



СОЦІАЛЬНА ФІЛОСОФІЯ

SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

UDC 130:141.7(4-15)

DOI 10.35433/PhilosophicalSciences.1(91).2022.5-16

THE PHENOMENON OF "WESTERN" GLOBALIZATION AND SIMULACRUM OF CIVILIZATION

I. G. Utiuzh*, I. A. Sajtarly**, N. V. Pavlenko***

This article examines the correlation between such postmodern phenomena as globalization, "massovization" and national economic centrism. It is concluded that this is national economic centrism which represents a serious alternative to globalization, whereas the projects of so-called civilizational identity act as simulacra. However, this alternative only intensifies economic paranoia and reinforces the religion of comfort in modern mass societies.

In other words, within the framework of enhancing national economies, the only social model – mass society – is reproduced due to the reproduction of the same model of increased production, which needs similar increased consumption. Hence, the existence of another society contrary to consumption society is just impossible per se, that is the process of annihilating humanity as a capability of affective (libidinal) control is only increasing. There is almost no gentleness, nor modesty left, which increasingly exacerbates the ethical context of modern social studies. To our mind, we can presume that the crisis of liberalism primarily reflects the crisis of capitalism itself and its mode of social life, which today is trying to protect itself by means of its tested practices.

Therefore, a critical social theory in the form of the "theory of mass society" should be generally considered as a separate conceptual social model in the context of globalization, which currently increases the homogenization of cultures in terms of their transformation into a common 'vulgar' mass culture.

* Irina Utiuzh, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Head of the Department of Social Sciences, Zaporizhzhia State Medical University, 24 Mayakovsky str., Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.

E-mail: ytyh13@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1152-0151

** Inna Sajtarly, Associate Professor, Doctor of Sciences, Professor of the Department of Philosophy of Humanities of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine.

E-mail: inna.saitarly@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-8253-4898

*** Natella Pavlenko, PHD, Lecturer of the Department of Social Studies, Zaporizhzhia State Medical University, 24 Mayakovsky str., Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine.

E-mail: vnatellan@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-5283-4945

Keywords: *Civilizational Approach, Globalization, Economic Centrism, Mass Society, Social Crisis, Degradation of Moral.*

ФЕНОМЕН "ЗАХІДНОЇ" ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЇ ТА СИМУЛЯКР ЦИВІЛІЗАЦІЇ

I. Г. Утюж, I. А. Сайтарли, Н. В. Павленко

У статті досліджується співвідношення таких постмодерністських явищ, як глобалізація, "масовізація" та національно-економічний центризм. Зроблено висновок, що це національний економічний центризм, який є серйозною альтернативою глобалізації, тоді як проекти так званої цивілізаційної ідентичності виступають як симулякри. Однак ця альтернатива лише посилює економічну параною та зміцнює релігію комфорту в сучасних масових суспільствах. Інакше кажучи, в рамках посилення національних економік відтворюється єдина соціальна модель – масове суспільство – за рахунок відтворення тієї ж моделі збільшеного виробництва, що потребує такого ж збільшення споживання. Отже, існування іншого суспільства, протилежного суспільству споживання, просто неможливе саме по собі, тобто процес знищення людства, як здатності до афективного (лібідинального) контролю, лише зростає. Не залишилося майже ні лагідності, ні скромності, що дедалі більше загострює етичний контекст сучасних суспільних досліджень. Як видається, можна припустити, що криза лібералізму відображає, перш за все, кризу самого капіталізму, його способу організації соціального життя, який сьогодні намагається захистити себе своїми перевіреними практиками.

Тому критичну соціальну теорію у формі "теорії масового суспільства" слід загалом розглядати як окрему концептуальну соціальну модель у контексті глобалізації, яка нині посилює гомогенізацію культур у плані їх трансформації у загальну "вульгарну" чи "масову" культуру.

Ключові слова: *цивілізаційний підхід, глобалізація, економічний центризм, масове суспільство, соціальна криза, деградація моралі.*

Introduction of the issue. The spread of the postindustrial mode of production devalues the main achievement of civilization – the value of man, since the mode of production acquires an extremely technological character.

It seems difficult to contest the civilizing paradigm, in particular, its argumentation about the specifics of national economies, but even this national specificity does not negate the very essence of capitalism, its natural movement towards social collapse through inevitable annihilation of culture.

There is almost no gentleness, nor modesty left, which increasingly exacerbates the ethical context of modern social studies.

The purpose of the work – is to reveal the peculiarities of the phenomenon of "Western" globalization

and simulacrum of civilization and its impact on society.

