

SOLIDARISM IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL ECONOMIES

Abstract

The article looks at the methodological problems that allow analyzing regularities of building relations within one state and in the global landscape. The author focuses on the description of two global paradigms - the liberal and the communitarian (solidarism) ones. The author also points out that, as applied to human community, the proposed methodological approach enables to assess the economic and social efficiency as well as the efficiency of international cooperation from a liberal and/ or communitarian perspective.

Key-words: globalization paradigm, communitarianism, solidarism, individualism, liberalism, economic efficiency, social efficiency, economic nationalism;

Despite the fulfillment of all the requirements of globalization, the unification and institutional adaptation of national spaces to the environment often unusual to them, today's world does not become more homogeneous, and the relations between countries more harmonious. On the contrary, globalization, as if assuming equalization of the capabilities of the countries and the parity of the relations, provokes a gap widening in the levels of social and economic development. Naturally, there arises a question about the shortcomings of the globalization paradigm, the miscalculations of theorists and ideologists predicting its success.

Meanwhile, like any other category, the globalization paradigm can be analyzed in two directions, positive and negative ones, and corrected in the right direction. It is only necessary to clearly identify the problematic, pressure points of the modern the planetary society globalization and the collective will concept.

From our point of view, globalization problems should be explained both by means of the methodology of individualism and solidarism (communitarianism). The latter, rejected for ideological reasons, as such, gives rise to many questions to the modern globalization paradigm. For example, is the current mono-deterministic process fair if viewed in the context of widening the gap between poor and rich countries? Is the current concept of globalization, imposed by the dominant countries of the world, ignoring the positions of the outsider countries, is true (and what is the actual the goal)? And whether sooner or later the question about the need to formulate radically new „mainstream” arise both because of the obvious bankruptcy of the previous one and because of the swinging of pendulum of another „idea of justice” which is fraught with world-scale wars and conflicts and what, in fact, we are already observing today.

Without denying the legitimacy of the critical attitude to the solidarism approach as a methodological basis for assessing contemporary global and national socioeconomic processes

the attention should be paid to the fact that it was turned into an ideology (and always turns) precisely due to its emphatically hypertrophied communitarian nature. Meanwhile, this approach like every other one has not only drawbacks, but also the advantages because, firstly, it is successful with the successes of the global and national society development, with its movement from individualism to solidarism as a higher and better stage. Secondly, the management of a solitary global society is entrusted to supranational governments and not to the dominant states and their enclaves. They are assigned the equal position along with other countries, including the outsiders. Thirdly, the communitarian stage of development provides for the priority of the common interests of the society in relation to individualistic ones (including both at the national level and in the international relations).

Individualism and communitarianism regarded as antipodes are an unpromising way of scientific analysis. The recognition of their complementarily and mutual enrichment is a modern times requirement. The relevance of this statement is of continued importance and in the present conditions, when all dimensions of globalization, cultural, economic, social, and environmental and others, are in a critical state, and needs more focused scientific attention in order to develop optimal forms of the international cooperation in a global context.

Nevertheless, despite the seemingly obvious need for a unifying globalization paradigm, individualism remains its conceptual basis. It really is a more natural and effective development force and a force that allows the strongest survive and the weakest gradually die. It denies the subjective interference, the corrective and regulatory actions and, respectively, the need for active control centers, since it does not require the coordination of interests of strong and weak participants both within the states and globally. It denies the need for state intervention in the course of socioeconomic development, so that it does not interfere with the objective, spontaneous forces of self-regulation.

Naturally, its consequences which at all levels are the result of free competition are predictable and, first of all, consist of the widening the gap between the strong and the weak, the population strata, countries, regions, etc. Monopolization which is always a direct consequence of competition in the global dimension transforms into a monopolization of global space by the leading countries that subordinate the planet's resource potential and hiding behind the slogans of individualism do not consider it necessary to share their achievements with the peripheral countries.

The global problems of modern times, as aptly notes the Norwegian economist, the member of the Norwegian Institute for Strategic Studies, E. Reinert, in his book „How Rich Countries Got Rich ... and Why Poor Countries Stay Poor”[1], owe their non-resolution to the free game of individualistic forces, because the individualism provides for the priority of the private interests over the common ones and rejects the very concept of social, including global, justice and

solidarism. Solidarism to a certain extent limits the effectiveness assuming the position of the production facilities performance. But the concept of community effectiveness differs from the concept of production efficiency. The effectiveness of the global interaction, the interaction within the country of regional associations is measured by the level of solidarism maturity.

