

Towards a global currency. An academic opinion

Authors:*

Napoleon POP,
Valeriu IOAN-FRANC

A*bstract:* The authors present below a synthesis of a broader work, as a result of a 2011-2014 study made by the Institute of National Economy of the Romanian Academy. The authors aim at an analysis of a new paradigm of the post-crisis economy, trying to clarify the issue of the globalisation mechanisms in the financial-monetary domain.

Keywords: *macroeconomics and monetary economics; money; monetary policy; central banking; international economics; financial economics.*

JEL Classification: *D0; E0; E5; E6; G0; H0*

1. The major doubt and the return to principle

Trying to find the link between causes and effects, i.e. economic globalisation was accompanied by the deepest financial crisis, we were gradually led to a philosophical plane of the approach, which was the distinction between what “appears” (phenomenon) and what “is permanent” (substance). Therefore, we saw globalisation as a perpetual “evolution” of the world order, while the leading actor was Man listening to his reason. As knowledge is senses-based, as Parmenides would say, it produces opinions on what surrounds man, but the restraint to this kind of knowledge could confront us with what is permanent.

* *Napoleon Pop, Ph.D., Institutul Național de Cercetări Economice “Costin C. Kirițescu”, Academia Română; Valeriu Ioan-Franc, Ph.D., Institutul Național de Cercetări Economice “Costin C. Kirițescu”, Academia Română, e-mail: franc@ince.ro.*

Knowledge is rational and by it we try, according to Hesiod, to find the ultimate benchmark or principle of things, which makes us – beyond perpetual evolution (reality is an eternal flow, an eternal novelty, according to Heraclitus) – accept “a total existence, the ultimate and the same ground of things, either God or matter” (Bagdasar, Bogdan, Narly, 1995). Thus, we come closer naturally to Anaxagoras’ idea that order (of things) can only be the result of a primary “*Intelligence*”, of a spiritual, infinite, self-supporting principle. Therefore, any order is rational, because it is a *fruit of Intelligence*, about which Hesiod, placing Man between Earth (Gaia) and Love (Eros), considered him to be at the basis of the principles of things.

What we have described above is, in fact, a synthetic representation of the connections we used and considered while preparing our essay (Pop, Ioan-Franc, 2012-2014). This synthesis is necessary for explaining the break – only apparent – in the linearity of the economic logic, as a reader’s opinion, while in fact we need a logic concerning a much wider phenomenon to show what a global currency mankind actually needs to cure itself. Initially we considered a global currency able *to cure a globalized economy*, but we saw that it was not enough. We need something able *to cure mankind first* by what an individual should be, do and behave under all aspects, and especially the economic ones.

Why all these? The answer is quite simple as the prevailing economic aspect of our life has overwhelmed the principle of unlimited existence of the generic human being, and not of a transient individual. The same prevailing economic aspect has reinforced the Man’s role in economy, because it has ignored his dual nature – spirit and body – and has restrained his needs almost exclusively to a material, quantitative existence. Unsustained spirit – *the ark of permanent values* – has turned the human behaviour to money-measured uses, and by the limited purpose of making profit, people have tried to justify the means used by public policy . What apparent simplicity we find in the phrase saying that “the only expression of economic performance is profit”, but how unfair it is and how many tragedies it caused are issues to be discussed in another work, in the years to come.

It is true that the initial idea covered the global currency as *money* and possible determinations offered or imposed by recent events (financial crisis) or earlier events (distorsions caused during the Great Moderation), able to ensure the recognition of this money in a universal way and to use it in the multitude of transactions that form, develop and consolidate the globalisation. We believe that the global currency, as *money* (e.g., something like DST or other monetary standard), had to stabilize the economic values against risk, either by quick

escalation (speculation bubble) or by quick depreciation (crisis), besides better absorption of inflation shocks or exchange rate volatility.

While the recent financial crisis provides evidence in this respect and many works of political position and/or economic expertise on some reserve currencies reveal what we could understand by a global currency other than any of the traditional reserve currencies (an attack directed mainly against the US dollar), then the distortions accumulated during the Great Moderation direct us towards something else, from phenomenon to principle. According to some opinions, the financial crisis revealed the end of a long cycle (of the Kondratiev type), of about 100 years, consisting of other cycles characterized by apparently similar phenomena, but certainly with a more profound significance.

Maybe the profound significance of the economic cycles that started in the early 20th century could be produced by the progress of economics, following the research work on the policy configuration and conduct, on combinations of tool calibrations and measurements, on the interdependence between economic basic policies (fiscal-budgetary and monetary ones), but still ignoring the primary cause. Within the same framework, we find the definition, methodology, measures, estimates, proposals, predictions of macroeconomic indicators, optimum correlations and determinations to minimize risks, to control the channels of transmission of economic policy impulses, the calibration of the latter and, finally, the search for a much wanted economic sustainability. If for clear reasons – one refers to the *order* to work with – the *conventions* were abundant in economic research, we forget that Man and his conduct cannot be fit in a mere *algorithm* or any other fixed substitute, which could help us in economic reasoning.

In our opinion, there are two comments to be made in connection with the cognitive process focussed on economics for managing rare resources (in accordance to almost all definitions provided by them). The first comment is that the above cognitive process focused on the object of economics is imagining that economic policies could be improved to become splendid machinery able to ensure the proper management of rare resources. But all efforts to mathematically formalize economics and include it by (forced) assimilation in laws specific to sciences could not ensure the theoretical consistency of economics. We could accept the (limited) utility of such efforts for making easy *simulations* by comparison with *laws* still far from the socio-human character of economics, but risking to fully exclude the subject of economics – the human being.

