

**Slavo Kukić<sup>1</sup>**  
Faculty of Economics  
Mostar  
slavo.kukic@tel.net.ba

*Original scientific paper*  
**UDC 316.42.063:316.32**  
**DOI**  
*Received: 15.01.2012*  
*Accepted: 01.05.2012.*

## **Globalization – hope or threat to project the future?**

### **Abstract**

*In relation to the phenomenon of globalization today are dominant two opposing groups of approach. According to one, globalization is not in question nor from the processual, nor from the perspective of value. Procedural, it is the regularity of the general history of humanity walk, and it is impossible to stop it. Not only that. Each stopping is by itself, in terms of values, retrogression and antihumanism. According to others, however, the meaning and scope of globalization have completely opposite meanings. It is, economically, the process of planetarisation and domination of big capital. But, this is not the worst. It is the process of unification and cultural value, and, then, it means that it is also the process of destroying the identity of any other account for the identity of big business. In this process, in the same matrix, will first die identities of small nations, and then everyone else. From this perspective, globalization is viewed necessarily as antihumanism, it is against the fundamental postulates of human life and society. How, therefore to position towards globalization?*

**Keywords:** *globalisation, antiglobalists, state-nation, cultural uniformity, colonialism.*

### **1. Introduction**

Globalization is today, in all, the notion that is in everyday life and in scientific vocabulary - the most intense used. In everyday life is noticeable - in the communication of political elites, businessmen, passersby - the real race in the use of this term. It often happens that those who use the term globalization do not know its true meaning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Professor of Sociology at the University of Mostar. E-mail: slavo.kukic@tel.net.ba

On the other hand, the labeling of the same phenomenon in the world is done by using different coins. In France, for example, the common name is mondialisation, in Spain and Latin America, the term globalization, in Germany Globalisierung, etc.

There is a diversity of concepts that are used in science to denote the same process - from the “global formation”<sup>2</sup> and “global culture”<sup>3</sup>, through “global system”, “global modernity” and “global process”<sup>4</sup>, to “global culture”<sup>5</sup> i “global cities”<sup>6</sup> etc. In use is, however, most often the term “globalization”, which has already in late eighties and in early nineties become the relatively most frequently used to indicate the new, for its meaning global process<sup>7</sup>.

It is difficult, therefore, after all, not to agree with Ulrich Beck’s thesis that globalization is in the last thirty years, certainly the most used, and yet the least defined, most likely the most irrational, vague, and politically the most effective word.<sup>8</sup> And not only that. This position, but also about the same characteristics, it could keep for years to come.

There is a certain evolution in the approach of reach of globalization. During the eighties and nineties of 20th century is recognized, for example, the tendency of globalization dividing scholars into *radicals* and *skeptics* (Giddens), or, in Held’s version *hyper-globalists* and *skeptics*<sup>9</sup>. For the first ones, hyper-globalists or radicals, the world of national economies, sovereign states, autonomous cultures belongs to the past, and globalization is inevitable historical necessity. Unstoppable economic force: multinational financial capital, the company and the IMF as a global economic arbiter turn the national economy into their local unit. It is used to empty the autonomy and sovereignty of nation states. With information-media revolution and its cultural products - TV shows, movies and

<sup>2</sup> Christopher Chase-Dunn, *Global Formation: Structures of the World-Economy*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

<sup>3</sup> See: Arjun Appadurai, *Disjuncture and Difference in the Global and Cultural Economy*, Public Culture, 2, 1990, pp. 1-24; Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997, as well as Roland Robertson, *Globalization – Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1992.

<sup>4</sup> See: Leslie Sklair, *Sociology of the Global System*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991; Mike Featherstone, (ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage, 1990; Friedman, T.L., *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*, New York: Farrar, Straus&Giroux, 1999.

<sup>5</sup> Jameson, Frederik and Maso Miyoshi, (ed.), *The Cultures of Globalization*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

<sup>6</sup> See: Sassen Saskia, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton: Princeton University Press., 1991; Carlos Fortuna (ed.), *Cidade, cultura e globalização*, Lisboa: Celta, 1997.