Today it can be confidently asserted that individualism destroys the national and global societies which are based on the priority of common interests regarding the individual interests. The understanding and recognition of this circumstance has long ago been reflected both in philosophy and economic theory and not once has been put into practice. In particular, even Plato who substantiated the idea of arranging an „ideal” or „just” state (360 BC) noted that such a state should be concerned with the interests of the society as a whole and not be an introducer of interests of those who is not able to protect them on its own, that the private interests break the basis of its sovereignty and stability. „Politics” by Aristotle (335-322 BC), a treatise in which the foundations of social and political philosophy, political science and management theory are described contains a number of considerations regarding the destructive power of individualism and the unifying force of solidarism. Communitarianism which is based on solidarism is the way to justice and seeking such justice, the implementation of this most important principle of the coexistence of individuals unites them in societies. These theses find their development in the famous works of T. More (Utopia, 1516) and T. Campanella (The City of the Sun, 1602) where it is proved that an ideal state created under the principles of justice provides a stable and progressive development of the society. The unifying basis for such a development is the common (communitarian) interest. And if in the given works there is no place for individualism in the studies of their followers who also profess the idea of the uniting power of communitarianism (solidarism) it is given a subordinate, derivative place. In particular, in the works of the camera list A. Serra, J. Mill, F. List, A. Hamilton, F. Perroux and others who believed that individualism plays a stimulating but destabilizing role in the development of the society, while communitarianism stands as the factor of its foundation and, under certain conditions, is destined to become a mobilizing principle, a force of development subordinating individualism. This is another school in economic theory about which it is preferred to keep silent because it contradicts the modern paradigm of globalization.

The modern concept of globalization declaring the goal of creating a unitary, just world space is actually centered on a different interpretation of global communitarianism (solidarism) and justice. Communitarianism attributed with a basic unifying function at the level of transnational corporations and the practice (it should be emphasized) of using the fundamental principles by the leading countries (the „globalizers”) is excused. Individualism is reckoned as a paradigm base for development and inclusion of other countries, especially peripheral ones in the global processes. The latest global economic crisis demonstrated the validity of such a statement, as the

leading countries for the sake of its overcoming focused on internal problems strengthening the communitarian component of the socioeconomic development inside and transferring the principles of individualism outside, to the level of relations between countries. This has had a more negative impact on global balance. And the attempts to solve the internal problems by turning the weak countries to the dependence using their potential strengthen this effect.

The violation of the global economic and social balance which becomes expressive in the late 1950s of the last century, the growing gap in the levels of the countries development directly derives from the implementation of the neoliberal concept of modernization based on individualistic principles of unification imposed to the post-war world by the leading countries, in particular the USA. As early as in the late 1960s – early 1970s, the consequences of such modernization became obvious: yet another repartition of the world into zones of influence, the strengthening of monopoly pressure and the domination of certain countries in peripheral regions, monopolization of raw material markets and monopoly pricing policy. Under the slogan of the world integration the world economy quickly polarized, the „poles of development” and serving economies have formed. Consequently, an asymmetric world structure of production, demand and consumption has formed, and, certainly, the world’s poles of extreme poverty and extreme wealth have emerged.

In the late 1960s, after the actual completion of the decolonization process, an imbalance in redistribution of the world resources appeared in the world dimension. If during the colonial times their reserves were under the control of a small number of metropolitan countries, then the growth in the number of countries freed from the colonial dependence that became the disposers of national raw materials led to the de-monopolization of resources allocation, the randomness in the redeployment and pricing (the so-called advantages of self-regulation in the context of the variety of supply and an increase in the number of market participants). Thesis what caused the succession of global resource, and, therefore, financial and economic crises. It became obvious that monopolization, as a form of communitarianism manifestation (in this case in this sphere) was the guarantee of order, controllability of the redeployment of resources and pricing for them. The issue of coordinating actions in the sphere of resource provision of the economies on a world scale arose in the agenda. Obviously, that is why in the 1970s. The Club of Rome for the first time initiates the research on the global problems of human development, a destructive shift in global balance, primarily in the use of natural resources. In the final report of The Club of Rome on the results of the research represented in the book „The Limits to Growth” its author D. Meadows summarized the results of this research and made a number of conclusions about the subjective nature of global instability factors. Yet all of them, despite the concern was about the problems of redistribution of resources, were explained by “the inefficient arrangement of state eco-politics” [2]. This report did not reflect other aspects, in

