

**THE CYCLES OF TRANSITION
– AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE
ON GLOBALIZATION –**



Marin DINU
Ph. D. Professor
Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest

***Abstract.** The particularity of the emergence of Central and Eastern European economies sits under the sign of a double-target: the break-off with the model of the planned economies of the communist type and the starting of the transformational processes leading to the market economies of the capitalist type – on one side, and the engagement in the project of integration into the European Union – on the other side. Both targets suppose gradients of change not just under the impact of the strategical options for different forms of transition, but also on the axis of time, marking true cycles of the emergence. We can elementarily distinguish two cycles, one specific to attaining the parameters of a functioning market economy and the other belonging to the beginning of convergence toward the standards of the European model of the economy. Substantially different as an integration of transformational alignments, the two cycles are within continuity – as a process of emergence – on the path of realizing an effective rupture with the bureaucratic mechanisms of regulation and with the functioning of the regulating mechanisms of the coordinated market. In fact, the cycles could be named: the interior transition (post-communist transition) and the exterior transition (integration in the E.U.).*

What factors must be taken into account at the conclusion of the transition? Is there an inter-conditioning of the paths followed between the two cycles? Are there priorities for the strategists on assuring the finalities of the emergence on the two cycles? To what degree do the

failures of the first cycle reverberate in the other cycle? Is there a space of national creativity in the integrative processes? These are a few of the issues which the present study tries to bring to light.

Key words: interior transition; exterior transition; ordinate principle; Pre-global Age; Global Age.



Referentials

The emergence of the economies of European post-communist countries follows a path with two successive anchors: the first corresponding to the interior transition, of an abstract nature, and the second specific to the exterior transition, of a contingent nature (Dinu et al., 2007). In the case of the destructuring of the planned economy of the communist type and the structuring of the market economy of the capitalist type the logic followed was that of conforming to a theoretical matrix deduced from a historical process of a few centuries, in which development was centered on the market. In the case of achieving compatibility with the parameters of functionality and performance of the European model of economy, the evolution follows a trajectory of the concretely assumed communitarian experience – as active and reactive part, while the finality of the integration process is being approximated.

Beyond the faith in consistency founded on the ideal values contained by the abstract matrix of change in the cycle of the interior transition, the emergence of post-communist economies constitutes a process in which the effects are not necessarily spontaneous, and the causes are not superiorly determined every time. The changing of the regulating mechanism – from plan to market – is not linear nor radical, as it is not either immediate or complete. In concordance with the framework of reference of the adaptive projects to modernity, the change in social systems takes the form of a learning process, whose features derive the truth that nature does not take any leaps. For change to be radical it has to be superiorly determined. In the absence of the internalized projection – of the rational actors of change, as well as of the

vision shared by a critical mass of people – there is no chance of it occurring. If nature refuses the ordering through shock, society – as order of the human nature – will make the ruptures relative and will approximate the continuity.

These limitations also mark the exterior transition, even though in this cycle of the emergence the objectives explicitly resonate with the expectations of people, with supplemental impulses especially in the support for social, economical and territorial cohesion.

The ideal image of the first option and the real image of the second generate not only complementarity problems which must be solved, but also problems of redefining the dependencies that visions are made of. The experience generated by the transition thought along an ideal scheme leaves no room for initiative, often not even in the case of alternative solutions. This is legitimized through assumptions, in an initial stage under the resurrectional guise of the imperative “believe and do not question”.

Generating the exterior transition, in the historical variant of the integration in the European Union – which is sustained on conditions of entry, seems to eliminate the freedom of choice, in fact proposing by the joining unlimited scope for the freedom of rationalization – both in the conception of the model as well as in the implementation of ideas validated by experience and accepted through negotiation.

The multi-layering of the emergence has coherence problems because the referential matrices, even though they are from the same class, have different constituents which move in an order of different prevalences. The ideas tested on a contextual experience should extend it beyond the primary context - in the case of the interior transition – and the transformation of the context resulted from the first stage of the emergence should adapt, on the path of adopting the good practices – therefore operating with the principle of experience, through trial and error, seeing and doing – for a model which is, in its turn, under configuration.

The measure of consistency of the two cycles of emergence is done with different instruments adhering to different founding principles. The theoretical projection of post-communist transition – based on the assumptions of the Washington Consensus – is judged in terms of a natural order, with spontaneous rationality and infallible self-regulation.