Analysis of recent research and publication from which the solution to this problem was initiated. As the basis for the research, the authors use the theoretical developments of other scholars on the globalization, massovization and national economic centrism such as Baudrillard, J., Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F., Fukuyama, F., Ortega y Gasset, J., Reich, R., Žižek, S. and others.

Researcher of globalization, George Ritzer states: "It is likely that no single topic has received as much popular and academic attention in recent years as globalization". Considering this phenomenon as "the spread of worldwide practices, relations, consciousness, and organization of social life", Ritzer quite rightly remarks that in the modern "academic world" we can observe "a near obsession with this topic" [14:574].

When describing modern globalization, Ritzer uses the term "grobalization", which, as he claims, means a combination of the concepts of "grow" (in the sense of profit growth) and "globalization". In this relation he writes:

"What is central here is the idea of grobalization (a companion to the notion of glocalization), or the imperialistic ambitions of nations, corporations, organizations, and like and their desire, indeed need, to impose themselves on various geographic areas... Their main interest is in seeing their power, influence, and in some cases, profits grow (hence the term of grobalization) throughout the world. Grobalization involves a variety of subprocesses. Three of them – capitalism, Americanization, and McDonaldization – are central driving forces in grobalization and are of great significance in the worldwide spread of nothingness" [14:587].

In his statement, Ritzer directly points out to the cultural and ideological risks caused by globalization, using the term of *nothingness* that according to him, expresses "largely empty forms relatively devoid of distinctive content". Like most modern researchers, what Ritzer emphasizes on is a "Western bias" of globalization, a common conviction in "the preeminence accorded to developments in the West" [14:574].

According to Ritzer, this process often occurs "dramatically". In this connection, we would like to draw a particular attention to the dramatic consequences of globalization, *nothingness* of the social and cultural life of peoples, especially those countries (nations), which are directly involved in this process. For instance, as far as organization of social life is concerned, globalization resulted in the most common type of society, namely the *mass society* with its trivial values of consumption and pleasure. The global economy is not only based on these principles, it requires them, dragging more and more people into the consumer swamp and credit slavery.

The outline of unresolved issues brought up in the article.

Therefore, it turned out that most authors were more about the economic explanation of this phenomenon. We are primarily referring to the representatives of the so-called critical social theory, especially the current followers of postmodern philosophy. It is the critical social theory based on a system approach that allows us to comprehend some modern processes, such as the crisis of liberal ideology and so-called Western civilization, and finally the crisis of capitalism itself. In other words, the representatives of the above-mentioned critical approach tend to view globalization primarily as the spread of Western capitalism, liberalism, and, most importantly, as a market economy represented in the forms of such institutions as WTO and IMF. This is a generally recognized fact.

Moreover, there are some thinkers, who criticize this economic system, not without a reason, believing that the IMF in particular and globalization in general "have worked to the advantage of the wealthy nations, especially the United States (which effectively has veto power over IMF decisions), and to the detriment of poor nations.

Discussion and Results. We would like to start this article with the words belonging to Ritzer, who states the gap between rich and poor has actually increased as a result of globalization" [14:575]. Liberal ideology, which is a direct derivative of industrial capitalism, has proved to be a solid foundation for globalization and recognition of the only model of civilizational development, namely the Western one. This model aims to maximize the integration of the entire local economies around the world into a unique 'global market' run by so-called multinational corporations. It is not surprising that this multinational expansion provokes strong resistance, sometimes turning into open conflicts, of some national elites.

Nevertheless, the current crisis of liberalism is primarily a crisis of production, increased job cuts and a bloated consumption economy, which overall contributes both to the global production and social crisis. Jean Baudrillard perfectly demonstrated the way, in which post-industrial service-virtual production increases the role of economic fiction, as well as its total dominance in all spheres of public life. This is *the simulacrum* that dominates economics, politics and personal relations [2]. However, there is another component of modern capitalism – an excess of production resource in a form of "living human individuals", which, for a long time, has been formed rather for consumption than for libidinal labor, and a significant part of which is not integrated into the production system. That is why, after twenty years of active search for Giddens and Baudrillard, for example, it has become obvious that today the masses tend to manifest the traits described enthusiastically by Le Bon [8] and Freud [4]. In other words, contrary to Giddens' view, the result of expanding globalization is primarily the extension of the global mass society [12] wrote: "the revolt of the masses"), rather than "global cosmopolitan society", as stated by Giddens [6]. Therefore, "a key clash taking place at the global level today" [14:577] is the clash between dehumanization and humanism, rather than just between fundamentalism and cosmopolitanism or civilizations.