The research on the Great Depreciation still goes on, but the cognitive progress made by economics (at least after the 1929 Crisis) seems *roughly* to be in

contradiction with the sense and especially with the profoundness of some crisis in the economic system caused, to our astonishment, within the above-mentioned cognitive process.

This very fact leads us to the second comment, confirmed by globalisation and highlighted by the financial crisis, i.e. the importance of the subject in economics, but mainly the importance of preventing its exit from the matrix of values, which naturally (for us) and lawfully (for others) attach morality to any human action within a social collectivity, which in fact defines a stage of worldly order. While globalisation aims at conquering mankind by expanding the western-type democracy and market economy, then we clearly see the values according to which human action manifests (or should manifest) and the specific features of world order take shape. Similarly, clear we find (and plead for that) the amount of *present reference values*, a restoration of the pre-Socrate's philosophy, of the spirit of the Bible, of the principles for the nature of states' relationship established by Westphalia Peace Treaty, of the French Revolution human rights, of the Helsinki principles.

The aggravation of the crisis led to *two major warnings*: the need of refocusing on the importance of the economic subject, as a major factor in setting and directing the course of the economic cycle; proper relation of the economic outcome with the quality of the action of the actors who make a society functional in accordance with generally accepted values. Thus, the causality of crises of any kind is shifted from *punctual phenomena* (overproduction, low demand, premium-rates, the risk of an oversized financial economy as compared to the real economy, etc.) to *principle* (human behaviour). Also, all states of minds featuring the markets, as dynamic dimensions of economic interaction, were transferred by the economic crisis where needed, i.e. to the individual, and the "market feelings" finally became Man's feelings for what he made himself.

To what was the financial crisis finally reduced? To mistrust! Whose and among who? Only man is capable of this feeling, because only he can trust either in his fellow or in things surrounding him. There is no trust between things *per se*, just as the trust in institutions exists only through the people serving those institutions. Trust is the only anchor for a sound economy, as the economy itself is the expression of the most complex human relationships, not otherwise. Since Adam and Eve were driven away from Heaven, man's life has been ensured by his own action and economy – at the highest or most complex level we know it today – is and will be the sum of man's actions to lead a full spiritual and bodily life (Pop, Ioan-Franc, 2012).

While trying to identify the primary cause – deviation from and value abuse in human behaviour caused mistrust – one may notice that the final sense of all the

public policies for subduing the financial crisis implied the restoration of Man's trust in "markets", i.e. in *platforms* of his own relationships that make economy alive. This interpretation provides also the correct sense of the way of perceiving the austerity programmes as such and, especially, their toughness. An austerity programme could improve the macroeconomic indicators (reality proves that it is an unsustainable restoration), but never human trust completely. There can be much discussion on this case from a sociological viewpoint, but we should note that rectifying mistakes at the expense of the people cannot generate trust between people at different levels of economic decision-making. But, of course, it causes social unrest.

The extremely difficult acceptance – in progress – of the effects of the financial crisis (and of the other crises caused by that: economic, fiscal, banking, public debt, political and social) implied an approach to globalisation as a phenomenon. There is a wrong perception of its definition and evolutive stage, but what worries us is that an insidious tendency inside this process, which also comes from the past (especially from the recent past of the Great Moderation) determined high decision-makers, high clergy, professors, experts and analysts to talk about **the globalisation of inequality, alienation and pauperisation** and many other attributes that might be attached to this phenomenon.

All this elements found in the analysis, interpretation and opinions on the complexity of the financial crisis phenomenology as well as references to history have shifted the economic and metric-monetary approach to a global currency to a new socio-philosophical horizon. On this new horizon we understand that a global currency, i.e. money, as a means of exchange and amassing, should be created after the model of another global currency, able to reflect new human relationships that could hinder the tendency of some realities causing problems even to the most fierce supporters of purely commercial rate of return: inequity, social alienation, middle class shrinkage, totally unbalanced dispersion of wealth – the outcome of the toil of all people.

This new global currency means a return to the love for the fellow man in the Biblical sense, when the return to respect for people's dignity through public policies should prevail. This broad respect on the vertical and the horizontal of the society could become the foundation of a real trust among people (the most valuable global currency) able to face cyclical volatilities caused by human behaviour. In this respect, "worshipping" the market beyond what it is – a human creation – is false, and Adam Smith's divine hand seems to reach a solution in finding out that the ineffable in this case is Man himself. Divinity lies in Man, not in the market, and what should be worshiped (which is a given fact) is

everybody's caring about the fellow man, in accordance with the hierarchy set by our option for systems and values.

What worries us more is that public policies serve or imply less and less the plenitude of the human being, while the ultra-cultivated economic is mainly directed towards the materiality of life, i.e. the needs of the body. Publicity and commercial communication are focused on this side of the human duality. The sense and the qualification of the rate of return and of the economic performance are quantity and materiality. This eroded the spirit by ignoring man's needs in this respect and the unbalanced distribution in the life materiality is about to eliminate any trace of spirit. But the spirit is what stores and urges the individual to be moral. We should not forget that out of this mass of human beings, lacking spirit but materially rich, we are to select the people in charge of public policies and, further, to give sustenance to abuse and the deviation from values.