<sup>7</sup> Anthony Giddens, *Sociology*, Oxford: Polity Press, 1990; Anthony Giddens, *Runaway world: how is globalization shaping our lives*, Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski and Turk, 2005.

<sup>8</sup> Ulrich Beck, *What is globalization?* Zagreb: Vizura, 2003.

<sup>9</sup> David Held, et al., *Global Transformations*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.

news - it is announced the end of the national cultures and identities. Instead of a multipolar it is created the uniform, unipolar world. *Fukuyama's* language, dramatic struggle, wars and conflicts belong to the past, and we came to the harmonic order, by the end of history<sup>10</sup>.

For *skeptics*, however, things look very different. The story of globalization is just another in a series of myths and nothing more. Reality, they say, goes in another direction entirely. Or more specifically, now that same world is less integrated than before World War. Instead of globalization, regionalization is at work - the creation of three major financial and trading blocs, European, Pacific-Asian and American - who do not unite but divide the world. On the other hand, the beginning of 21st century does not announce the death of the nation state. On the contrary, on the scene is the proliferation of new independent states, and nation states are increasingly becoming creators of globalization, establishing the rules that shape the world economy. In part, therefore, is not integration of the world, but its fragmentation, division in different and conflict blocks of civilization and ethnic enclaves<sup>11</sup>.

Attitude towards globalization, however, is formed by other criteria also. Most notably, of course, is the classification according to the principle of opting for or against globalization as a planetary process. According to this criterion is more and more welcomed the division into the globalists and antiglobalists.

## **2. Couple of theses on the concept**

Pro and cons of globalization, and that is what the title suggests, is in the focus of this analysis. Before that, however, it is necessary, and in function of achieving required assumptions of emphasized analysis, to redraw the borders between several fundamental concepts.

The first is, without doubt, the concept of *globalization*. What should we mean by that? In the literature one can find many definitions. For *Scholte* for example, globalization is “deterritorialization - or [...] growth of supra-territorial relations between people”<sup>12</sup>. *Held*, implies under it “[...] expansion, deepening and accelerating of interdependence in all aspects of contemporary social life - from culture to crime, from finance to spirituality”<sup>13</sup>. Globalization is, he explains, “the process (or group of processes) which includes the transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions - defined in terms

---

<sup>10</sup> Frensis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, New York: The Free Press, 1992.

<sup>11</sup> David Held, *Democracy and global order*, Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 1997.

<sup>12</sup> Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization. A critical introduction*, London: Macmillian, 2000, pp. 46.

<sup>13</sup> David Held, et.al, *The same*, pp. 2.

of their scope, intensity, velocity and impact - generating transcontinental and interregional movements, networks, activities, interactions and use of power<sup>14</sup>. For *Robertson*, globalization is a concept which refers to “reducing the world, but also to raising the awareness about the world as a whole”<sup>15</sup>. *Friedman* under this phenomenon understands the unrelenting “integration of markets, nation states and technologies to an unprecedented degree, which allows individuals, corporations and nation-states to spread around the world farther, faster, deeper and cheaper than ever before [...] the spread of free market capitalism to every country in the world”<sup>16</sup>. For *Giddens*, globalization can be understood “as an intensification of social relations at the global level, linking distant places in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events that occurred miles away and vice versa.”<sup>17</sup>. Acceptable, of course, since it says nothing about the consequences of globalization - and in connection with them are the greatest theoretical disputes - as the definition of *Ulrich Beck*, in which globalization means “the process of economic, social, cultural and political activity that transcends national borders”<sup>18</sup>. It, explains Beck, is a process through which sovereign national states overlap and undermine transnational actors with varying interests and degrees of power, orientations, identities and networks.