Today, we can observe the structural 'demise' not only of the Western civilization (as Spengler believed, or Huntington predicts), but also of culture as such, since any culture in its core is a system of prohibitions, whereas 'cultural imperialism' with its widespread fast-food restaurants and entertainment industry can hardly be called a culture in its true sense.

Due to the constant rhetoric of consumption and pleasure, a high level of atomism and lack of direct interpersonal communication inherent in the so-called postindustrial society,

people are becoming increasingly dehumanized. In this regard, we must pay particular attention to relationship between the mentioned process and the process of globalization.

The point is that the modern 'masses' are not only indifferent, they are potentially aggressive; for this, there are several explanations. It is obvious that most of the reasons for mass aggression are related to both a total heightened sense of economic risk and the risks of survival. These masses are of particular concern to the upper stratum, since they are too used to being wealthy, free and protected.

In this regard, another prominent author of modern times, namely, I. Wallerstein [17] quite reasonably uses the term "dangerous classes", indicating the constant danger of a social explosion, even in the so-called "wealthy countries".

Therefore, we can presume that the crisis of liberalism primarily reflects the crisis of capitalism itself (whether we refer to a decline in production or a reduction in consumption), which today is trying to protect itself by means of its tested practices.

We are referring to an ideological way of inspiring confrontation between different social groups, or a repressive way, in connection with which some modern authors reasonably note: "Violent ghettos are perfectly compatible with liberal societies because they are normalized as "off-limit" zones for the majority of citizens" [9:161].

According to Hannah Arendt, modernism generated totalitarian regimes – the invention of systems in which all people are equally superfluous, which, as some scholars state, inevitably leads to concrete practices of genocide, for instance, Nazism [1].

But, what about the masses, who constantly appear to be superfluous nowadays, in the context of postmodern imperialism called globalization?

In other words, "can we talk any longer of the mob" on the global scale, of "the corpse factory and the pits of oblivion" [1: 171] in the postmodern era?

Is there a danger of coming annihilation of entire human communities?

All these questions remain open and are directly related to the issue of globalization. In any case, based on a number of postmodern papers, we can presume that globalization, primarily, generates a global monolith society designated as mass society, and it is this society that is the basis of most problems of modern capitalism, including both ideology and culture, and, finally, capitalism itself.

Nobility as the last hope of philosophy, or the last philosophical illusion

It is known that the concept of *mass society*, which has long been rooted into modern philosophical discourse, primarily means socio-cultural decline in general, and the ethical decline in particular. We shall make a general analysis of several landmark studies of mass society ("mass man") proposed by brilliant thinkers of the 20th century, namely Oswald Spengler and Jose Ortega y Gasset. Indeed, the first serious accusations against the masses within the framework of a civilizational approach were made by Oswald Spengler. According to him, the power of the masses symbolizes the power of a "pampered society", "ignorant crowd", which spreads intensively at the civilizational stage of cultural development.

The masses can only be designated as the *fourth estate*, which is a marker of the overall cultural demise, since it plays a key role in socio-cultural decay:

"... notion of the Fourth Estate, the Mass, which rejects the Culture and its matured forms, lock, stock, and barrel. It is the absolute of formlessness, persecuting with its hate every sort of form, every distinction of rank, the orderliness of property, the orderliness of knowledge. It is the new nomadism of the Cosmopolis, for which slaves and barbarians in the Classical world, Sudras in the Indian, and in general anything and every- thing that is merely human, provide an undifferentiated

floating something that falls apart the moment it is born, that recognizes no past and possesses no future. Thus, the Fourth Estate becomes the expression of the passing of a history over in to the historyless. The mass is the end, the radical nullity" [15:358].

At first glance, Spengler is far from idealizing a particular culture, and sometimes he shows his negative attitude to the relevant idealizations, especially in relation to ancient heritage. In particular, he explicitly blames his contemporaries, who, in his words, offer "audacious descriptions" of Antiquity and do not even want to mention the real life of "classical cities" and the same realities of "world-cities of to-day", where we can also find the same "dirt and riff-raff, terrors and brutalities, pleasure-boys ... phallus worship and imperial orgies": "in cities, life is bad; there, there are too many of the lustful", also said Zarathustra" [15:31].