That is why we believe that the equation of the object of the economy should be raised to another level, if we are going to talk about the need to change the paradigm of our way of living.

By this new suggested approach, the simplification to which the economic thinking reduced, for understandable reasons, the equation of the present paradigm is only one side of the human spirit, we would say that one of selfishness generated by group interests within a hierarchy no matter how much we talk about neutrality, generality or uniform applicability of a rule. Economy is reduced to markets, which were conferred their own life by sublimating the human relationship complexity in a society to the relation between capital and labour, as mere parts of each side of the creative duality of man, aiming to manage rare resources in order to give sense to perfect competition.

We think we have learnt – during the last financial crisis – a happy (remembrance), tough (punishment) or guiding (solution finding) lesson (Pop et al., 2010) about what is the primary cause of a real or possible societal disaster of all times. The association of the deepest financial crisis with the deepest trust crisis (Barroso) directs us to observe deeply the human behaviour and to what determines it. The change in paradigm is in Man, not only in the change of his nature, but also at a new start line for the same values given to us at the cognitive level of our today's intelligence. Of course, this requires looking back at the past and sees other effects that become causes for losing one's way. The collective common sense recalls the lessons of the past but, unfortunately, this is a mere gentle breeze of an incomplete awakening.

Economy, being all-inclusive or, in other words, catching Man's intelligence (we now are talking about the economy of culture and economic culture, definitely

societal stages), is or should be human relationship for perfection. A change in paradigm required by the financial crisis, which we call now the Major Doubt (after the Great Moderation), is simple: the famous mix of economic public policies, declaratively dedicated to Man should balance the spiritual comfort and the material comfort, i.e. not to forget the primary cause of the material comfort – the creative human spirit – and reciprocal determinism between spiritual comfort and material comfort.

2. The devious way of approaching the theme

Currency was always linked to order, served and even changed it. In this respect, we tried to find the ingredients of a possible global currency, as money, in the worldly order, which is in a steady evolution.

Since money is an exchange means covering extended human needs and geographical economic areas, the financial systems extended along with the orders they served and became one of the most important dimensions of the global order. Money – *fiction with function* – is a symbol of trust among people, set in motion by extended recognition and acceptability. Money means more than what the economy object relates in the merchandise–money–merchandise equation. This handbook simplification could not surpass the problem of ethics and morality in the financial-monetary order, inspired by principles and values of the human spirit. In other words, trust in currency is based on respect for values promoted by human spirit, and its anchor is an ethic and moral human behaviour.

Money/currency was and is an important part of politics (Buchanan, Tullock, 1995, inspires and determines it in many circumstances, and, without money, politics *should produce it*, as credible as possible, to maintain the users' trust in the *fiction with function* (At the beginning of the book *The calculus of consent – Logical fundamentals of constitutional democracy*, James Buchanan and Gordon M. Tullock (the former is a Nobel Prize winner for economics in 1986) write: "If , there were no money in politics, then nobody would rush to stand as a candidate!" The book was translated into Romanian and published in 1995 by the Expert Publishing House of the "Costin C. Kirițescu" National Institute for Economic Research of the Romanian Academy). Free will of not producing money was replaced, just for this reason, with the monetary order (the last one was set at Bretton Woods, 1944) and an international financial system characterized by rules now undergoing globalisation.

Similarly, money/currency, in connection with politics and within an economy expanded by mondialisation and then globalisation, has given the geo-economic,

geopolitical and geostrategic (the three G's) dimensions of the international relations. The dynamics of the 3 G's revealed the consistency and importance of imbalances of any kind; their statistical recording is value-based, expressed in money. The primary cause of imbalances proved to be also an ethic and moral problem intrinsic to Man, but not mandatory, as we can see in their evolution. The fluid of ethics and morality or their carrier in the world proved to be the currency, even if the currency itself is part of a *convention* of the mankind. If by politics and policies we understand behaviours based on values, then the variability in financial ethics and morality (i.e. money handling) already shows a deviation from values, causing inequalities and seclusion, which worries us.

Now we speak about a crisis of trust among people organized in vertical and horizontal hierarchies, which affects not the trust in currency as a symbol, but in the human *determination* it includes, a sign of significant correlation between the source of trust and the deviation from values and the abuse in defining them. Here we synthesize an aspect by observing, in the present context of the Major Doubt, that individual vices have a chance to become public virtues.

The theme of a global currency could not ignore the question of a single currency, i.e. the euro governance and functioning, at least from two points of view. The first one concerning a *model* of global currency and the second concerning the *primary cause* of the malfunctioning of the euro (is it linked to human behaviour). Is the assumption that the euro is a political project and, consequently, the thesis of the Optimum Currency Area (OCA) proves twice not to be applicable correct?. The OCA is a theoretical reduction of empirical research which tries, in our opinion, to find a probability. According to economics understood in our way as a *sumum* of human behaviours in a certain relationship, OCA ignores the political reason due to which it cannot be predictable 100 percent, especially when the politics is involved.

The attempts to theorize in economics, being led only by known handbook rules valid for certain repeatable realities, show us that nothing is fully repeatable. We should note that what appears to be a repetition has always new features, which include cognitive breakthrough including the innovation to use it for the Good, but also for the Evil (the law of unintended consequences!). Unfortunately, the malfunctioning occurring along with a new breakthrough turned into innovation (see financial derivatives) is going to be treated by means of knowledge acquired before surpassing the cognitive threshold, when it is assumed that solutions should require a new breakthrough (so that innovation, which is subject to unintended consequences, should be used better).