particular, the issue of the underlying causes for the devastation of such policies, the principles of the organization of human economic activity within the ecological possibilities of the biosphere was not covered, apparently due to the domination of the individualistic (or, as it was declared, anthropocentric) vision of global development. Taking the interests of the „economic person” as the main value as a basis the authors, meanwhile, put the common global goals at the centre of the research. They were forced to consider the „interests of the biosphere”, the nature, as the main common global value, because it was obvious that abstracting from communitarian interests does not allow and will not allow to solve the main problem of mankind in the future – ensuring sustainable, stable global development. The contradiction was that the direct recognition of the global interest’s priority would mean abandoning individualism, the idea of the “economic person” as the conceptual basis of globalization.

But in the resolution of the set tasks solidarism had to play an important role: the states, especially those with developed, highly competitive economies, were recommended to cooperate with the peripheral countries with the aim of increasing the national capacities for sustainable development on the basis of scientific and technological exchange and transfer of technologies, including the innovative ones. Such cooperation was to raise the national economies to a new level of development and ensure their mutual complementarily, integration capacity, socioeconomic interaction and compatibility which would positively influence the structure of the world production and optimize the structure of world demand.

Regarding the structure of the world demand: we should focus not only on its direct connection with the rational consumption of the world resources, but also, in the classical sense, on its stimulating role regarding the quality and directions of the world investment resources redeployment. The demand determines the level and is determined by the level of production. Therefore, firstly, the peripheral countries cannot always be consumers of the high-tech products due to its incompatibility; for instance, with the existing national infrastructure (e.g. the absence of the electrical grids does not allow the use of electrical industry products). And, secondly, they cannot be a source of investments, since the low level of economic structure development of such countries cannot ensure the high investment reciprocity of proceeds from the resources sale and the way to the investment in the developed economies is blocked due to the communitarian (only in relation to themselves) nature of the economic policy of the leading countries’ governments.

Solidarism in the national economic policies of the dominant countries resides in the protection of the national economic spaces from any misbalancing, spontaneous impacts on the structure of national economies, especially investment ones. It is implemented through the high level of targeting and indicative planning by strengthening the role of state property, and, in this context, leave no space for the prevalence of individual interests over nation-wide ones.

Agenda 21 approved by the UN International Conference in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 actually confirmed that the world community has realized the need to introduce a category of economic and social justice in international relations. The ways to overcome the problems that in global dimension required the communitarian approach to their solution were proposed [7]. And, most importantly, it was recognized that ensuring the sustainable development requires improving the quality of life of the entire population of the planet and for this purpose it is necessary to jointly take certain measures to adjust the directions and boundaries of economic growth in each of the regions of the world, since the modern interconnected nature of the world economic systems can allow stimulating the long-term economic growth in the peripheral countries in the mean time not allowing a development gap of dominant economies. On the contrary, with certain changes in the structure of the world demand caused by the agreed, coordinated actions the letters provide themselves with stable and solvent markets and consequently stimulate the development of the supply economy in the leading countries.

Social development in the document was associated with the uniformity of dynamics and the location of production, provision of jobs, food, education development, health care, social services, etc. Moreover, there was no need for preferences or special attention to the social and economic problems of the peripheral countries (in relation to the leaders). For the globalization processes on the basis of the communitarianism paradigm planned and solidarity approaches to the location of production are enough. With regard to social needs, meeting these needs the international community had to guarantee social diversity, respect for the rich cultural heritage and ensure the observance of civil rights and not to go beyond the limits of cultural traditions and national mentality in transformational activities, and guarantee the participation of the national communities in deciding on the country's future. Global communitarianism could have included all this.

Therefore, the following comment was added to the sustainable development strategy: „A sustainable and long-term development is not an invariable state of harmony, but rather a process of change in which the scale of resources exploitation, the direction of the capital investments, the orientation of technological development and institutional changes are consistent with the current and future needs”[8]. It would be logical to propose the coordination of such a process from the centre, but this function was entrusted to the UN which did not have effective leverage on disinterested, namely, competitive countries. Thus, the community component of the global development scenario could not be implemented. The world community could not create a global consolidated system based on the dominance of a collectivist management organization, the most effective form that would ensure its functioning. Considering that the organizational culture in which the preference is given to the common interests, but the interests of subordinate subjects become the goal is inherently inherent to such

systems this system is responsible for the development of regions, countries, various social groups, including the individual interests of the private industries. Such a global consolidated system is usually characterized by hierarchy and the existence of common, collective forms of ownership since the property is the pivotal point of managerial influence and the contusive filling of economic interest. The function of self-regulation under such a system is weakened, In contrast to this; the collectivist mechanisms of social mobilization are strengthened. The main ethical value of this archetype is social justice, and the basic principle is communitarianism.