The humankind always generates the inevitable anthropological type, which Spengler characterizes as "a new sort of nomad, cohering unstably in fluid masses, the parasitical city dweller, traditionless, utterly matter-of-fact, religionless, clever, unfruitful, deeply contemptuous of the countryman and especially that highest form of countryman, the country gentleman. This is a very great stride towards the inorganic, towards the end" [15:35]. He says:

"...that which is found in all Civilizations under different contemptuous labels – dregs, canaille, mob... but with the same tremendous connotation. In the great cities, which alone now spoke the decisive words...a mass of rootless fragments of population stands outside all social linkages. These do not feel themselves as attached either to an Estate or to a vocational class, nor even to the real working-class, although they are obliged to work. Elements drawn from all classes and conditions belong to it instinctively — uprooted peasantry, literates, ruined business men, and above all... derailed nobles.

Their power is far in excess of their numbers, for they are always on the spot, always on hand at the big decisions, ready for anything, devoid of all respect for orderliness, even the orderliness of a revolutionary party" [15:400].

Nevertheless, this critical perspective does not mean that Spengler is a follower of economic determinism. For some representatives of socio-cultural thinking of the 20th century, the close correlation between social structure and production system, that is, between industrial 'decadence' and universal social degradation is obvious; but, not for Spengler.

According to him, every civilization has its own structure of power and ethics, and even its own economic life. In this context, Spengler declares:

"Wholly different from this, both in idea and in evolution, and sharply marked off in tempo and duration, are the economic histories of the high Cultures, each of which has its own economic style. With the State rule radially from cities appears the urban economy of money, and this rises, with the oncoming of the Civilization, into the dictatorship of money, simultaneously with the victory of world-city democracy. Every Culture has its own independently developed form-world. Bodily money of the Apollinian style (that is, the stamped coin) is as antithetical to relational money of the Faustian-dynamic style (that is, the booking of credit-units)..." [15:477].

Therefore, Spengler is not inclined to explain the socio-cultural decline only by industrial capitalism, but, nevertheless, he recognizes the corrupting role of money and robbery at a later level of the Civilizing Process, which, in his deep conviction, must again be subordinated to the tasks of true government, "tradition and ambitions of strong families".

In other words, Spengler insists on the revival of aristocratic class, which connects his ideas to those of Nietzsche. Like Nietzsche, Spengler is obsessed with

the idea of noble races – nations, which have aristocratic dynasties. Aristocratic minority is selected by "destiny", and does differ from other estates in its extreme sense of honor, rank, significance and purity of blood. If we put it in postmodern terms, it is this 'intuition', or 'phantasm' of the noble race that underlies Spengler's gestalt-analysis.

These nations or races have had a deep cultural implication in history since they had this noble estate: "Every nation is represented in history by a minority... So long as a people is a nation and works out the Destiny of a nation, there is in it a minority which in the name of all represents and fulfils its history" [15:172-173]. According to Spengler, numerous nations who do not have such an elite minority are "fellaheen", that is, plebeian. These are peoples without destiny or history. They are not able to create a state, so they have disappeared, or will disappear without leaving a trace.

In addition, according to Spengler, a marker of the cultural "demise" of a nation is its growing pacifism, that is, a fully conscious *refusal of war*. This point of view is very similar to the Nietzschean demarcation between the two basic forms of morality, which is not surprising, since both of them belong to the same school of thought.

We are referring to the distinction between the morality of "slaves" and the values of the chivalrous-aristocratic race, which included, among other things, its propensity to war. Spengler recalls Nietzsche several times; in this context, he writes:

"It will always remain the great merit of Nietzsche that he was the first to recognize the dual nature of all moral. ...but at the basis of all his opinions this lies strong and clear, that good and bad are aristocratic, and good and evil priestly, distinctions... The good are the powerful, the rich, the fortunate. Good means strong, brave, thoroughbred, in the idiom of every Spring time. Bad, cheap, wretched, common, in the original sense, are the powerless, propertyless,

unfortunate, cowardly, negligible – the "sons of nobody" as ancient Egypt said" [16:342].

Like Nietzsche, Spengler writes about the *honor* as a basic concept of the noble estate: the survival of a nation is always a "matter of blood", which primarily designates loyalty, modesty, bravery, chivalry, self-control, and resolution.

Therefore, the triumph of the philistine world of wealthy citizens is a true marker of the current Western decline; it is for this reason that people are losing propensity for militancy. Another thing is the upper class ("elite"), which tends to fight against external enemies, allegedly over cultural ideals or cultural differences. However, Spengler is fully conscious that now the traditional nobles have only retained their "prefixes" (titles) and nothing more.