With globalization, however, should be mentioned and some other terms used, often to indicate the same phenomenon, which have a very different meaning. Among them is, first of all, the concept of *globalization*. It is, according to *Beck*, the ideology of neoliberalism, in which the world market eliminates or replaces political action. This means that globalization reduces the multidimensionality of globalization on the only one, economic dimension, while all others - the ecological, cultural, political, social globalization is mentioned, if mentioned at all, only as subordinate to the domination of the world market system. The difference between globalization and globalism emphasize some other authors, too. For *Cohen* and *Kennedy*, for example, globalization is “an objective process of world integration,” and globalism “awareness of living in ‘one world’”<sup>19</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> *The same*, pp. 16.

<sup>15</sup> Roland Robertson, *Globalization – Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1992, pp. 8.

<sup>16</sup> Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*, New York: Farrar, Straus&Giroux, 1999, pp. 7-8.

<sup>17</sup> Anthony Giddens, *The consequences of modernity*, Belgrade, 1998, pp. 69.

<sup>18</sup> Ulrich Beck, *What is globalization?* Zagreb: Vizura, 2003, pp. 44-45.

<sup>19</sup> Robin Cohen and Kennedy Paul, *Global Sociology*, London: Macmillian Press Ltd. 2000, pp. 358.

In connection with globalization are, after all, and any other terms. In scientific terminology is, for example, introduced the concept of *glocalization*<sup>20</sup>, the ability to choose from a global assortment of varied elements and adapt them to local needs in order to establish a creative relationship between local and global. In the use is, after all, the notion of *globalization*, which is introduced in the use by *Ritzer*, and it is the phenomenon completely opposite of glocalization, it means, the fascination with the growth (or profit) which organizations and the nation push to expand globally and to the detriment of the local.

In connection with globalization is, after all, and so-called *anti-globalization* movement. As a rule, namely, by that term is implied a planetary opposition to globalization as an idea and as a process. Within the movement, however, the term “anti-globalization” is not generally used. Instead there is a need for a different globalization, one that would be fairer towards people and more sustainable to nature. *David Graeber*,<sup>21</sup> for example, advocates striving for freedom and tolerance, environmental standards, worker rights, acceptance of diversity [...] It is not, in other words, the anti-globalization, but the most internationally oriented, globally linked movement that has ever been seen. Movement actors, namely, stress the many positive aspects of globalization - the increased communication between people, a growing planetary consciousness about social and environmental issues, more widespread understanding of the planet as a system for which we are jointly responsible, creating a cosmopolitan consciousness. But is, therefore, inside the movement, opposition to globalization is reflected in opposing the growing social division and injustice and increasing destruction of nature. Instead, the members of this movement say that we need to globalize human rights, respect for diversity, tolerance, sustainable development and so on. Therefore, promoters of emphasized idea and movement, rather, instead of the term anti-globalization, use some other - “globalization from below”, “alternative globalization”, “a movement for global justice and solidarity”, “movement against corporate-led globalization”, etc.

### **3. Theoretical points of contention**

What is globalization? Is it reality or fiction? Is it old or new process? Does the globalization abolish the concept of the nation-state? Does it bring prosperity, or whether it is just a new form of colonialism? Is its result cultural

---

<sup>20</sup> Roland Robertson, *Globalization – Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1992, pp. 15.

<sup>21</sup> *David Graeber* is, otherwise, a professor of anthropology at the University of Yale.

uniformity? It is just part of a wide range of issues in respect of which there are theoretical disputes.<sup>22</sup>

### **3.1. Globalization as old or new process**

Indeed, is *globalization old or new process*. It is, in other words, one of the issues that cause confusion, and theoretical controversy. Part of the authors, in fact, this process link exclusively to contemporary. Some of them, often, in fact, concentrate solely on the past twenty years. Rare, however, are not those, who think that what today is called globalization is nothing new. Indeed, most evidence supports the theory that this is a process with a long history. Or, more specifically, in the long journey of globalization can be identified at least three major historical waves. The first of them coincides with the birth of modern European society during the sixteenth century, a time when the global arena - as perceived territorial expansion, economic, technological and military superiority - is dominated by globalization.