From the point of view of the global community, the creation of such a system is a real revolution the conduct of which, first of all, touches the structure of the economic and social systems inside the country. And if traditionally hierarchically constructed national systems belonging to the Eastern civilization worlds are structurally are structurally ready to become a part of such an architecture the Western ones that occupy dominant positions in the global hierarchy and strengthen them due to the level of competitiveness already existing are “fuelled” by using the potential of the periphery and resist. Being able to alleviate the acuteness of the poverty problem, help the developing countries to overcome the consequences of the globalization individualistic scenario (by expanding the scope of activities on strengthening the capacity and transferring the financial resources and clean technologies helping to form appropriate consumption and production patterns, etc.) these countries deepen the contradictions of globalization and become their hostages themselves.

Among the main problems faced by the leading countries is the structural and technological problem as naturally-determined consequence of the transition of the most developed countries to the post-industrial phase of economic development. International competitiveness which today directly depends on the availability of high technologies creates a mobilizing and blocking dominance effects. Technological advantages (especially the monopoly ones) prevent the emergence of new competitor countries in the world markets and the incompatibility of the technological structures of the dominant and peripheral countries, as already noted, leads to a gradual narrowing of the market for consumption of high-tech products.

In addition, for example, the USA invest over a third of total investments in the information sphere only which is about 7% of GDP (the same situation is in the other developed countries). However, such a high-tech model of a competitive advantage has its own negative consequences. The additional income is invested mainly in the same industry in which it was obtained which leads to a structural imbalance of the national economy, the development of one sort of industries at the expense of others. The stability of surplus profits leads to attempts of the state to redistribute the funds through taxes for public interest, while in order to enhance the competitive advantages the funds must be invested in the further development of technologies, but on the other hand, the relatively mild taxation of the large corporations is socially

unacceptable. Specialization in the production of commodities in the production of which there is a tangible technological superiority makes the economy more vulnerable in the event of a change in the structure of demand for the commodities or a decrease in the demand for products of key industries. The competitive high-tech industries provide a high level of income and low employment in the country, as a result of the outflow of medium-technology production and medium sized businesses from the country takes place, the employment problem aggravates. With each workplace in the industry transferred by the companies to other countries 1.7 workplaces in education sphere disappear. In addition, more and more workplaces in research and development, services and management sphere disappear from the labor market.

The resource and energy problem of the dominant countries is also exacerbated. Most part of the natural resources, including energy, is concentrated in developing countries, among other things due to their irregular consumption. The „old industrial countries” have almost exhausted them on their territory, while the periphery countries for technological reasons have not even started to use them. That is the problem of the international resource distribution differentiation. It is aggravated by the fact that the consumption of energy resources in the developed countries is much higher than in the underdeveloped ones (the eighth of the world’s population consumes about 54% of the world’s energy production). The presence of an energy problem is well recognized not only by the dominant, but also by the poor countries, the owners of energy resources. Therefore, since the 1970s the rapid growth of the oil prices began. And this growth was due to the fact that certain oil-producing countries implementing the communitarian scenario have united in the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), carried out a partial or a complete nationalization of their oil industry and entered into a cartel agreement to compensate for losses caused by the volatility of the world monetary and financial system and dollar devaluation. On the other hand, they got an opportunity to influence the world conjuncture in the same way as monopolies breaking all the bases of implementing the global solidarity scenario.

Formulated at that time, the main objectives of the energy policy of the West (decrease in oil dependence of the economy, replacement of oil by other energy sources, development of energy-saving technologies) were accompanied by initiatives that were reflected in the decisions of the UN Conference. However, the further course of global development continued in the direction of redistribution of world energy resources in favor of dominant countries, which was much cheaper than implementing the planetary communitarian scenario.

