reallocate production in cases where there is better correlation between labour costs and productivity, and more hope of economic profit.

The convergence processes typical for the labour force and related to globalization are justified by the propensity to efficiency, given, as the case may be: by increased trade – goods manufactured in underdeveloped countries with low costs of the labour force and low prices, compete with good manufactured in advanced countries with higher labour costs; direct foreign investments – companies relocate their business in areas where labour costs are lower than in the countries of origin; emigration – workers from developing countries emigrate to advanced countries and compete with their domestic labour force.

Beyond any criticicism, it seems that multinationals and governments need each other and normally reach a compromise solution where companies maximize a certain reasonable profit and governments maximize a certain reasonable level of fiscal income and employment. It is generally becoming more and more obvious that, as a result of the globalization processes, companies rather than states become the main players of the world economy. However, states are still preserving their regulatory role in reducing the negative effects that may be incurred from uncontrolled competition.

Economic globalization has been accompanied by the emergence of bodies that monitor the behaviour of the states from the point of view of complying with the free market regulations. Thus, when governments make decisions, they not only must comply with domestic political and economic forces but also with the international and regional agencies that register and monitor all domestic decisions. Thus, governments that enjoy international credibility also enjoy privileged financial flows while those governments that do not manage to comply with global or regional regulations can become subject to restrictive actions. Significant withdrawal of funds can influence the citizens' living standard and political stability and the reliability of the government can be hugely eroded. Thus, globalization becomes a major tool to run the domestic political life by arbitrating, through the public opinion, the behaviour of governments.

The real revolution caused by globalization on international markets forced the states to re-think their functions and to adapt the latter to the new realities, characterized by the fact that investors, that is financial capital and global companies make states compete in the beginning and later on reveal the public opinion where they will invest. Since the macroeconomic component diminishes, they are objectively directed towards more involvement in improving their own human capital and the general domestic market conditions: a high-performance educational system, good infrastructure, a well structured financial system, a non-partinic legal system, etc. become ingredients that help states to attract funds for big projects.

At the same time, a certain social reality characterized by a combination of institutional corruption and legal and political insecurity appears in many underdeveloped countries and also in some developed ones and encourages speculative financing and investments that, instead of improving the living standards, bring about more poverty and frustration of the employees.

That is why the countries enjoying international recognition are those which overtly contribute to the proper operation of the markets through clear cooperation between the public sector and the private one, either at the domestic or at the international level. These countries make sure their own regulations are well understood and sanctioned, in full compliance with international standards and the guidelines sent by international bodies to each separate country and favour development of practical systems of education, health, social protection and violence prevention. In response to the requirements imposed by globalization, the states give up certain macroeconomic prerogatives and focus more on microeconomic policies and balanced cooperation between the state and the civil society.

Globalization is generally accompanied by obvious success in many areas and also by many economic and financial crises. Globalization seems to favour everybody but is perceived as responsible for increasing discrepancies between the poor and the rich, by rendering even poorer those who were already poor and by allowing significant differences in development among various countries.

The engine behind globalization is the increased competition between companies, triggered by the openness of economies which facilitates expanded mobility of goods and services, of financial capitals and labour force; the states are compelled to comply with international standards in order to have access to the competition for funds and investments meant to ensure higher development.

The theories supporting globalization claim that countries with strong democratic institutions and economic policies that focus on education and training and are open to international business enjoy better access to foreign investments than countries that lack such institutions and development policies. Given the context of increased globalization, the winners are the consumers all around the world because they see prices go down and have the feeling that their real income is increasing; these aspects take place as soon as important mutations occur in the sovereignity component of each state.

This beneficial image of globalization is supported by the following facts: the amount of trade increases as a result of trade development and liberalization and of the cuts in general transportation costs which makes the supply of goods and services increase; an impact will be the increased quality and lower prices; once capital flows increase, capital costs decrease which facilitates easier access to loans for consumption and investment; capital transfers are followed by modern technology transfers which impact upon the general professional training and education, with major implications, in the sense that it incurs growth, upon labour productivity, salaries, consumption and exports; labour force migration from underdeveloped countries towards developed countries allows increased family income and increased consumption and economy growth in their countries of origin.