The second wave, then, arised in the midst of the industrial revolution, in the middle of the nineteenth century and lasted until the First World War. It is, in fact, of the time in which international trade recorded a tremendous growth rate. It is, also, about the time that marked the great migratory movements of labor towards America and Australia. Both of these processes, the process of free trade on one hand and the movement of people on the other hand, are, indeed, stopped. The reason for this needs to be found in at least three groups of causes - the conflict between the great powers and the escalation of aggressive nationalism that culminated in World War II, the creation of an authoritarian system in the USSR, which, moreover, means the complete opposite of the Western economic and political system, and, finally , sharing a single global space into hostile blocs.

Finally, the third great wave of globalization began with the ending of the Cold War, and the process gained new momentum with the fall of the Berlin Wall. The latest, third wave is significantly marked by technological and informational revolution, the global economy, global culture and supranational political systems.

But that's not all. Quite the contrary. If we compare the movements today with those in the past, for example, during the second half of the nineteenth century, among them, there is a large degree of similarity. Not only that. The degree of openness and integration of international economy is considered by some, still lower than in the second half of the nineteenth and the first decades

---

<sup>22</sup> Viewing the above, and some other theoretical disputes in connection with globalization gave Arthur Jan Scholte in his study *Globalization. A critical introduction* from 2000.

of the twentieth century<sup>23</sup>. If we, however, accept such a view, from it arises the next logical judgment - that the current degree of globalization is not, how is often, and without cause, believed, something new and unprecedented. If, however, the novelty can be spoken about, then it is related to the fact that today's globalization, emphasised by *Ellen Wood*, "is the universalisation of capitalist social relations"<sup>24</sup>. The novelty is, then, in the fact that the extent of globalization of activities is much broader today than in the past in which, objectively, were limited to a narrow circle of people and small in scope. Finally, it would be wrong to bring down globalization today, and one in the past, only to its economic dimension.

Closely related to the positioning in relation to this question - doubt, in fact, whether the old or the new process - is the alignment with respect to the dilemma whether is, in the case of globalization, the word about reality or fiction. Those, for whom, globalization is a new process that marked the thread of twentieth century, identify it as an essential component of reality and 21st century. Accordingly, therefore, participation in it is not a matter of choice, but necessity. That globalization is a part of modern reality, among others, recognise and actors of anti-globalization movement. In relation to the others they are indeed different because of their orientation to change and stop the bad sides of globalization, and good to spread and further develop. Those whom, however, the phenomenon of globalization associate with the past, the story of globalization as a process of contemporary consider inflated, indeed fiction classic, fashionable concept and fabrication that serve veteran intellectuals as a new theme that keeps them afloat.

### ***3.2. Does the concept of globalization abolish the nation-state***

One of the most important theoretical points of contention is without a doubt, applied to the question of *whether the globalization abolishes the concept of nation-state?* Relatively widely spread is the view that, of course, is represented by the *hyper-globalists*, which amounts to the thesis that "globalization is a new epoch in human history in which nation-states have become unnatural"<sup>25</sup>, that globalization abolishes the concept of nation-states, that states are no longer important, that, in other words, their place was taken by supranational and transnational, networked global empire, according to Hardt and Negri. Accordingly, of course, it is claimed to be expected that, in the relatively near future, will

---

<sup>23</sup> Hirst Paul and Thompson Grahame, *Globalization - the international economy and management capabilities*, Zagreb: Liberata, 2001, pp. 12.

<sup>24</sup> Mark Rupert and Smith Hazel, (eds.) *Historical Materialism and Globalization*, London: Routledge, 2002.

<sup>25</sup> David Held et al., *Global Transformations*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999, pp. 3.

disappear, and national products and national technology, national corporations and industries, and that states are losing or completely lost “control of the basic elements of his economic policies”<sup>26</sup>.