In this sense, the ecological problem in dominant countries acquires a particular specificity: firstly, the immediate threat to life and health of the population of developed countries is growing due to the increased environmental burden on the territories of these countries; secondly, the state of the environment is deteriorating as a result of the activities of

technologically underdeveloped industries in peripheral countries (including harmful ones, transported from developed countries); thirdly, the quality of life, the high level of consumption in the leading countries of the world causes a change in the structure of needs, shifting the emphasis on their quality characteristics, such as the consumption of environmentally friendly products, the state of the environment, etc., moreover, in the social plan, social inequality is aggravated.

The socio-political problem is especially acute for the dominant countries today. A special response of peripheral countries to the economic expansion of the leading countries (together with their democratic declarations) is the intensification of migration processes and the pressure of migrants on the social systems of these countries. In addition, the unevenness of economic development and the exclusion of the communitarian category of social justice from interstate relations leads to its stronger demand at the national level, thereby increasing the threats to both national and global social stability. The existence of individualistic subjective components of global social and economic policy becomes the basis of a sustained tension in relations not only between different social strata of the population within the country, but also in the global sphere.

Based on an individualistic basis, globalization enhances the phenomenon of confrontation. The culture of individualism, which covers the world society, leads to its unification according to the pattern typical for national spaces: the relationships between subjects are based on competitive principles; Subjects are allocated on the basis of ownership, the distribution function is assigned only to the owner of the capital; The main mechanism of social mobilization is individual motivation, especially in favor of capital; The main goal is to make profit. Individualism is cosmopolitan, non-national, therefore this culture demands liberalism and openness, free access to resources and markets, denies the effectiveness of international relations between the subjects of the highest level - between states, and vice versa, requires the leveling of the role of the state. International relations constructed on this model simplify the possibility of mastering the national socio-economic and cultural space and facilitate their atomization, which gives dominant countries special preferences in the competitive struggle. After all, their own spaces are closed due to a number of macroeconomic and technological - monopolistic and communitarian, by their nature, benefits. Particularly because of these considerations, in order to weaken the competitiveness of the countries of the periphery, the leading countries require them to get rid of consolidating communitarian factor – that of a state that can influence internal socio-economic processes (especially by concentrating a significant or strategic share of ownership in their hands), play a mobilizing role and defend national interests. But, these are national governments who are entrusted with social responsibility.

The phenomenon of confrontation makes the content, logical continuation and consequence of competition. Competitive confrontation at the level of economic entities generates a monopoly of the winner in production, in a certain industry, or region; competitive confrontation at the state level - generates dominance and, as result, expansion and creation of conditions for strengthening unfair competitiveness of national economic entities. Such conditions can be created by unifying the external world to their own needs. Protected by the dominant state commodity producer is opposed to an unprotected individual producer from a peripheral country (where „there is less of statehood”).

The confrontation between the periphery and the center under the conditions of the individualistic scenario of globalization should be based on the principle of confrontation between states, and not economic entities. The type of management on which confrontation is based is the application, at the national level, of communitarian technologies: the state form of ownership and rational behavior of economic entities whose interests are subordinate to the national and effectively ensure mobilization and the necessary redistribution of resources. Under these conditions, sustainable development in the country can be secured by the nation itself. At the same time, an economic entity protected by the state becomes more competitive, and its activities are subordinated to its interests.

The opposition of states under the current scenario of globalization is built on the model that the leading countries define, imposing on the less developed countries the conditions of individualism - self-regulation, openness, competition, free pricing - and leaving the terms of communitarianism for personal consumption. To reach the level of interstate competition, underdeveloped countries must mobilize their efforts in the model of economic nationalism and build national competitiveness to ensure equal conditions for participation in confrontation. „The real lesson is that taking advantage of globalization requires the development of internal potential along with the development of international relations,” says D. Roedrick[9].

Returning to the efforts of the world community to implement the program of joint overcoming of global problems, it should be noted that although globalization in the individualistic, liberal scenario continued to develop disparities both between and within countries, aggravate the problems of poverty, hunger, deterioration of health and illiteracy of the population, destroy the ecosystem on which world wealth directly depends, further development of the communitarian scenario of globalization has gradually stopped.

Absolute conviction that the scenario of globalization can only be liberal-individualistic and, accordingly, the values and institutions in the countries of the world are to be transformed to the needs of such a model, and also the belief that imposing it will not cause significant resistance, was expressed by F. Fukuyama, who claimed: „We are at the end of history, because there is only one system that must continue to dominate in world politics, namely, the liberal-

democratic West ... Time is on the side of modern era and I see no reason why the US will not rule”[10].