What we are witnessing now – as regards some long-term effects, within which even the last, very acute, financial crisis, was a mere episode – should be also

approached through political economy (not only economics), which places human order at the centre as a set of behaviours and rules. Therefore, any purpose seems rational if it is the outcome of intelligence and principles, and not the outcome of a hazardous combination of phenomena. Then, what is intelligence good for?

The departure from the purpose of the broad Good and the idea, by which the single currency itself was introduced, besides the fact that the euro cannot be a model for the global currency, lead us to a more comprehensive understanding of the global currency within the present process of globalisation, beyond the monetary-mathematical formula of a circulating currency. In our opinion the OCA can be practically achieved only by convergence of some human behaviours meant to observe some empirically formulated rules (Mundell) as they prove not to be preserved in generational time (see the profound differences in vision between the founders of the European project, considered as persons or individuals – Monnet, Schuman and, closer to the euro, Werner, Delors – and those pretending to carry it on today), in accordance with the initial contract (*pacta sunt servanda*, as Etienne Davignon, former president of the European Commission, says). Similarly, the convergence required by the euro in a limited area of Europe cannot be globally expanded because we should include several human behaviours in a moving extended space.

Man has to help his fellow people, but the inequity caused by the best performing economic system shows that, in fact, things do not happen like that. Currency, besides its utilitarian role given by human trust encoded in a symbol, now measures the dimensions of inequity, and their order of magnitude, which worries us, is about to push us to the *quantitative threshold of irreversible destruction* of the global social peace.

The analysis of the concerning features of the euro crisis, of the way to deal with the vulnerability of the euro governance, of what central banks do and might do as recognized “parents” of any currency, shows what the *spirit of the global currency* should be before being a traditional circulating currency at a global level. The ineffable way we are used to when saying that currency in fiction, a myth embedding the trust among people, a revelation of a total existence, is now eroded not by inflation but by manipulation of the spirit, which must be stopped, although we perceive it as a manipulation of exchange rates, interests, prices, ratings, etc.

Euro, as a political project, is not yet completed because one of its technical requirements – the fiscal pillar – is the object of the highest volatility in human

behaviour (of executives), driven by interests that ignore the values matrix, which they exceed and, even worse, we are forced to consider “new values” as non-values. From the Ancient we know that we live always with the risk that vices become virtues. In this reality we find the real cause of the financial crisis, a strange combination of *collective innovation* with *individual vices*, which led us to questioning a financial order and, implicitly, the global one as well as the paradigm in which we live.

Therefore, we think that Rebecca Costa’s (2012) warning that we have reached a cognitive threshold to be surpassed is correct to the extent that from now on knowledge will be recombined with values and will be based on the primary cause. To keep values only in mind without applying them to the economic, political and social action is the very *difference* – in constant growth – between the economic policies, capable to satisfy the material need of worldly life (unfortunately, of less and less people) and the free manifestation and the *nourishing* of the spirit.

A key moment of the “empiric” approach to the global currency was the study and recall (also by other authors) of the worrying features of the euro crisis (Pop, Ioan-Franc, 2013).

We were surprised especially by the debate on the distinction between *de Eurozone crisis* and the *euro crisis*, both leading to the need of morality in EU governance, in the narrowest sense of observing the commitment. To talk about a deficit in democracy, the failure to consider the behaviour of the public and private sectors, the problem of corruption or the social trauma caused by austerity programmes, failing to suit the present times (so, we have come to the major problem of deflation!), etc. means to refer to aspects of morality, and what we had to learn from the so-called euro crisis was quite something else than the question of the *economic fundamentals* of a currency.

The euro crisis was not a crisis (only) of the economic fundamentals of the currency, which has just celebrated ten years of life, but an *existentiality crisis* of a currency that leads to a scale political project. We should remember the despair formulated in the phrase “Euro falls, the EU falls”, which turns us to the prediction made in 1949 by the French economist Jacques Rueff on Europe’s future: “*Europe (united – a.n.) will be if it has a currency or it will not be*”. The reformulation of Jacques Rueff’s idea I found in the speech delivered by Pierre Werner at the Romanian Academy, after a half century, in September 1994: “Europe will be built by means of a currency or it will not”. Of course, the existence of the euro is more profound in our opinion than the power of suggestion and

representation of the entity that issues it physically (ECB), which is dependent on the idea of monopoly provided by a multiple state will that partially, gave up a slice of national sovereignty.

Euro exists owing to a vigorous economy (Eurozone) as long as it is “populated” by the man of action. We understand by this “population” a human interaction including the manifestation of man’s needs and concerns about satisfying them. Therefore, people meet on platforms created by them and communicate by means of principles and rules. We do not know other needs than Man’s needs and the understanding, more and more obvious, that Nature (but what is it?) in which Man is placed would impose its own principles and rules. Economic indicators measure this interaction after all. In their content expressed in figures we can also identify the bases of the single currency. The lack of action motivation of a man geographically situated in the Eurozone (for example, low income, severe unemployment, lasting poverty, etc. that hinder him to consume, invest, risk, etc.) is equal to slow death of that area, including its single currency.

What remains where there is no trust? In our times, we find only central banks “pushed forward”, either by their legal commitments or by situations not produced by them (“irresponsible governments”, said Claude Trichet at the end of his mandate as ECB president).