The vision of exterior transition uncovers the option for a construction on-the-go, with perpetually corrected architectural sketches, with procedures negotiated for the testing of good practices, with the empirical sterilization of the world of ideas and with the anti-utopia vaccination of the global world.

The different consistence of the two stages of emergence in Central and Eastern Europe has an aporetic nature and it leads to the ever more visible confrontation of paradigms in today's world. Collision is among the founding principles:

- a) that of the uniqueness of the explanation (Verlet, 2007) assured by the acceptance of the hierarchical order – the Creator, the Idea, the Sovereign (the Hegemon) – in the case of the Washington Consensus;
- b) that of the relativity of the explanation assured by the empirical reference points of the communitarian context, as a functional order of the competencies in the horizontal plane, with vertical transactions – the Actor, the Expertise, the Whole (the Community) – in the case if the European model of integration.

The principal positioning in the vision of the interior transition denotes the option for a paradigm, which sustains the centrifugal order in which performance is a product of the cementing of the dependencies between the center and the periphery, on the alignment of the management of powers. The alignment of a country to the tutelary tendency of organizing a world made up of parts happens on the path of the interior transition, the whole is the sum of the composing parts. It is the order resulted from parts which chose independence in order to fructify their dependencies. The tension between the ideal - independence - and the real - dependence - creates the hierarchical type of order. The limit of the evolution of this tension sublimates hierarchy and selects the center. One part eventually cuts through the hierarchy through the discretionary control of dependencies, it assumes the role of the system's center by a functional view, although in reality it is the absolute hierarch. The coherence of the explanation is realized by relating to a unique theory representing the framework-vision, founder of the global order, which belongs to hegemonism.

By the interior transition – especially as a reflex of the model of the shock therapy, in its orthodox, non-institutional version – a country elects to join an order built on hierarchical dependencies. It is globalization **under-stretched** on the principle of the uniqueness of the explanation. We have ascertained that this globalization is a logical error (Dinu, 2006). The ordinate principle on which this globalization is self-legitimized is that of adversity, the sole binder of “top down” hierarchical systems.

The principal positioning in the vision of the exterior transition highlights the option for functional dependencies among parts which permanently transact the rationalization of the whole. The model contains paths of pertinence for the homogenization of performances, built on the principle of the relativization of the explanation for the definition of the optional common space. The functional links are tested progressively on the horizontal plane of dependencies, and the bonds of transversal competence are legitimized in the cohesive space, of the integrative type of the common sharing of sovereignties.

The degrees of performance generated by the expansion, especially toward the center and the east of the European continent – which opens the Pandora’s Box represented by the center-periphery relationship, have a temporal value limited by the mechanisms of convergence, as a function of the model of integration. The parts manage their dependencies tending to imitate the behavior of the whole, while the whole is permanently approximated with the performance of the parts, in their effort of acting in the negotiating space of the community. The coherence of the explanation is build on the framework-theory generated by the principle of the relativity of the visions on reality held by the public actors, as parts which negotiate their interdependencies beginning with what is being approximated to be the common whole. The parts cooperate for the competitiveness of the common space, transaction its enlargement and deepening, propose the convergent action in the approximation of the global order.

The European integration, as the formula of an exterior transition and part of the emergence of European post-communist countries, underpins the experience of opened systems of a “bottom up” type. Change as a learning process sits at the base of the ordinate principle of the harmonic competition of cooperative nature, which opens the

founding path of globalization, as a founding paradigm of an idea of global order other than the hierarchical one.

Traversing the cycles of post-communist emergence, the interior and exterior transitions represent, on one side the ending of the pre-global experience, and on the other side the entrance into the actual global experience. It signifies the exit from the model which preceded and achieved the first modernity, and the opening towards the model of the second modernity (Beck, 2003). Through the interior transition the emergent post-communist countries have experienced at a reduced scale and in a limited time frame a historical process, which otherwise would have lasted centuries in order to situate itself on the side of the trend in the evolution of the structuring of the world order. While by the external transition they have made a direct leap toward the crest of the wave of the change of the order-founding paradigm. Which means they have exited the Preglobal Age and have entered the Global Age.