The inability to implement another scenario of globalization, which would include solidarity instead of confrontation, as the leading component of relations between countries in the era of globalization, was reaffirmed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002. In the framework of international efforts to achieve sustainable development, taking into account the problems that societies create for the global environment, technologies and the world financial systems in which these countries play a decisive role - developed countries have assumed their responsibility. They also acknowledge that the standards applied by some countries (in particular market self-regulation) can be destructive and cause serious consequences, cause unreasonable additional economic and social costs in other countries in developing countries in particular.

At the same time, the summit declared the thesis that states should cooperate and work to create a liberal, open international economic system that can ensure economic growth and sustainable development in all countries. Thus, despite the destabilizing effect of the deepening of economic openness, which at that time already gave a complete picture of the shortcomings of the individualistic scenario of globalization, the summit participants came to the conclusion that this scenario suits all countries.

As the outcome of the summit, two documents were signed: the Johannesburg Declaration of Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development at the Top Level. Particular attention was paid to solving social problems of sustainable development: poverty, health, etc., and new problems - the development of trade, the effects of globalization, the sustainability of the financial system, and the financing of sustainable development. However, no specific mechanisms for solving these problems were worked out, especially, on the basis of the main component of communitarianism - solidarity [11].

The non-rationality of the individualistic concept of global development towards unlimited economic growth, the intensification of competition and, as a result, the widening gap between countries and the imbalance of world development, is undoubted, while the balance of the social and economic components of globalization would allow countries to cooperate to solve global problems. The concept of sustainable development contained only an idea and could not be translated into definite solutions or instruments for achieving sustainable development. The implementation of the concept of sustainable developments a complex fundamental task that requires its (concept) adequacy to the scenario of globalization, requires a radical change in the basic conditions for the development of international relations. More precisely, implemented in

the form in which it was formulated; it would be the starting point for changing the scenario of globalization.

Summing up, we should pay attention to the need to study another aspect of globalization - the foundations of the modern civilization paradigm, especially in the relation of global and national, its origins, the factors of changing parameters at the national and global levels, which raises the need to assess the globalization scenario from these positions and assess the possibility (or impossibility) of its correction.

The actualization of the problem of determining the current scale of civilization shifts is caused by an assessment of the values that is taking place now, and by the search for the content of the universal identity, it becomes the basis for the formation of a new image of the global world. Obvious is the fact that the individualist interpretation of a person as a self-sufficient basic component of the world community does not justify itself: on the background of the strengthening of more real and tangible global civilization and national shifts, such a component seems to be too abstract.

Meanwhile, it is on this abstraction that the modern concept of a conscious reorganization of global architecture is based - being reduced to the level of the basic justification of the distortions of individualism, it is called upon to balance economic and humanitarian injustice. Unification of the world space on individualistic, market-based cosmopolitan principles denies civilization values and turns into less significant such components (and at the same time system-forming issues) of the global world, as the state sovereignty with the mentality of the peoples that live there. The variability of the globalization scenarios is now leveled by the westernized concept formulated by the countries that, due to their domination in the world political and economic space, exert pressure on both national economies and civilization worlds. The ultimate goal of such pressure is the formation of a homogeneous, unified, global field that is sensitive to economic and cultural expansion.

At the same time, it should be noted that, firstly, countries-„Westernizes” do not perceive any attempts to question, let alone deform their own values, and, secondly, to unify their economic space on cosmopolitan principles. To this end, they have effective mechanisms for protecting national economies, information and cultural spheres. And, as noted, despite the declared principle of individualism „less than the state”, the state management of socio-economic processes in the leading countries is effective and is all-pervasive, and the tool for protecting the economy varies from direct and macroeconomic to „expansion of broad fields.” It is noteworthy that most of these tools cannot be used in peripheral or transitional countries because of their postindustrial content or a direct ban on their use by the dominant countries.

The mono-determinant, individualistic, essentially pro-market concept of globalization made a direct impact on the parameters of the modern civilization paradigm. In particular, it is directed against the solidarity values and perceptions inherent in individual civilization worlds. This leads to a permanent inter civilization conflict, which manifests itself in local wars.