The central banks took quick action after the start of the financial crisis and remained in the first line for long time, possibly contrary to their natural mandate, and apparently increasingly affected in their independence so hardly granted: Man’s freedom to correctly decide on the cost of money, which is a vehicle that by the power of its fictionness connects people by trust.

In this context, the central bank – crisis connection undergoes a triple approach to the trust coined by people in the currency myth: the geopolitical perspective of the central banks’ policy, *what they can do through their monetary policy*, what their institutional *future* could be.

Richard Taverner (1505-1575, apud Pop, *loan-Franc*, 2013, pag. 219) said that the results of the modernisation of a society are determined by the history of institutions embedding wisdom that we can trust. Central Banks, following the Bank of England, has become the guarantor of the state of law (itself represented by a multitude of interconnected institutions) as regards the trust to be invested in the value of a national currency.

But what shall we do to trust a global currency, when many opinions lead us to a globalisation of inequity and, implicitly, indifference? How can trust be equally

distributed between inequity and indifference? Are such perceptions of globalisation devastating for Man? Don't we join two contrary notions when we say it is a globalisation of solitude or isolation?

These questions determined us to go further to another approach to the global currency, i.e. a transcendental vision, we would say, between spirituality and materiality of life *served* by money. There is much talk (and we insisted to be aware of that) about the division between these two states of the human being, considered as a whole, because the choice made through policies implied too much the materiality of finite life along with a continuous deterioration – some say, to an irreversible point – of spirituality transcending the life of the physical body, the infinite source of all values created by mankind gathered in what we call civilisation. While in globalisation we saw an easier and all-inclusive progress of human civilisation, through its lines of force of *primary cause* type – intrinsic values of human reason given by the Creator as initial legacy – then Omraam Mikhaël Aïvanhov (2011) is right to say that “*we may talk about a true civilisation only when the exchange currency among people will be love*”.

We are always reminded that the protagonists of the economic reality are people “*with an inborn ability to conceive and propose new objectives constantly*” (Jésus Huerta de Soto, 2011), therefore worldly life has a purpose since the spirit organizes the world (Anaxagoras). It is recognized, in many realities, that the spirit has gone wrong or the purpose has been changed. The two assumptions lead us to the question of human verticality and the causes of its “curving” to excessive materiality, while the conventional quantitative method for measuring the spirit and creativeness (e.g. the GDP) has become the benchmark of the latter. Therefore, we should not be surprised by the increasing number of “victims” of low financial morality (corruption, manipulation), as a proof of the structural modification of man's character, which Divinity dislikes. Even Mihai Eminescu said that “*the toil of a man can be paid, but his character, his culture, never*”, if we are to talk about what we measure by the GDP indicator.

We need to *improve man's way of thinking*, making the spirit consistent with the primary reason, destroyed by an excessively material purpose and man's performance recognized almost exclusively by the money earned, spent, owed, saved, invested, issued, etc. The prevalence of profit made the economic precepts, i.e. successful management of rare resources, be mainly quantitative, material but along with a hesitating use of *productivity factors*, an economic euphemism that vaguely recognizes the role of the spirit in economy. This formulation tries to combine intuition, creativeness, innovation, passion, dedication, solicitude, etc. – features specific to the human being, by which

nevertheless, the capital is made. People have resorted too much to the belief in money and credit, because the ethic of today's society, based on what we call a balance sheet, in its broadest sense, is modelled by the money flowing in or out.

Therefore, the sense of change is to stop producing disorder and ugliness, which are **residues** of man's action not totally dedicated to Order and Beauty, which is, giving up the idea that two pairs co-exist as in dialectics of contraries.

We should also think of the semantic origin of the word "currency". Currency comes from the word "curraunt" (Middle English), taken through Old French, from the Latin word "currens", which means movement, circulation. A supposition that currency sets us in motion, serves better even the idea for the need to return to the primary paradigm, as any movement is synonymous to change.

Maybe, in the myth or legend of currency, which embraces the highest fiction and rules over our good or bad life, we find encoded the very reason of change toward the better, which is our nature.

Of course, we have to overcome many obstacles before we could touch a real global currency, when starting with a modest transcendental treatment of it. Something should stimulate us to go on to *something* about which Napoleon Bonaparte said: "*Any obstacle contains the joy of the man who will overcome it.*"

3. Facing realities and constraints over time

Trying an approach repositioning us, we think the convergence initiated along with globalisation – not institutionalized by treaties – has a special and broader character and a socio-philosophical significance, somewhat different in nature from the nominal and real criteria of convergence required by the single currency (euro). "Getting stuck" with belief and volatility in limited multicultural spaces, supposedly manageable by common will of the member states seems to be surpassed by practice. We do not think that by globalisation we should come to a global state/village, with a fiscal-budgetary policy of the nature of a global fiscal union. It should be a much higher ideal, a return to the beginning of times.

Generalizing the democracy values at a global level, probably a process in progress for much longer time should come down from the state policies to relationships among people, although even on such relationship we have doubts that they are on the proper way, when globalisation connotes inequity and indifference.

We insist on this *level lowering* for two reasons. First, globalisation, as we see it evolving, leads or should lead to planetary order of individuals, not only an international order of states.

The second reason for the above *lowering* is the fact that individuals can preserve or manipulate a set of values as ultimately they give life to institutions of the state of law, and not the institutions as such, which we usually consider as guarantors. Institutions have always shown signs of *being defeated* under the will of individuals who ignore the real significance of values, in general and the needed behavioural direction in accordance with such values, in special.