For instance, in his notorious "The Decline of the West", Spengler states that nations understand one another as little as individuals do, and it is national (racial) hatred that is the main reason for the entire military history: "In the race there is nothing material, but something cosmic and directional, the felt harmony of a Destiny, the single cadence of the march of historical Being. It is in coordination of this (wholly metaphysical) beat that produces race-hatred..." [16:166]. Therefore, if the military groups of aristocracy, for instance, fought against each other, it was only to maintain or establish the metaphysical values of their race or nation. People or nations seem to be living some "metaphysical life" rather than the real one. How convincing is this argument? It is just as convincing as the civilizational approach in general and the physiognomic approach in particular.

In relation with the above-stated, there arises a logical question: "Why is only misunderstanding caused (according to this logic) by racial and cultural differences to be the reason? Are cultural (racial) differences the only reason for hatred between nations, or is there anything else, other passions, for example, greed, ambitions, sadism,

which, according to psychoanalysis, can be a more solid foundation for collective hatred?

Even Nietzsche seemed to be more honest about the class nobility, when he wrote: "At the center of all these noble races we cannot fail to see the beast of prey, the *magnificent blond beast* avidly prowling round for spoil and victory; this hidden center needs release from time to time, the beast must out again, must return to the wild: – Roman, Arabian, Germanic, Japanese nobility, Homeric heroes, Scandinavian Vikings – in this requirement they are all alike. It was the noble races which left the concept of 'barbarian' in their traces wherever they went; even their highest culture betrays the fact that they were conscious of this and indeed proud of it..." [10:291].

It is noteworthy that when describing the Gestalt of Western culture, Spengler focuses on the special propensity of Western races to expansion. He writes: "...but the Western strives to direct the world according to his will" [16:501]. Is there the suggestion in these words of the aggressive colonial policy in the past and foresight of the coming globalism in the future? Indeed, the mass society in the industrial era is subject to a higher level of utilitarianism, conformism and consumerism than in the previous eras. However, the masses can be no less "militant" and "aggressive" than their "elite". Starting with Spengler and ending with Samuel Huntington, the explanation for waging transnational wars in terms of the Civilizing Paradigm is founded on the thesis of racial (national) hatred.

This thesis is supported by representatives of psychoanalysis, who believed that the problem of war is mainly of an affective nature in terms of accumulation of excessive aggression in the masses, societies and states. However, this hatred may be rather due to the entire existential dissatisfaction – poverty or misery, need for power and violence and other destructive impulses of the humankind than due to some supersensible causes.

As far as the cultural differences in 'soul', 'faith', language, etc. are concerned, this is just an excuse for satisfaction of the bloody instinct and need for hatred. Militarism is primarily a passion that maintains some nations by annihilating others.

Moreover, within the framework of the civilizing paradigm, mutual enrichment of cultures is considered to be problematic or not considered at all. Is it due to the fact that in the modern world cultures are already lifeless, since their value core, that is ethics, is lifeless too? The "revolt of the masses" as a disregard of spiritual ideals is primarily a crisis of morality in all social strata, which inevitably leads to a crisis of the human community as such.

Another brilliant example of a critical approach was offered by a Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset, who elaborated his theory of the masses based on the contrast of their nullity with the virtues of true aristocracy. As far as the modern Western society is concerned, Ortega basically defines it as a mass society. According to him, this society is "captured" by the masses, and this fact will inevitably cause it to totally collapse [12]. The essential traits of the masses are their amorphous crowding and faceless multitude.

Meanwhile, the socio-cultural and, mainly, historical significance belongs to the elite, which, in his opinion, should be regarded as the intellectual and educated minority that creates values and purports and confronts the mass man. According to Ortega, the marker of an elite person, that is the presence within a human being of this "noble" source, consists in constant dissatisfaction with himself and, consequently, the strive for self-development in terms of creation and morality. Ortega emphasizes that due to industrial and post-industrial achievements, especially due to technological progress, modern people are able to live with comfort and pleasure, whereas in the past only few were able to live so that is aristocrats. These few cultivated "good manners",

which primarily served as a symbol of their social superiority, while the masses were extremely hedonistic, with an apparent lack of any moral obligations and restrictions. This is definitely a brutal society with barbaric manners, indeed devoid of "all respect for orderliness" [15: 400]. Thus, it is the ethical component of culture that is significant both for most representatives of the civilizational approach and adherents of a more critical view of the cultural core, which, as it will be clarified, cannot be only reduced to the language, religion or some metaphysical "gestalt": the problem of modern 'civilizations' is, first of all, the problem of social and ethical degradation.