People across the world, if they work and make loans, can have goods and services at lower prices, lower interest rates, easy access to education, professional training and migration. Obviously, the labour force in countries with high globalization rate, stable democratic institutions and high competition, namely in advanced countries, has better acces to the benefits of globalization than in other countries. Given the context of this equality accompanying globalization, in fact, differences in salaries increase, for the wealthy population as well, and the percentage of poor people actually increases.

The free movement of capitals allows investments wherever there is comparative advantage, thus their responsibility towards the national labour force diminishes. The rule in the diversification of activities, in the relocation of industries and services etc. is given by the profit aimed at by companies, not by reasons pertaining to public policies. Through these actions, multinational companies diminish union actions requesting salary increase in the countries of origin and meet the need of higher salaries in underdeveloped countries. Thus, the labour force becomes more obedient, it can be disciplined strictly according to economic criteria, and the main objective will be to increase labour productivity and to maximize the profit of the global company.

Although the political economy looks like an elitist topic, meant for connaisseurs only, in everyday life economic policies that are well conceived can improve people's lives. To achieve that, states must adopt policies that should trigger economic growth and ensure at the same time an even distribution of this economic growth. For instance, privatization of companies makes them more efficient but becomes profitable only if the market is competitive and well regulated.

There are many examples all over the world that prove that imposing economic policies recommended by the IMF aimed at privatization and drastic reduction of social expenses did not lead to the results expected by the poor countries. However, „although everybody was dissatisfied with the suffering that usually accompanied the IMF programs, the IMF simply believed that it was part of the pain that countries should undergo on their path to a functional market economy and that the measures proposed by the organization would be alleviated in the long run. A little pain was obviously necessary but, in my opinion, the pain caused in the developing countries by the globalization process and development, in the way they went under the supervision of the IMF and other international economic organizations was much too big. The reaction against globalization was increasing because of the obvious damage caused in the developing countries by the policies adopted on ideological grounds and by inequities in international trade"[50].

Almost 50 years after its creation, the IMF has representativity problems because, instead of reducing the crises, the economic and financial crises became more frequent and deeper. Even more serious is the fact that „many IMF policies that imposed the premature liberalization of the capital market have contributed to global instability. When the crisis started in country, the IMF funds and programs not only did not stabilize the situation but also worsened it, in most cases, to the disadvantage of the poor. The IMF did not fulfil its initial mission to promote global stability and was not more successful in the new missions either, like for instance the coordination of the transition process from Communism to the market economy in former Communist countries"[51].

The origin of all problems of the international institutions seems to be the morals of the leaders because it is the leaders who decide what institutions do, why they do what they do and what the states and the public institutions pertaining to them should do.

The first question mark regards the way in which the leaders of these international bodies are appointed. For instance, although the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank perform their activities mainly in developing and in poor countries, they are run only by representatives of rich countries. The head of the IMF is traditionally a European and the head of the WB is an American; they are appointed behind the closed doors which may mean that the respective institutions are not actually representatives of the nations they serve.

Some question marks regard those who represent countries in their talks with these international institutions. Thus, with the IMF, this role is played by the ministers of finance and governors of the central banks while with the WTO, the role is played by the trade ministers. Each minister, elected or appointed, sooner or later is involved in local business communities. Consequently, the leaders of the international institutions come mainly from rich countries and represent groups of financial and commercial interests from these countries, and the ministers of finance and trade reflect the concerns of the business communities of the countries they come from and not only. Consequently, the decisions of these institutions normally reflect, in many cases, the conceptions and the interests of those who make these decisions, the policies of the international economic institutions are too often subordinated to the commercial and financial interests of the dominant business communities.