If the resistance of civilization values in the cultural context to this day is not overcome by the predominant Anglo-Saxon civilization, then in the economic sphere the individualist based principle occupies leading position. It is true that here there is a certain manifestation of the values and mentality features inherent in certain civilization worlds, as special forms of functioning of the banking system in the countries of Islam, communal economic arrangements in the Middle Eastern countries, state-monopoly forms of ownership in the Far Eastern countries, planned economy in the Scandinavian countries, and the like.

Direct pressure on national economies from countries-„Westernizes” provokes a reaction of rejection, especially the rejection of individualistic models of development. Models of modernization of national economies are perceived by society only if they meet its civilization-value orientations, which, in turn, is the basis and manifestation of solidarity. The mechanisms of adaptation of national economies to civilization challenges and threats are based on these foundations (are its derivatives), require the priority of national interests over private, individual interests.

National economies cause systemic changes as far as they affect the civilization paradigm- under the condition of openness, the leading countries determine the direction and the concept of global transformations, while the countries of the periphery, by providing cultural and direct resistance, change their trajectory. Together they unbalance the global space.

At the same time, global system changes provoke the autocracy of civilization world and countries, under which internal civilization value systems and communitarian basic components of the social structure (the controlling and corrective role of the state, the processes of nationalization, etc.) are strengthened.

Reflecting the processes of inter conditionality and interdependence of various components of the functioning of the world community, the socio-political phenomena of the last decade stimulate the formulation of a new global paradigm of the societal system. The manifestation of this world outlook is the activation of the “civilization vision of the world”.

Communitarianism prompts the need for the formation of an extra-historical and extra-civilization phenomenon - the noospheric paradigm - that will push for a transition from local to general relations, such as attitudes toward nature, the universe, man, communications, i.e. it will require a change in the psychology of the global society. These are the reasons why it ought to turn into the fundamental principle of the formation of a new paradigm of globalization. But

so far it has not been possible to carry out such a scenario, the states (if they want to remain so) are forced to look for ways to protect themselves from external challenges, strengthen community security. These ways are connected with strengthening of own solvency, first of all competitiveness.

The current stage of globalization is really characterized by the active borrowing (or imposing, exporting) of institutions generated by cosmopolitanism, and the expansion of the transnational „ideological assistance “of libertarian content. „All countries undergoing economic modernization must be very much like one another: they must have national unity on the basis of a centralized state, they urbanize, replace the traditional forms of organizing societies like tribes, sects and clans with economically rational forms based on function and efficiency, and provide their citizens with a universal education, „wrote F. Fukuyama[12, p.7]

But in this context, the experience of developed European countries is interesting, and in the context of the uniqueness and not the unification of their economic models that underlie social progress, determines their institutional structure and ensures its successful functioning. According to Oiken's definition, „ideal types of economy” can act as an object of such analysis, where sufficiently expressive and closely related to national identity and economic mentality, [13]. From this point of view, the economic history of a number of European countries, among a stable and rational France, is of interest. Despite the prevailing view of the completely individualistic foundations of the formation and functioning of national archetypes, its economic and administrative institutions, specific cultural archetypes inherent in the hierarchical system of institutions are typical for this country when, against a background of equal (democratic) active communication between leaders and subordinates, decisions are made by managers and are carried out without discussion, respect for authority is referential, based on confidence in the person who represents it and who assumes sole responsibility(not collective responsibility) for the work performed. Such a business culture can be fully attributed to the communitarian principles of the organization of societies, however, in fact, it is a form of organization of democratic processes and, at the same time, a manifestation of the special features of the mentality formed together with the emergence of modern developed countries of Europe. And, most interestingly, it was in these countries that it was influenced by a special economic theory and practice of a communitarian, in its essence, cameralism, more than under the influence of mercantilism. These countries were approved through the use of a special libertarian policy, which was imposed on other countries, thereby turning them into a servicing periphery.

What is happening today has already happened many times in history: cosmopolitanism (libertarianism, individualism) in the economy gave way to new trends - countries that were in crisis and did not want to continue to serve the leaders inevitably turned to the idea of national

identification. Historically, one of the key events that initiated the formation and spread of cameralism as the basis for the formation of statehood in the peripheral part of Europe was the Treaty of Westphalia, concluded in 1648 after eighty years of multinational armed conflicts in Central Europe. Its main message is the right of states to sovereignty and choice of their own way of development.

It is obvious that, like after the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia, as well as after the First and Second World War, that is, in the post-crisis periods of the development of the global society, today individualism again comes to a new level - it becomes the basic principle of international economic relations, but between the states, and not only individual subjects of economic activity. And this is an objective result of instability, which was provoked by liberal practices and intensified by the lack of solidarity both in relations between countries and inside these countries themselves.