In modern philosophy, the idea of the cultural "decline" of the postmodern elite has been acquiring greater significance. In other words, as convincingly demonstrated by Ortega, an essential attribute of mass society is a lack of cultural differences between the upper and so-called declassed strata. Which spiritual ideals of the upper class that this class allegedly intends to "establish in eternity" can we talk about? Moreover, it seems highly doubtful that war should be able to restore aristocratic nobility. On the contrary, modern humanity continues on the path of establishment of a replete society as their only dream.

Thus, despite Spengler's expectations and Nietzsche's "eternal accusation against Christianity", which can be inscribed "wherever walls are to be found" [11:62], people have long abandoned moral ideals both in the form of "aristocratic ethos" and Christian morality with its imperatives and rhetoric of suffering: "Only the Devil's world, with its grim-all-presentences remained" [16: 293]. To our mind, the postmodern man is not able to shape himself into a personality, to build national consciousness, etc., since the entire global system of social relations has 'grown' into the production and consumption economy based on desiring-production.

***Economic centrism as an
alternative of the civilizational
development***

As it has already been stated above, we can observe a total change of purports, and economic centrism is becoming the basis of the mass society existence. The modern era can be called the era of economic rationality, i.e., anyone who refuses to admit seeking wealth is considered to be insane. Ethics and Good are recognized as madness while Evil and Vice are viewed as rationality.

Economic rationality is a kind of 'ethos', namely 'capitalist ethos' that can result (or has already resulted) in the emergence of a new cultural variety of capitalist economy, a society of economic centrism, which will change our social world beyond recognition. In our article, we already emphasized that it is capitalism solely that now underlies the concept of human individual: in order to raise the standard of living, it uses, according to some scholars, vile motives inherent in a man – greed and love of gain. It is the masses who have a need for violence, torture and bloody spectacles, since they like it, especially when there is no other way to compensate for their discontent with life.

No other system can be compared with capitalism in the way of adapting to someone's desires and tastes, which can be considered rather trivial by others.

The world of Debt and Schizophrenia, as Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari accurately observe in their project *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, is the essence of the current social situation. The phenomenology of debt has this meaning: "to breed man, to mark him in his flesh, to render him capable of alliance, to form him within the debtor-creditor relation, which on both sides turns out to be a matter of memory – a memory straining toward the future ...debt is the immediate effect or the direct means of the territorial and corporal inscription process" [3:190]. The authors even present the formal, mathematical essence of the

phenomenon of debt, it is about the equation of debt, about "the terrible equation of debt: injury done = pain to be suffered" [3:191].

Defining economics as a substantial mode of being, Deleuze and Guattari "restore to the 'economic' domain the dignity of Truth, the Potential for Events", as Slavoj Žižek rightly states [18:328]. The debt economy violates the principle of social progress – "an increase in the degree of freedom of the individual and society." In the debt economy, the opposite processes occur – "an increase in the degree of dependence and unfreedom", which can be observed in the life of Ukraine. Ukraine's debt obligations to the IMF and unfair interaction with the WTO institutions almost completely exclude Ukraine from the 'club' of competitive countries on a global scale. Historically, the ideological manipulation of the civilizing paradigm has levelled the real reasons for differences in living standards and the unequal positions of different countries in the modern geopolitical space. This geopolitical difference is explained by the issues of cultural, patriotic and historical identity, and other rhetoric. The adherents of the civilizing paradigm obviously make an artificial division between politics and economics, and put economics below politics. We can observe the occurrence of the so-called ideological manipulation, when the key question formulated by Robert Reich is neglected and concealed: what is the role of an individual state at present, when a universal global economy is establishing, thus gradually blurring state borders? In his paper "Saving capitalism", he replies: "...the economic function of the state is not to raise profitability of its flag-waving corporations or to multiply the wealth and possessions of its citizens scattered around the world. The genuine objective the state strives to achieve is an increase in its citizens' standard of living by making greater contributions to the global economics" [13:172]. The concern about national competitiveness should be a top priority today.

The dominants are changing: from general universalism and globalism to diversity and self-sufficiency in the choice of life values and development priorities. In his paper, a Russian economist Boris Kheyfets states that there are two reasons for the "decline of globalization": "We can identify two main reasons that allowed us to conclude about the decline of globalization. Firstly, protectionism in world trade and investment has strengthened, which has already been called "economic nationalism". Secondly, the processes of regionalization and transregionalization have significantly intensified, especially in the post-crisis period. They have resulted in the formation of economic unions that remove almost all tariff and non-tariff barriers to free movement of goods, services and investment, which creates certain obstacles for non-members, i.e. for development of relevant global asset flows" [7:10].