The financial crisis revealed, by its causes and effects – first on an economic plane and then on a societal plane – that what we want to solve is not the occurrence of a new prime rate, but the prevention and correction of a deviation that became a “drift” in man’s behaviour, morality, ethic, discipline, etc. Thus, the currency – as we understand it at present – has become a means to legitimate the above deviation, a more profound cause of the loss in the most important asset of mankind, trust.

At present, the aspects of trust are economically related to moral hazard, information asymmetry, herd behaviour, ecstasy, euphoria, precaution, agony, aversion and attractiveness, a broad terminology, meant to demonstrate that anything else – let’s say, of second ranking order or the second level of the primary cause – is the foundation of trust, and not the correctness of the direct interaction among people. In other words, any other representations (political stability, central bank independence, interest rate, exchange rate, level of consumption and investment, internal and external deficits, etc.) could go beyond the direct interaction among people. Do we really want that inert things – regulation texts, statistical methodologies, indicators, indexes etc. – be the source of trust, if they do not reflect or include the primary source of people’s trust?

To avoid from the very beginning the question “how could one objectively look at reality?”, we answer that objectivity is not ours, we do not create it, but it is our steady plead to look at it by means of the values and principles that define morality as a rule of the world. Nothing has changed in the morality discussed by ancient philosophers (Plato, Aristotle) and in the way it was described in the Book of Books. What has changed in the historical cycles that have defined the succession of planetary orders has always been human behaviour, exposed to various traps, starting with the forbidden fruit in Heaven and ending with the illusion of low or alarmingly negative interest rates that now cause us a lot of trouble.

The evolution of human behaviour can be interpreted also cyclically, as a pulsation of dominance of one side – spirit and body – of the human species over the other, initially in balance.

The pulsation disequilibrium in our time seems to absolutely favour quantitative materiality, which reveals a *sunset without a sunrise* of spiritual life, lasting inability to show a real care for fellow people, in the broadest sense of biblical love. What does it practically mean? Inability to *cooperate* through public policies, both for their formulation, and for enforcement and addressing among individuals!

We said a real care for fellow people, since we are increasingly confronted with its falsity in the political message and, therefore, with indefinite prolongation of meeting expectations by which some fellow people are legitimized by others. In fact, the lack of cooperation worsens/deepens what confronts us as individuals, departures us from one another, either on the scale of ranks concerning some responsibilities of giving or receiving or on the skyline of our living together, in the creative quietness we need so much.

One of the present actions is the steady appeal for cooperation, in speeches, declarations and public documents, which shows an approach to the thesis we are pleading for. Étienne Davignon, our contemporary but also a contemporary of the founders of United Europe, himself a prestigious contributor to this project, was a steady supporter of the philosophical principle of the stoic Epictetus: "*Nobody can progress while wandering among contrary things*". This principle guides us in making the correct choice of eliminating as many contraries among fellow people as possible, by preaching the benefit of mutual understanding. Therefore, the effectiveness of global cooperation means now an increasing common denominator of re-recognized elements of the uniqueness of mankind as a whole or among individuals. The cooperation built between two European countries after World War II – France and Germany – put an end to an irreconcilable aversion between the people of the two countries, now recognized as engines of the European development.

We have also to admit the power of education in modelling the society with Man at its centre and we hope this will not become a mere slogan. Therefore, we think we need to stop the erosion of human capital on the side storing the fundamental values and principles, since it is the only one having the unique advantage of creativeness. Why? Because the moral life of our body cannot be separated from spirit without the consequences we see (that troubles us!), of which we complain (to whom?) and its management (by whom?) wastes our resources (which ones?).

Since almost exclusive attention is paid to materiality in worldly life (anyhow, dull without the nerve of spirituality), it seems that "material wealth has no longer a relative and transitory value, it does no longer serve higher purposes of life, but it

has become a purpose itself" (Oswald Spengler and Petre Andrei, apud Buluță, 2013) with harmful effects on mankind. Man's improvement lags behind improvement of things, and the conflict between ideals, aspirations and philosophical concepts of the individual as creator of values and the products created by him is worsening to the point where the former – the most important ones for making progress – become the object of some appreciations and rules inferior to the latter.

Our endeavour for a global currency is stimulated by the reality of the time, defined as a societal crisis of its moral evolution. We hope that unless things remain as before, as economists say, it does not mean that our healing is confined only to the recovery of the shattered spirit of the present, since we produced the crisis by this thick spirit. That is, the crisis of the modern western world is "*a consequence of the modern western mentality to reduce everything to quantity, to build a world without God by neglecting the superhuman... it reflects the notion of pure quantity*" (René Guénon apud Buluță, 2013).

Reality – either as illusion or as illusive persistence – confronts us, especially the economists, with grave things, as well. Should we believe that elimination of poverty – a picture of human decay – has as a state solution mere satisfaction of needs intrinsic to the material side of the nature of the man in need? Of course, we cannot stop here when we pretend that we respect Man!

4. Realities and constraints as well

This is about overcoming some distortions related to the fact that development does not equally benefit people in real time, and this is statistically proved with regard to the wealth that has become the prevailing ultimate economic purpose. No wonder that all religions, from the financial "religion" of the IMF to catholic and orthodox denominations, worry us by elaborate messages on inequality; the rich become richer, the poor become poorer.