There is a formula for the representation of the alignments of the continuity of process between the two cycles of emergence. What is generally considered as a finality of the interior transition, is eminently a vague expression, with no rigorously measured guidelines, susceptible to the political hijacking of its constituents. Appreciating the fulfillment of the interior transition according to the so-called status of “a country with a functional market economy” is at the discretion of subjective conjunctures. In reality you cannot even enumerate the sufficient and necessary qualities for describing a functioning of the market economy along the transformational path which begins with the de-structuring of the bureaucratically coordinated economy. Such an exercise, had it not been considered gratuitous it would nonetheless prove useless, because due to the lack of epistemic consistency and rigor of the instruments of evaluation it cannot be rationally explained.

Somewhat paradoxically, the interior transition does not let itself ended by incontestable rules of evaluation. This very fact has an explanation, even one which belongs to the specifics of the emergence of post-planned economies. The two cycles of emergence share a common closure. This we do not find by measuring the finality of post-communist transition, but the finality of a pendant of it, highlighted autonomously to a lesser extent because it is hidden in the paradigm of the exterior

transition as a post-capitalist transition (Drucker, 1999), of which we will talk further down.

The end of transition is generally attested through a parameter of the route of compatibility with the model of the second cycle: attaining the standards relating to the real convergence; in the first place, because the public perception of the indicators of revenue is more sensitive. Post-communist transitions ends together with the conclusion of the real convergence with the model of post-capitalist transition.

The challenges

The success of the emergence is dependent on the coagulation of the vision over its cycles. If the entrance into emergence is superiorly determined, in other words it is a problem of the propagation of the force of the global context, the finality of the emergence appears as possible in the conditions of an epistemological rupture; if the option for a changing of the founding paradigm of the world order becomes effective. The rational choice targets not just the coexistent alternative in the configuration of the world, but the paradigm which will found the experience after the rupture as well. A paradigm which will reveal the potential to under-stretch evolution on a trajectory on which the limit-problems of the old paradigm find solution in the solving of the problems specific to the new paradigm. The coexistence of the visions creates an aporia which cannot be overcome by itself without the radical modification and replacement of the founding principle of legitimacy and uniqueness of the explanation by the founding principle of legitimacy and relativity of the explanation (Verlet, 2007).

The cycling of the emergence in European post-communist countries being the result of the adherence to another founding theory of the world order, contains a paradox: in order to be sure of the success of the transformations in the first cycle, the transformations specific to the second cycle must start. The option was for a change which cannot be finalized unless the move is made toward another change, which holds the first as a necessary condition in order to surpass it. The two cycles of transition are continuous in appearance, because in reality the cycle of the exterior transition comes with a paradigm. This paradigm will transform the first into a particular case placed in a remodeled context which will

permanently lose its potential for universalization through uniqueness. The already given verdict (Brzezinsky, 2000) that the hegemonical option of world order is the final one, announcing the end of the Preglobal Age, is related to the paradigmatic rupture between the two cycles of the emergence of post-communist countries and to the option for the European model of approximating the world order, which heralds the dawn of the Global Age.

This is why the models followed in the two stages of transition are and continue to be perceived as conflictual. They bring competition close to the visions on world order, not because they represent differently instrumentalized interests, but because they have, in spite of the politically correct silence, different ideological signatures. The ever more visible dispute among the two visions of world order tends to become more acute as the optional relevance changes in favor of the European model for the approximation of globalization. Rightfully speaking, we are the protagonists of the twilight of the vision centered on the uniqueness of an explanation destined to legitimize itself as is, only in the hierarchical systems of the management of power and at the same time of the birth of the vision coagulated around the principle of the relativity of the explanation. These are tested empirically in closed, self-organizing systems (Prigogine, Stengers, 1997). In these, the parts assume negotiated competencies with transitive surroundings, the management of powers being the expression of participative horizontality in an integrative process which amends itself on the go.

The historical position of the European post-communist countries confers them the privilege of witnessing and participating in an epistemological fracture at the level of the framework-theories regarding the world order. In an extremely short time interval for making true the change of paradigm, the post-communist countries falsify (Popper, 2001) the theory of capitalist order after the break-off with the theory of communist order by approximating the structuring of the founding theory of another paradigm, of an eminently post-capitalist consistency. The double rupture has no historical precedent. It opens a breach in the evolution of the world which will act as a milestone marking the end of the Preglobal Age and the birth of the Global Age. Within the interlude in between these fault lines the escape from the totalitarian communist orbit

happens abruptly, as it does the trek interrupted by the communist episode, which is the transition to capitalism, both experiences belonging to an age about to be extinguished.