With such understanding is true, not everybody agrees. Great is, namely, the number of globalization theorists, in the ranks of skeptics, of course, - among them a particular weight have Hirst and Thompson - for which the state plays a major role in the internationalization of the economy. Accordingly, they refuse to even talk about the globalization of the economy, arguing that even today most of the shops do not take place globally, but on the contrary, within certain regional blocs - the European Union, ASEAN in Asia, MECROSUR in South America, NAFTA (North America Free Trade Agreement).<sup>27</sup>

Skeptics, then, challenge the thesis that corporations tend to lose their identification with the corporation's home country, to become spaceless, global. Research, that had a purpose of determining the index of globalization of multinational corporations - an index that is expressed through the degree of property and persons employed in third countries - showed that there is an insignificant number of those corporations whose index of globalization is above 75%. Not only that. Among the 25 first such corporations fifteen years ago there was no one from the U.S.<sup>28</sup>

In accordance with this state of things, skeptics believe that it is wrong and story about corporations that move the state from the top of the pyramid of power. Thus, theoretical attention, instead of that fiction, according to Dicken (1998), should be directed to the study of complex and specific relations of states and corporations today. He, indeed, does not deny the revised role and functions of the state in terms of the modern world. However, it is important that “the nation state continues to significantly contribute to changing and reshaping the global economic map”, in other words, state without corporations do not mean anything. An not only that. Without the green light and support from the state - and in favor of this are exploited many different empirical indicators of aid which, in the last fifteen years, the most powerful corporations have received from the mother country - corporations would have never cross national borders.

We should not, however, doubt that the state still plays a significant role even in global terms. It is impossible, however, to disagree with the thesis that their

---

<sup>26</sup> Manuel Castells, *The Information Age - Economy, Society and Culture*, Volume II, Zagreb, 2002, pp. 250.

<sup>27</sup> Exports of EU countries outside the Union, for example, participates in the total trade with only 8% (Jürgen Hoffmann, *Global threats and opportunities for policy work in the EU*, Zagreb: Journal of Social Policy, 6 (3/4), 1999, pp. 307-329).

<sup>28</sup> See: Peter Dicken, *Global Shift - Transferring the World Economy*, New York: Guilford Press, 1998, pp. 194-195.



sovereignty has nonetheless become the “*multifaceted*”, according to Scholte and Held. Or, more specifically, part of that sovereignty was transferred to a *supranational* authorities, such as, for example, the International Criminal Court in The Hague, WTO, etc. There is, then, and the growth of global corporations and their increasing weight in the real world of management. We can not deny, after all, and ever-growing influence of *NGOs* and *civil* society, which globally are increasingly assuming the role of partner, or even replacing states as actors - particularly the poor state of which are more and more assuming some sectors such as health, the fight against hunger and poverty, environmental protection, etc.

### ***3.3. Globalization and cultural uniformity***

One of the fundamental theoretical issues is the question of *whether globalization is bringing cultural uniformity?* However, it is both one of the main points of contention. George Ritzer has, for example, become famous with his thesis on the *McDonaldization* of society. According to this thesis, the effectiveness, measurability, cost effectiveness, predictability and control are the foundation of how we prepare and eat food, but also the way the society functions, the way we live. Or more specifically, uniformity and monotony become a global “iron cage” where no one and nothing can escape. McDonaldization or in words of *Benjamin Barber*, *McWorldization* is becoming a lifestyle that offers uniformity, uniformity of living and thinking but also requires a kind of loyalty and total dependence, a style which does not need a man, citizen, but consumers. It is clear, of course, that McWorld and McDonaldization are metaphors, and instead of McDonald’s can occur masses of other meanings of the same metaphor - MTV, Nike, Coca-Cola and other corporations. But the essence is the same - the way to more uniform diet, clothing, lifestyles and attitudes, and more uniform society.