These are warnings that can reveal an unpleasant fact that we approach a threshold where, perhaps, there is no return, but certainly we risk having a "limp" human population, some living exclusively in materiality and some excessively escaping in spirit, until even the last hope dies and they prematurely disappear physically.

Inequality measured by wealth dispersion – as wealth is measured by currency – shows that even the access to currency will be unequal as regard its relevance to worldly life. Currency is not an element of modernity, as it was mentioned in the Old Testament. Modernity, by its economic model, changed the sense of the

currency, at least by the disproportion between real economy and financial economy.

The financial economy used excessively the currency, thus distorting heavily the sense of the rate of return of the economic model, itself exclusively directed towards profit, which worsens inequality. Inequality raised questions regarding the capacity of economics to explain and prevent such an answer to the societal development in relation to its subject, Man. For the first time in several decades, important economic publications (*The Economist*, *The Financial Times*, etc.) hosted debates on the problems of fundamental economic research, as well as related methods and tools.

There were several radical viewpoints, pointing out the fact that, in matter of *knowledge of knowledge*, we should return to the times before Aristotle, who ordered our today's knowledge. Even if these viewpoints have not yet produced the expected echo, the fact that such debates take place means recognition of the limits of mainstream economics. That is why, by focusing the theme on another perspective on currency that of a transcendental approach as well.

Looking transcendently at a global currency we took rather a philosophical way than an economic one, although we are concerned about the intersection with each other, but also with other realities and constraints. We believe that the global currency should first be considered a new relationship of people by a broader and different way of communication than that one in our days, and broader than that offered by currency as a means of exchange. Perhaps, what a global currency should preserve is the ineffable, which makes it recognizable to all of us, attractive and useful. The myth and the legend of a global currency should restore people's trust based on common societal values of mankind as they have been left by Divine Order, and a new *global monetary standard* should be only the material expression of a new symbol of global-type governance.

Of course, for many the preoccupations more successful in defining a global currency – some already mentioned – are those following the technical model of issue and management of a currency or monetary standard, enjoying a higher recognition, as an investment in trust. The difference, manifest for a few decades, is that the attitudes of rejection of the traditional money standards occur quite often, being caused by the level of trust, which is increasingly influenced under objectively economic factors (traditional tools of economic analysis) or subjectively "ideological" ones (geopolitical and geostrategic opinions), strongly echoed by leaders, especially in times of tension. In this respect, communication is increasingly important, but constraints remain.

The fluid way to the human community by communication is conditioned by several factors, some determining or delaying the hope of many people that things are firmly directed, although this way has reached a higher degree of freedom than required. Even this chosen freedom implies the constraint to allow for deviations from the chosen direction, which takes time and energy, all measured by cost.

5. Some concluding remarks

The constraints of time and times could not depart us from the realism of a global currency in our terms, but to see how society is wrong even before initiating a major political project which (also) implies a global currency. This project deals first with the need to close ranks so that the phenomena which are destructive due to the size of their variability should be led a normal path, in accordance with what we call fundamentals (aren't values part of the same fundamentals family?). What is a normal path in our times is hard to define, but we still know and believe in the *primary principles* of all times, of course if we first reconsider the real spirit which should govern the mankind.

Due to realities we see that the globalisation is, maybe, in an early stage, so we still witness a sequence of changes, which cannot be deprived of a finality inspired by the word "globalisation". In our opinion, a finality we want to reach by globalisation is probably a phenomenon which either gathers us *around something*, now destroyed, or *we shall never exist*, paraphrasing similar opinions (Saint-Exupéry). The finality we refer to is not ours, and we only want to relate it to our work, i.e. *global currency, which could become the focus of a wiser human action in the future*. We need a new valuable element to unite us and, only then, a real circulating currency connecting all of us.

We saw several times that globalisation has drawn our attention – not only today and not only on the need to heal ourselves, but through channels of contamination opened by the increasing interdependence among states and individuals – on the risk of self-destruction. We should be aware of it and stop it.

Globalisation – as we try to discuss and understand it now – started in the context of distortion of values, even if the intention was to generalize a model based on western values shared by as many people as possible, beginning with the state and further formation of individuals. The question is whether a model, from a certain evolutionary stage, generates in fact a globalisation other than that of the proximities in the cause-effect relations in our times.

Thomas Piketty (2013), an influent French economist, brings up for academic discussion in the USA and the EU **the globalisation of inequality**, the cause of it being “*the fundamental law of capitalism*”. Leaving aside a possible suspicion of ideological preference and the influence of the political area where the author conducted the research, we are not surprised by the new extremes. On one hand, a doubtful law with an inexorable effect on the social (Piketty), according to the economic paradigm we are used to live with, and, on the other hand, an interpretation near the truth regarding the evolution of the state-market relation (Murray Rothbart), in which we see the sense of regulation, focused on the protection of the capital, but in the spirit of the same law of capitalism. Whether they are right or not in formulating their theories are less significant when compared to statistical evidence and the “live” perception of economic inequality and social repercussion which, for now, they accompany the dark side of globalisation.

The fundamental question is how we can keep inside the model – now the most performing one with regard to resource allocation – both the worldly values given by the pure spirit to us and the value of the most synthetical human relationship, moral or material (*the new economy*), represented by a currency. Could we depart from the utility of currency beyond what is moral for most of our fellow people or is it moral not to care of this majority?