The irony of history is found in the fact that the abandoning of communism as a formula of the management of powers is simultaneous with overcoming the adversely structured capitalism. This is heading to both a post-communist as well as post-capitalist version of world order. The cycle of the external transition, which bears the pragmatic form of the European integration project, represents the revolutionary leap in the mechanisms of progress. It also, evidently, stands for the prefiguration of the new formula for the management of powers, with a new ordinate principle, that of harmonious competition of a cooperative type. This is the founding principle of the world order perceived as a different modernity.

The alternative of the antagonistic or adversative systems of the management of powers represents a specific substantiation of the first modernity, stemming from the Enlightenment's project and brought into effect by the industrial and national revolutions. Capitalism and communism have stayed in the trail of the propensity of the dependencies in various planes. The entwining of destiny repeats the biblical experience of the brothers who burdened the beginnings of humanity with the act of the calculated extinction of the other. There is no survivor under the rule of intolerance! Symbolically, the double rupture of paradigmatic order in the transition of Central and Eastern European countries signifies a moral compensation for them; they are attributed the role of drawing the curtain over the failure of adversity as an ordinate principle, of announcing the death of the fratricidal heroes of the first modernity, capitalism and communism, and as well of approximating the values of the second modernity.

That these "rational wonders" happen in this part of the world is a certification of the belief that after having gone through both of the faces of this Golgotha of the first modernity, the experience of change in which utopia is limited can be built, and social engineering can be excluded. The rationality of the experience (Habermas, 2000), including that of individual discernment, is fortified by the living in the alternative, not just by the theoretical reference - even a critical one. Post-capitalism could not have emerged anywhere but where post-communism has been lived! The exit from the alternative was, for the countries of Central and Eastern

Europe which are now integrating into the European Union, the break-up with all the forms of orders belonging to the first modernity.

The breakthroughs

The reality of the European construction has gone way ahead of the framework-theory of the global order. It can be perceived as an insinuation of a breakthrough of experience through the emptiness of the theory. In fact, the breakthrough has the value of a scientific revolution (Kuhn, 1976) which although real, did not manage to dislodge the credible rules of the “normal science”. The order explained by the founding principle of adversity has generated habits of orientation and psychological comfortabilities so powerful that they resist falsification. As long as the phenomenology of the pre-global world covers the perception of the real, the breakthrough suggested by the coming into effect of another principle is refused as an absurd request, and the phenomena it generates are being minimized.

Fitting the way of relating to the constitution of reality is a complicated operation of accrediting the propensity towards another ordinate principle. Foregoing a founding principle of global order bears some resemblance to the process of the challenging of Newtonian physics by the Einsteinian physics: the theory of general relativity, by changing the perspective over the fundamentals, has enlarged the horizon of the explanation and transformed the theory of universal gravitation into a particular case inserted into the new conceptual universe (Barrow, 1999).

The changing of principles spurs a process of unification both at the level of theory as well as of the real world. This process moves the limits of the explanation and those of experience – of society in our case – to new, broader horizons in which the powers grow, including the powers of understanding or of knowledge. The principle of harmonious competition of a cooperative type frames in other contexts – especially of negotiation – the various expectations, imposing a positive vision over the limits and limitations under which the individual discernment is transacted.

The most significant alignment of the paradigmatic transgression specific to the European construction is the movement of the constitutive values. We can distinguish two trends: one of the reincorporation of some values from the old model, and another of the testing of specific values.

The generative mechanisms of the European model of globalization – as a new experience of world order – are both evolutionary and revolutionary. Essentially, the particularity derives from the vision that the real is the reason and goal of knowledge, while knowledge both unravels and creates the real.

The sense of the functioning of the relation between the model and the phenomenon is a game of compensation between continuity and rupture. The dosage respects the grading of difficulty in the process of learning, the renewal of paradigms being, in the end, nothing other than a learning process. Time is an immanent variable which marks the grading of the complexity of the systems – imitating the anthropic route: birth, adolescence, maturity, death – on the symbolic path: entries, transformation, exits. Evidently, just the subjective time is finite (Hawking, Mlodinow, 2007). The model of the order approximated by the European integration respects the rules of opened, self-organizing natural systems. It is a society model which favors the redefinition of the subjective times in the space of sustainable co-living, exactly because this space – being recreated in common – is freed from adversity.