Often, however, we have the authors who do not accept this interpretation of globalization. For them, globalization does not produce uniformity and monotony. On the contrary, it increases the possibility that more than ever before, we enjoy the diversity, the variety of lifestyles, new cultures. Because of a blind fear of the U.S., they think that the opponents of globalization do not realize that today Asian rappers in London are nibbling Turkish pizza, Indians in New York are learning to dance salsa, Mexicans are eating meals from the Pacific Ocean made by English cooks, etc. The world, in other words, has never been closer to the possibility that each person chooses for itself a cultural or any other identity that he wants.

On the other hand, the arrival of new and unfamiliar ideas and goods is making assumptions of increasing opportunities for local cultures and traditions

to express themselves and expand their local peculiarities and particularities, to express and expand the possibility of glocalization as the process of creating more heterogeneous world, as a process in which individuals and local groups, living in a pluralistic world, have a high degree of customization and innovation. It is, after all, a process that creates fertile ground for hybridization, the hybrid identities, dynamic mixing of cultures, of which each takes what suits him.<sup>29</sup>

Globalization, then continue advocates of this approach, enable the development of cross-border identity. It is likely that, for example, the advocates of feminist philosophy of BiH will more identify with the representatives of the same ideology anywhere in the world than with the people in Bosnia that built the meaning of their public engagements based on ethnic assumptions.

Finally, since it means “end of the national project,” globalization, “encourages the growth of non-national forms of *collective identity*”<sup>30</sup>. Not only that. It creates the possibility that one individual has several identities - that he feels like a member of more nations, more races, sexual preferences, etc.

### ***3.4. Globalization - the assumption of global welfare and neocolonialism***

Does globalization brings prosperity or is it, exactly the opposite, a new form of colonialism? This is also one of the central, perhaps the most important issue of theoretical debate and controversy. It, of course, needs a note. Whether is talked about about the positive or negative impact of globalization, as a rule it is about its effects on democracy, human rights and minority rights, peace, social justice, poverty and hunger, environmental protection and biodiversity conservation, etc. And the answers are, in simple, radically opposed to each other. For some, globalization is a *win-win* scenario where everyone wins, for others, such as members of the so-called anti-globalization movement, it is just a new form of colonialism.

Supporters of globalization are characterized by the thesis that it provides great opportunities for real world development. For clarification, they explain, with its development are significantly improving living conditions in almost all countries (IMF, 2003). Similar theses can be found in World Bank report from 2002. In it, among other things, is emphasized the success of globalization in reducing poverty in third world countries that are more integrated into the mainstream of world economy. Or, as pointed out by one of the members of this theoretical approach, “Globalization offers a richer life, in a broad sense, for people in rich countries and the only realistic way out of poverty for the poor

<sup>29</sup> John Tomlinson, *Globalization and Culture*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.

<sup>30</sup> Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalization. A critical introduction*, London: Macmillan, 2000, pp. 160.

in the world<sup>31</sup>. Not only that. It will, added by some of this intellectual circle, increase the security of citizens with regard to the state and increase citizens' individual freedoms.

On globalization, however, many members of the anti-globalization movement look completely different. It is considered as, “a process in which corporations move money, factories and produce even in greater speed in search of cheap labor and raw materials and governments willing to ignore laws to protect consumers, workers and nature”<sup>32</sup>. It is, in fact, the liquid tape that surrounds the world by widening the gap between rich and poor<sup>33</sup>.

#### **4. Instead of a conclusion**

Globalization is, without doubt, one of the hot topics of global theory. Conflicting theoretical pictures in relation to it are consequences of just fundamentally different relationship towards the new reality that is rapidly formed. For this reason, of course, they shed light only on some fragments of that reality, those who idealize themselves or else, those who are demonized. The new reality, however, exists independent of it and in parallel with it.

A complex approach to globalization, therefore, instead of classifying “for” or “against”, should be based on several premises. But above all, considering globalization as part of the life of modern man and society, the fact that we live in a society in which the contours of the new - the global cosmopolitan society - yet in sight, should be focused on the identification of two forms of globalization, its positive and negative effects. The goal is to first support, stimulate, and to put others under scrutiny of theoretical criticism, ethical evaluation, building a kind of global codes, thanks to which this kind of impact would be eliminated or at least minimized.