But not only in the area of politics and policies there is an advance to opacity, but also in the policy of the central banks, even in the middle of the strongest trend of transparency. Here, we have a translucent transparency of *frosted glass*, as the opacity of the central banks comes from differentiated monetary policy approaches in conditions of prospective guidance, but which cannot be globally assembled. Such divergence in the context of accepting globalisation, specialists say, is about to prejudice global stability. It is worth mentioning at least the effect of the disengagement of the FED’s quantitative relaxation policy which stimulated speculative capital movement. They delocated development resources and made exchange rates volatile, due to the volatility of capital inflows.

Now we are again confronted with the situation when the sovereign/state need more money than usually, which is about to distort even the monetary mathematics that must back the trust in currency. Michael Spence (2012), a Nobel Prize winner for economics (2001), besides George A. Akerlof and Joseph E. Stiglitz, called this divergence *non-cooperative co-operative game*, i.e. another way to express the departure from the cooperation needed by globalisation evolving in its positive natural direction.

If we consider globalisation as a societal reform towards the uniqueness of a government model that is the best one which mankind has experienced so far, it results that globalisation still has a long way ahead, on one hand, to share the same values (we witness serious shortcoming, see the case of Ukraine) and, on the other hand, to complete globalisation, to re-balance in a robust way *four not three factors* (Franz Fischler, 2013), i.e. economy, environment, social responsibility and *quality of life*. The last factor is mainly related to inequality, considered by all who see the wrong way of globalisation as regards the **Man and his fate**.

In this way, we also had to deal with the global currency, considered, first, a major political project to improve globalisation, and, second, a tool of human relationship through economic action, which should be governed by morality, making room for the human spirit inclined *by nature* to respect a fellow man.

What we should learn from the euro experience is **enlightenment** for a global currency from several points of view: (i) euro was created by the human spirit for the clear purpose to keep together only several countries for now for historical reasons, which can be now extended to the whole world; and (2) euro was designed on the basis of a **strong political will**. So, we should note how much *the human spirit embedded in a currency* counts for benefiting the worldly life. In other words, the euro intended but did not succeed for worldly reasons **to support economic performance, serving at the same time the spirit-body duality**, because such performance in the name of biblical love could be the *supporting foundation* of the global currency in a mathematical-monetary sense for a more balanced future of this world.

Currency is the easiest means of exchange when we talk about the living necessities, but no treatise on currency asserts that people should be treated by their *value* in money. J. F. Kennedy was talented enough to inspire us over time with the intrinsic significance of a possible global currency: *“Let us dedicate ourselves to what the Greeks wrote so many years ago: to tame the savageness of man and make gentle the life of this world”*.

References

- Aivanhov, Omraam Mikhaël – 2011, *Gânduri pentru fiecare zi*, Editura Prosveta.
- Bagdasar, N.; Bogdan, V.; Narly, C. – 1995, *Antologie filosofică*, Universal Dalsi Publishing House.
- Buluță, Gheorghe - 2013, *Criza lumii moderne*, în volumul *Guénon, criza și domnia cantității*, coord. Ahile Z. Verescu, Editura Civitas, București.
- Costa, Rebecca – 2012, *Ultimul avertisment, a venit timpul să ne gândim la pericolul dispariției*, Editura Trei, București.

- Fischler, Franz – 2013, *România trebuie să elaboreze un program de dezvoltare rurală care să facă față provocărilor*, interviu în Recolta.eu.
- Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas – 2009, *Unele elemente de orientare în știința economică, în Epistemologia roegeniană*, Book I, Collection NBR, translation Gh. Dolgu, vol. 13/VII*, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Isărescu, Mugur C. – 2009, *Contribuții teoretice și practice în domeniul politicilor monetare și bancare*, Romanian Academy Publishing House, București.
- Kirițescu, Costin C., 1996 – *Un secol de frământări monetare*, Library Collection NBR, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, București.
- Piketty, Thomas - 2013, *Capital in the Twenty-first Century*, Editions du Seuil.
- Pop, Napoleon – 2008, *Virtuți ale politicii monetare*, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Pop, Napoleon – 2011, *Decizia de politică monetară*, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Pop, Napoleon; Ioan-Franc, Valeriu – 2012-2014, *Towards a global currency – Preliminary (I); Way possible (II); Realities and constraints (III)*, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Pop, Napoleon, Ioan-Franc, Valeriu – 2012, *Credință și economie*, Expert Publishing House, București, second edition, with a foreword by George Radu Serafim.
- Pop, Napoleon, Fugaru, Amalia, Ioan-Franc Valeriu – 2010, *Despre criză cu discernământ și fără mânie*, Premiul "Victor Slăvescu" al Academiei Române, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Pop, Napoleon, Ioan-Franc Valeriu – 2012, *Spre o monedă globală (I) – Preliminarii; Spre o monedă globală (II) – Calea posibilă; Spre o monedă globală (III) – Realități și constrângeri*, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Pop, Napoleon – 2008, *Virtuți ale politicii monetare*, Expert Publishing House, București.
- Rothbard, Murray N. – 1982, *The Ethics of Liberty*, Humanities Press
- Soto, Jesus Huerta de, 2011 – *Eseuri de politică economică*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași.
- Spence, Michael – 2012, *The Next Convergence: The Future of Economic Growth in a Multispeed World*, Picador.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. – 2010, *În cădere liberă. America, piața liberă și prăbușirea economiei mondiale*, Publica Publishing House, București.