The groups of interest in the advanced countries and in the countries requesting assistance reach agreements through international institutions but „for the peasants in the countries under development who struggle to pay the debts of their countries to the IMF or for the businessmen affected by high VATs enforced as a result of the insistence of the IMF, the current system managed by the IMF is a tax system without representation. The disappointment regarding the international system of globalization under the aegis of the IMF is increasing because the poor (…) enjoy less subsidies for fuel and food (…) and see AIDS spreading because of less expenditure with the healthcare systems as a result of the recommendations of the IMF, while families in developing countries are compelled to pay the tuition for their children within the so-called programs «to recover costs», and choose not to send their children to school any longer"[52].

Many years ago, Charlie Wilson, former president of General Motors and US Secretary of Defense, who stated that „what is good for General Motors is also good for the country", defined the symbol of the specific conception of American capitalism. The IMF in its turn seems to have a similar conception, strongly claiming that the financial community considers what is good for itself is also good for the world economy and for national economies, and therefore this is how they should act. These directives were successful in many cases but positive results have not been seen yet because the international financial community believes that what is in its own interest actually is directed againt it because the ideology dominated by the liberalization of the markets and of the capitals corrupt the judgements regarding the ways to solve problems of national economies.

Globalization gives workers from the advanced countries the chance to adapt themselves faster to a new scientific revolution, to become experts in high technology services, which can result into a relative increase in salaries. From this point of view, low qualified workers are forced to accept jobs with rather low productivity and lower salaries.

In general, most workers in developing countries hope to gain something as a result of globalization, in the sense that they could get rid of unemployment, could be hired according to their qualification, could avoid emigration because they would find more jobs in their countries of origin, etc. At the same time, workers in advanced countries hope their income would not diminish through preferential access to higher and higher technologies.

The big challenge for our century is implacably to find ways to use the benefits of globalization and technological discoveries, to create institutons that should add value to the promises of globalization and to avoid huge global crises because, beyond any criticism, globalization is a multidirectional component that accompanies the economic and social life of mankind.

NOTES

1 Cf. *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, DEX, Academy Publishing House, 1975, p. 507.
2. Cf. Dr. ing. Cojocaru, George, Logistica-trecut, prezent şi viitor, article, in *Sisteme logistice* nr. 3-4, September-October, 1991, p.6.
3. Cf. Korka Mihai, Concepte de logistică pentru o întreprindere a viitorului, article, *Sisteme logistice* no.1, July, 1991, p. 3.
4. Cf. *Mic dicționar filozofic*, Political Publishing House, Bucharest, 1973, p. 329.
5. Cf. *Noveau Petit Larousse*, Libraire Larousse, 1968, p.530.
6. Cf. *Dicționarul englez- român*, Academy Publishing House, Bucharest, 1974, p. 437.
7. Definitions Commitee of the American Marketing Association, 1948, Report, in *Journal of Marketing*, October, 1948, p. 202.
8. Rushton, Alan, Oxley, John, *Handbook of Logistics and Distribution Management*, Kogan Page, London, 1995, p. 7.
9. Cf. Bălan, Carmen, op. cit., p. 25-35.
10. Perrotin Roger, *Le Marheting Achats. Strategies et Tactiques,* Les Editions d'Organisation, Paris, p. 19-20.
11. Amalbert, Marie-Noëlle, Bareau, Jean, Jibard, Ginette, *Economie d'entreprise*, Edition Sirey, Paris, 1989, p. 207-208.

12. Gattorna, John, *Managementul logisticii şi distribuției*, Teora Publishing House, Bucharest, 1999, p. 17-26.

13. Cf. Vagu, P., *Conducerea, organizarea şi planificarea unităților industriale*, Didactic and Pedagogical Publishing House, Bucharest, 1975, p. 25, after Fayol, H., *Administration industrielle et générale*, Dunod, Paris, 1966, p.10

14. Zorlențan, T., Burduş, F., Căprărescu, G., op. cit., pp. 20-22.