It is not by chance that the question of the inter country nature of competition based on strengthening the competitiveness of individual countries achieved in the context of the promoting national economic interests is acute already in the leading countries.

Great Britain withdrew from the European Union, referring to the unproductive nature of the solidarism measures it is taking to overcome economic imbalance. The entire campaign before the referendum was based on the thesis that the basis for the EU's activities was an unfair principle, when rich countries should support weak ones, and that solidarity would be more appropriate for Britain itself, as it would allow the country to develop its economic potential through its own efforts and investments.

D. Trump's economic program is also communitarian and provides for the development of the United States on the principles of economic nationalism. It also emphasizes the decommissioning of international solidarism programs and focusing on solving the problems of their own solvency [16]. In fact, D. Trump returns the country to an economic policy well described and implemented by the author of the US accelerated commercial and industrial development program by A. Hamilton in the 19th century and that was repeatedly used later in the history, in particular by F. Roosevelt and R. Reagan in the XXth century.

The leaders of these countries rightly believed and still believe that the global imbalances of the country are always opposed on their own and the success of such a confrontation depends on the competitive stability of these countries. The very same competitiveness is the result of solidarity - the unification of the efforts of society and the subordination of individual interests to the public ones, i.e., the goals and tasks the nation faces.

On the road to economic nationalism, the country is offered to return by M. Le Pen, one of the leader's of the presidential campaign in France. She believes that the system of unified Europe

„is based on the knowingly destructive ideology of globalization,” that „it must be destroyed and a free Europe created, of which indeed sovereign states are members.” She advocates France's withdrawal from the EU and holding a referendum so that „the French themselves could answer the question of leaving the EU”, as well as the need to „undermine the monopoly of the party of financiers and supporters of multiculturalism” who are interested in obtaining high profits at any cost, even at the cost of betraying national economic interests, but are not ready for the formation of a communitarian, solitary economy in one's own country.”[17] Her program echoes the program of Charles de Gaulle and is focused on increasing sustainability of the French economy to the challenges posed by the global environment. But it is even more important to take into account the fact that the model of economic nationalism has always remained popular in France and, like no other, was quite productive due to the reflection of the French mentality as an „ideal type of economy”.

References

1. Как богатые страны стали богатыми, и почему бедные страны остаются бедными – М.:Издательский дом Государственного университета — Высшей школы экономики, 2011.
2. The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind. –New York, N.–Y.: Universe Books – 1972.
3. См.: Чижевский А.Л. Земное эхо солнечных бурь. – М.: Наука, 1973. – С. 121.
4. Наше общее будущее (« Our common future»). – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 55.
5. Конференция ООН по окружающей среде и развитию (КОСР).
6. «Sustainable Development».
7. См.: Забота о Земле. Стратегия устойчиво существования. – Швейцария: МСОП, ЮНЕП, ВВФ,1991. С. 4.
8. Рассел Б. История западной философии. Т.1. М: «Миф», 1993. – С. 63.
9. http://www.project-syndicate.org/series/the_open_economy_and_its_enemies/description.
10. Fukuyama F. The West has Won: Radical Islam Can't Beat Democracy and Capitalism // <http://www.guardian.co/uk>.
11. См.: Многоликая глобализация. Культурное разнообразие в современном мире. / Под ред.: П.Бергера, С.Хантингтона. – М.: Прогресс, 2004. – С. 24.
12. Фукуяма Ф. Конец истории и последний человек. – М.: «Издательство АСТ», 2004. – С.7.
13. Ойкен В. Основные принципы экономической политики. – М.: Наука, 1995.
14. Райнерт Э. Свободный рынок превратит Украину в страну эмигрантов: Интервью. //Новоевремя. – 2015. – №39.
15. Ruggie J. Continuity and Transformation in the World Policy: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis. NewYork: Columbia University Press, 1986.
16. See: Речь Дональда Трампа в Геттисберге, штат Пенсильвания, 22 октября 2016 года. <http://www.whatthefolly.com/2016/10/26/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-gettysburg-pennsylvania>
17. Election présidentielle: ce que contient le programme de Marine Le Pen. – <http://www.lemonde.fr/election-presidentielle-2017/article/2017/02/04/marine-le-pen>.