It is obvious that the current geopolitical picture is being shaped as a struggle for regional resource provision and establishment of geopolitics' machinery. The mechanisms of nation-state goals and state protection will be the main constants of this development, i.e. the time of economic nationalism is coming. According to Immanuel Wallerstein [17], liberalism and democracy, preaching "the power of the best" (for the sake of justice, we should note that it does not depend on the birth) has created problems associated with a huge inequality in the system of world order, which means that democracy, liberalism, civilizational and cultural ideology – all these represent a screen, simulation that exacerbates the contradiction between rich and poor countries.

Europe has already experienced something similar and found a way out in totalitarianism as a form of suppression of the masses through terror and violence, mediated by turning to traditional values (civilizational identity). Suffice it to recall, they were outstanding philosophies of that era –

Nietzsche, Spengler, Heidegger. Was the world on the edge of new Nazism?

For instance, some thinkers of that time considered the ideas of national-socialism to be the way forward over the cultural crisis related to routinization of social consciousness, or, according to Spengler, to the "world city", the revolt of the masses [12], the cult of oral-anal consumption [3], etc. Like any other form of capitalism, post-industrial global capitalism is still based on liberal principles aimed to overcome any restrictions existing within cultures, religions and ethics in production and consumption. Given all this, the early Fukuyama, who announced the worldwide triumph of liberalism, was totally right saying that there is no longer alternative to capitalism [5].

Conclusions and research perspectives.

It is still the same capitalism, which, today, knows no limitations at all, even if we name it an 'autochthonous' capitalism (as some authors claim). Thus, the logic of historical evolution of capitalism is paradoxical: at first, capitalism led to 'humanizing' in the term of softening the repressive practices and even to annihilation of very rhetoric of violence (Foucault), then – to production of violence. The spread of the postindustrial mode of production devalues the main achievement of civilization – the value of man, since the mode of production acquires an extremely technological character. In the modern academic world, there is the concept, which used to be dealt with by almost the entire modern social philosophy but has long been forgotten. We are referring to the Marxist concept of dead labor, which is known to have found its way into critical social theory. Confirmed by many thinkers, this concept reflects a phenomenon, which causes an excess of living productive power rather than excess of simulacrum in production (despite the assurances of Baudrillard). It seems difficult to contest the civilizing paradigm, in particular, its argumentation about the specifics of

national economies, but even this national specificity does not negate the very essence of capitalism, its natural movement towards social collapse through inevitable annihilation of culture.

As a rule, this cultural vulgarity is considered as a consequence of the production evolution, that is a growth of industrial, and then post-industrial modes of production. In other words, it is highly developed capitalism that laid as a foundation the corresponding 'hedonistic' value system that devalues any moral restrictions. "The God died," and following him, the morality appeared the first to die. Then the ascetic ethics of labor and economy, so persistently defended by Max Weber, died too. It can be assumed that there is a social demand for violence, and it is caused, apparently, by a high level of dehumanization of modern societies, when the violence is the only way to take pleasure in life. Social violence in consumer society – physical or mental, individual or intergroup – is not only symbolic, but also a very real one: some produce it, others consume it.

Paraphrasing a famous statement by Guattari, we can say that in the mode of desiring production-consumption, "there is absolutely no need for sublimation", that is, "the hell" with culture and civilization. (We have in mind the notorious statement from *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia* which expresses the true attitude of the child to his parents in mass societies). According to Fukuyama, trust by can be seen as a final desperate ethical argumentation, which, however, does not affect the mass consciousness of the post-industrial savage. The fact that some actors are still involved in the production process and do not resort to violence does not mean they are civilized or humanized.

A lot of modern societies are potentially aggressive, as evidenced not only by the statistics of domestic violence, but also by constant broadcast in the media. This means that modern individuals created by means of

production and consumer practices are inherently incapable of focusing on values, which restricts their desire for primitive satisfaction.

LITERATURA

1. Arendt, H. (1962). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company.
2. Baudrillard, J. (1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. London: Sage.
1. Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by R. Hurley, M. Seem and H. R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. URL: <https://libcom.org/files/Anti-Oedipus.pdf>. (Last accessed 03.02.2022).
2. Freud, S. (1921). *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVIII (1920-1922): Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works, 65-144. URL: http://freudians.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Freud_Group_Psychology.pdf. (Last accessed 03.02.2022).
3. Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc.
4. Giddens, A. (2013). *Sociology*. 7th revised edition. Oxford: Polity Press.
5. Kheyfets, B. (2018). *Metamorfoza jekonomicheskoy globalizacii [Metamorphosis of economic globalization. In Russian]*. Moscow: Institute of Economics RAS.
6. Le Bon, G. (2006). *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. New York: Cosimo, Inc.
3. Moses, A. D. (2008). "Genocide and Modernity." In: *The Historiography of Genocide*, edited by D. Stone, 156-193. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230297784_7. Last accessed 03.02.2022).
7. Nietzsche, F. (2010). On the genealogy of Morality. In: *Ethics: The Essential Writings*, edited by G. Marino, 274-292. New York: Modern Library, The Random House Publishing.
8. Nietzsche, F. (1999). *The Anti-Christ*. Translated by H. L. Mencken. Tucson AZ: See Sharp Press.
9. Ortega y Gasset, J. (1993). *The Revolt of the Masses*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