The conciliation of a paradox between individual freedom and the negotiated social context, therefore between the principle of individualism and the principle of community, defies the perception honed by the postmodernist paradigm, especially the belief in the end of history (Fukuyama, 1994) through the absolute triumph of liberalism. The explicative models offered by the „superb” theories (Penrose, 2001) are not the result of „tabula rasa” type of operations; the models hold determinants of the precedents and add others which change the perspective, enlarge the referential horizon, multiply the power of understanding new phenomena etc.

The recovered values in the European model of globalization are mainly the market - in its institutional form, and democracy – cleansed of the aporias of political correctness. It essentially ads values such as: cohesion – with its social, economical and territorial dimensions, communalism – shielded against the propensities of mass, multi-level government – ejecting hierarchical reflexes, convergence – clearing the center-periphery blockages, post-national space – coming out from the taboo of non-negotiable sovereignty, Europeanization – as a formula of

identification with the performance of identities which stay diverse etc. The European model of integration is overlaid on a set of values different from those accredited by the first modernity. These are the values of the second modernity, those of the Global Age, as time of the global world.

We must notice the fact that the breakthroughs of the European model of globalization can be interpreted within the guidelines of the continuity-discontinuity tensions specific to scientific revolutions, of the change of paradigm. Evidently, the perception of the change of the frame of reference, of the acting context comes first and is evaluated as a change which embodies reconfirmed tendencies and unleashed trends.

In a surprising way, the European model of globalization is permissive to the reconfirmation of some determinants which have outlived both the exterior transition – of a post-capitalist essence, as well as the interior transition – of post-communist essence. The mixing seems contradictory if we analyze by the particular logic of the models which have suggested the intermediate values of postmodernism as a formula of survival (Dinu, 2006). It was, admittedly, an attempt of the adversative models of keeping their natural placenta, even with the help of postindustrial invention as a technical support for postmodernism.

The natural failure of the artificial mix of the determinants in making autonomous the convergence of the adversative systems on exclusively positive principles (Kolakovsky, 2007) does not constitute an argument of precedence for attesting the validity of the European paradigm of globalization. The European approximation of globalization is not the resuscitation of the theories of the convergence of systems and the orchestration of a new social engineering, because it simply does not combine the constitutive values of the preceding models of order, nor does it summarily arrange their ordinate principle. The European model of globalization – as of formula for world order – is built on another ordinate principle, that of harmonious competition of a cooperative type – and not that of adversity.

Thought out and structured adversatively, the capitalist and communist systems had constitutive values which were reciprocally exclusive. The system of the global world, approximated through the European integrative process, complements the values even when they appear to be divergent. The regulated market, for instance, is not the

exclusive market of the “invisible hand” capitalism, nor is it the bureaucratic decision of the uniform planning of the communism of the “visible hand” (of the state). The visions of adversity are practically left behind by mechanisms of control which operate in a regime of extremeness. The departure is made with the ideological perspective to get to the formula in which the expectations about the finality of the system are sorted by how they can be better satisfied and not by what instruments are used. The approach seems utilitarian, but it offers the possibility of getting out of the irreducible contradiction of the founding principles of an adversative nature.

In the same way, the common space, as a result of the decision of using sovereignties in common, of breaking out of the constraints of the identity values of the ideological nature of the nation-state, does not signify an option to the detriment of individualist principle of liberty, but the functioning of a transactional mechanism of balancing the rights and responsibilities, centered on the prevalence of individual discernment in valuing the natural rules of living together, which in essence is about the fulfillment of the individual as a social being.

The Teachings

For a country inside the European Union the approximation of globalization is naturally assumed both as an offer of opportunity and as a historical obligation. It is the opportunity to burn through the stages, being in the trend, to get to the crest of the wave represented by the new order. For Romania the chance of being an insider in a fundamental process of the contemporary world is salutary, of course, only if it is valued as a support for the gains toward modernity (Attali, 2007). In this regard there are a few priorities which should make their mark on the process of integration in its institutional and individual dimensions.