Prevela: Tamara Straživuk

---

<sup>31</sup> Philip Legrain, *Open world: the Truth about Globalization*, London: Abacus, 2003, pp. 24.

<sup>32</sup> Mark Ritchie, *Globalization vs. Globalism*, URL: <http://www.itcilo.it/english/actrav/telearn/global/ilo/globe/kirsh.htm>. (31.03.2004.), 1997.

<sup>33</sup> John Feffer (ed), *Living in Hope: People Challenging Globalization*, London: Zed Books, 2002.

## References

1. Albrow, Martin and King Elizabeth (ur.). *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*. London: Sage, 1990.
2. Appadurai, Arjun. *Disjuncture and Difference in the Global and Cultural Economy*, Public Culture, 2, 1-24, 1990.
3. Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
4. Barber, Benjamin. *Jihad vs. McWorld*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1995.
5. Beck, Ulrich. *What is globalization?*, Zagreb: Vizura, 2003.
6. Castells, Manuel. *The information age - economy, society and culture*. Volume II, *The Power of Identity*, Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 2002.
7. Chase-Dunn, Christopher. *Global Formation: Structures of the World-Economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
8. Cohen, Robin and Kennedy Paul. *Global Sociology*, London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 2000.
9. Dicken, Peter. *Global Shift – Transferring the World Economy*. New York: Guilford Press, 1998.
10. Featherstone, Mike (ed.). *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage, 1990.
11. Featherstone, Mike et al. *Global Modernities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1995.
12. Feffer, John (ed.). *Living in Hope: People Challenging Globalization*. London: Zed Books, 2002.
13. Fortuna, Carlos (ed.). *Cidade, cultura e globalização*. Lisboa: Celta, 1997.
14. T.L. Friedman (1999), *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*, New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux
15. Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.
16. Giddens, Anthony. *Sociology*. Oxford: Polity Press, 1990.
17. Giddens, Anthony. *Runaway world: how is globalization shaping our lives*, Zagreb: Circulation Jesenski and Turk, 2005.
18. Giddens, Anthony. *The consequences of modernity*. Belgrade, 1998.
19. Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Zagreb: Arkzin i Past Forward, 2003.
20. Held, David. *Democracy and global order*, Belgrade: Filip Višnjić, 1997.
21. Held, David et al. *Global Transformations*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
22. Hirst, Paul and Grahame Thompson. *Globalization - the international economy and management capabilities*. Zagreb: Liberata, 2001.
23. Hoffman, Jürgen. *Global threats and opportunities for policy work in the EU*. Zagreb: Journal of Social Policy, 6 (3/4): 307-329, 1999.

24. Jameson, Fredric and Miyoshi, Masao (ed.). *The Cultures of Globalization*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
25. Legrain, P. *Open world: the Truth about Globalization*, London: Abacus, 2003.
26. MMF. *Common criticism: some responses*, URL:<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ccrit/eng/crit.htm> (31.03.2004), 2003.
27. Ritchie, M. *Globalization vs. Globalism*, URL: <http://www.itcilo.it/english/actrav/telearn/global/ilo/globe/kirsh.htm>. (31.03.2004.), 1997.
28. Robertson, Roland. *Globalization – Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1992.
29. Rupert, Mark and Hazel Smith (eds.). *Historical Materialism and Globalization*. London: Routledge, 2002.
30. Sassen, Saskia. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
31. Scholte, Jan Aart. *Globalization. A critical introduction*. London: Macmillan, 2000.
32. Sklair, Leslie. *Sociology of the Global System*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
33. Šimleša, Dražen. *The anti-globalization movement - attitudes, motives, objectives and scope*, thesis, Zagreb, 2004
34. Tomlinson, John. *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.