10. Reich, R. (2018). *Vriatuvaty kapitalizm. Yak zmusyty vilnyi rynek pratsiuvaty na liudei [Saving Capitalism: For the Many, Not the Few]*. Translated by Roman Kornuta. Kyiv: Nash format.

4. Ritzer, G. (2010). *Sociological theory*. 8th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. https://www.academia.edu/33077856/George_Ritzer_Sociological_Theory_8th_Edition_BookFi.org. (Last accessed 23.02.2022)

11. Spengler, O. (1926). *The Decline of the West: Perspectives of World-history*, Vol. 1. Charles Francis Atkinson [translation with notes]. London: Georg Allen & Unwin Atkinson LTD.

12. Spengler, O. (1928). *The Decline of the West: Perspectives of World-history*, Vol. 2. Charles Francis Atkinson [translation with notes]. London: Georg Allen & Unwin Atkinson LTD.

13. Wallerstein, I. (2001). *Analiz mirovyh sistem i situacija v sovremennom mire [World system analysis and modern world state. In Russian]*. Translated by P. Kudjukina. Edited by B. Kagarlickii. St. Petersburg: Universitetskaja kniga.

14. Žižek, S. (2006). *The Parallax View*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Arendt, H. (1962). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company.

2. Baudrillard, J. (1993). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. London: Sage.

3. Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by R. Hurley, M. Seem and H. R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. URL: <https://libcom.org/files/Anti-Oedipus.pdf>.

(Last accessed 03.02.2022).

4. Freud, S. (1921). *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVIII (1920-1922): Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works, 65-144. URL: http://freudians.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Freud_Group_Psychology.pdf. (Last accessed 03.02.2022).

5. Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc.

6. Giddens, A. (2013). *Sociology*. 7th revised edition. Oxford: Polity Press.

7. Kheifets, B. (2018). *Metamorfoza jekonomicheskoy globalizacii [Metamorphosis of economic globalization. In Russian]*. Moscow: Institute of Economics RAS.

8. Le Bon, G. (2006). *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. New York: Cosimo, Inc.

9. Moses, A. D. (2008). "Genocide and Modernity." In: *The Historiography of Genocide*, edited by D. Stone, 156-193. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230297784_7. Last accessed 03.02.2022]

10. Nietzsche, F. (2010). On the genealogy of Morality. In: *Ethics: The Essential Writings*, edited by G. Marino, 274-292. New York: Modern Library, The Random House Publishing.

11. Nietzsche, F. (1999). *The Anti-Christ*. Translated by H. L. Mencken. Tucson AZ: See Sharp Press.

12. Ortega y Gasset, J. (1993). *The Revolt of the Masses*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

13. Reich, R. (2018). *Vriatuvaty kapitalizm. Yak zmusyty vilnyi rynek pratsiuvaty na liudei [Saving Capitalism: For the Many, Not the Few]*. Translated by Roman Kornuta. Kyiv: Nash format.

14. Ritzer, G. (2010). *Sociological theory*. 8th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. https://www.academia.edu/33077856/George_Ritzer_Sociological_Theory_8th_Edition_BookFi.org. (Last accessed 23.02.2022)

15. Spengler, O. (1926). *The Decline of the West: Perspectives of World-history*, Vol. 1. Charles Francis Atkinson [translation with notes]. London: Georg Allen & Unwin Atkinson LTD.

16. Spengler, O. (1928). *The Decline of the West: Perspectives of World-history*, Vol. 2. Charles Francis Atkinson [translation with notes]. London: Georg Allen & Unwin Atkinson LTD.

17. Wallerstein, I. (2001). *Analiz mirovyh sistem i situacija v sovremennom mire [World system analysis and modern world state. In Russian]*. Translated by P. Kudjukina. Edited by B. Kagarlickii. St. Petersburg: Universitetskaja kniga.

18. Žižek, S. (2006). *The Parallax View*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Receive: March 22, 2022
Accepted: April 24, 2022