Firstly, there is the loading of the public conscience with the specific vision of the evolution of the European model of globalization which Romania is part of. There is no other alternative compatible with this goal other than initiating and sustaining a process of learning of the values of the model, of disseminating the knowledge into the public space and internalizing this knowledge at the individual level of action and decision making.

It evidently is not just a passive process of learning but one which engages the innovative initiative of performance and of change at the level of the model, this being an evolution through the approximation of the finality, which draws upon both common and individual creativity.

Secondly, there is the treating of the integration exactly for what it represents for Romania: an extreme project for breaking out from the condition of the periphery. This supposes the acceleration of the evolutions on the road of recovering the fulfilling of the values of the first modernization, with its significant components of an economical and power management nature, specific to post-communist transition, and also the diminishing of the lack of potential of convergence as a result of the accelerated adherence to post-capitalist transition, defined by the European model of globalization. In a grinding way, this means that Romania should at once go through two started and unfinished projects, to adjust on-the-go the performance to the standards of a project which bears a different logic to the systems of order adversely coagulated and creators of perpetual ruptures. The cultural ingredients for such a leap in social experience are few and inadequate, which complicates the approach, determines an unfitting rhythm of change and produces incompatibilities with the context.

Thirdly, there is the urgent need for the definition of a pertinent road in the dosing of the own effort of adapting to the model and of the supporting factors generated for the cohesion toward the model. The gravitational force of the model is absolutely necessary in use, but is not sufficient for maintaining the correct trajectory of integration in the absence or scarceness of the own effort, of the inertial impulse sustained by the will for integration. This supposes the understanding of the entry into the European model of globalization as a coherently assumed project for the passage to the second modernity, as a chance of escaping the complications of the failures in the fulfillment of the first modernity (Dinu, 2007). The own effort concentrated to the maximum is destined to recover the un-mature processes specific to the first modernity, such as industrialization, not necessarily by finalizing them but especially by bringing into effect the processes specific to the second modernity, suggested by the specific evolutions of the knowledge society, as a

formula for the approximation of the determinants of the global society in the European version.

The European dream (Rifkin, 2006) deserves to be the Romanian's too, but for this it is not sufficient for the illusions and comfortabilities to be abandoned, but also for the destiny of identity to be re-thought so that it reconfirms itself through communitarian performance.

References

- Attali, J. (2007). *Scurtă istorie a viitorului*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- Barrow, J. D. (1999). *Despre imposibilitate. Limitele științei și știința limitelor*, Editura Tehnică, București
- 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 imperatiile sale geostrategice*, Univers Enciclopedic, București
- Dinu, M., „Globalizarea. Modelul explicativ”, Supliment al revistei *Economie teoretică și aplicată*, Seria Sinteze, 2006, București
- Dinu, M., „Modernitate după modernitate”, în *Economie teoretică și aplicată*, nr. 8(513), August 2007, pp. 53-60
- Dinu, M. et al. (2007). *Modelul european de integrare*, ediția a II-a, Editura Economică, București
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Societatea post-capitalistă*, Editura Image, București
- Fukuyama, F. (1994). *Sfârșitul istoriei și ultimul om*, Paideia, București
- Habermas, J. (2000). *Discursul filosofic al modernității. 12 prelegeri*, All Educațional, București
- Hawking, S., Mlodinow, L. (2007). *O mai scurtă istorie a timpului*, Humanitas, București
- Kolakowski, L. (2007). *Modernitatea sub un neobosit colimator*, Editura Curtea Veche, București
- Kuhn, T. S. (1976). *Structura revoluțiilor științifice*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București
- Penrose, R. (2001). *Mintea noastră... cea de toate zilele. Despre gândire, fizică și calculatoare*, Editura Tehnică, București

- Popper, K. R. (2001). *Conjecturi și infirmări. Cercetarea cunoașterii științifice*, Editura Trei, București
- Prigogine, I., Stengers, Isabelle (1997). *Între eternitate și timp*, Humanitas, București
- Rifkin, J. (2006). *Visul european. Despre cum, pe tăcute, Europa va pune în umbră „visul american”*, Editura Polirom, Iași
- Verlet, L. (2007). *Cufărul lui Newton*, Editura Nemira & Co, București