



---

## **Neo-globalization: Necessity, prospects and forms of evolution**

**Nikolay Eletsy**

Professor of Rostov Regional Department, Academy of Philosophy of Economics, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

---

### **Abstract**

The development of an objective basis of globalization, on the one hand, and the crisis of modern globalism, on the other, determine the necessity of transition to neo-globalization. On the common technical base of neo-economy there are possible various social forms and alternative trajectories of the evolution of neo-globalization. Neo-globalization is a long and complex process, in the early stages of which the phenomena of glocalization arise; contradictions between different models of global governance become more acute. The establishment of a new world order takes place under conditions of confrontation between the inertial models of globalism and the potential of humanization of global interactions. Humanistic alternative involves formational modification of the global society.

**Keywords:** globalization, global contradictions, crisis of globalism, new world order, neo-economy, neo-globalization, glocalization, formational transition, global political economy

---

### **Introduction**

The transition of humanity to the stage of global community is an essential feature of the modern stage of civilization. This transition is characterized by inconsistency and uncertainty of vectors of further evolution. To date, the historical limit of both technological and social factors of the previous types of functioning and development of society has been revealed. Formed by the beginning of the XXI century, structures and mechanisms of globalization that are correlated mainly with the dominance of global finance capital in world economy and politics, found their mismatch to objective realities of a changing world under transition to new technological paradigms and the evolution of world system in the direction of multipolarity and the launching of new centres of economic, political and ideological influence. The unipolar model of USA-centric hegemony, correlated by established terminology with the concept of "globalism", is undergoing an increasingly obvious erosion.

One of the key tasks of theoretical analysis, in this regard, is to differentiate the objective prerequisites of globalization, on the one hand, and the causes of the crisis of Americano-centric forms of globalism, on the other. The contradictions (if not the vices) of the unipolar globalism model formed and established to date are well-known and obvious: injustice and inequality, the cult of brute force, national-state and corporate selfishness, claims to exclusivity, double standards, the conflict of technological progress and humanism, etc. These contradictions are so deep and diverse that there are ideas of rejection of globalization in general – this is seen not only in the extremes of the slogans and actions of the anti-globalist movement, but also in the formulations of quite respectable politicians and experts – for example, at the last Davos Forums, the question of developing new rules for the "post-globalist" world was raised [26]. In the same vein, there are possible interpretations of Brexit, statements and some actions of D. Trump, trends of neo-protectionism, the renaissance of the

principle of national-state sovereignty, regional separatism and other similar modern processes.

In these conditions, the analysis of the necessity and forms of transition to "neo-globalization", overcoming the contradictions of modern globalism, but adequately embodying the objective prerequisites for the formation of a global civilizational community, is a key element of the research program of modern social sciences. At the same time, the study of the economic foundations of neo-globalization processes becomes the most important task of global political economy, which turns not only into a special section, but also into the main modern modification of political-economic knowledge [4; 8; 10].

Neo-globalization can develop in various forms, some of which are fraught with no less controversy than previous globalism. In this regard, there remains considerable uncertainty and variation of the poly furcation alternatives, which are equally possible at the present time, but are fraught with cardinal differences as they are implemented in future [3]. Since the trends in the manifestation of these alternatives and the actions of social forces interested in their implementation are observed already today, we can talk not only about theoretical models, concepts, scenarios of neo-globalization, but also about alternative agendas that synthesize theoretical approaches and practical actions of subjects (actors) of neo-globalization processes.

### **The formation of the neo-economy as an objective basis for the process of neo-globalization**

The developing radical changes in the productive forces constitute the objective material basis of social transformation, including the emergence and spread of new forms of globalization. The transition to a qualitatively new state of the productive forces was characterized in the previous decades and is now determined by various terminology and conceptual models. Previously, the ideas of post-industrial society and

service economy had significant popularity; now, due to facing the developed and the leading newly industrialized countries, the task of re-industrialization, more popular are the formulations about the sixth technological mode, the dominance of the tertiary and quaternary sectors of the economy, about the fourth industrial revolution and the emergence of "industry 4.0", about the virtualization of the economy. Generalizing for these and other modern theories is the concept of "neo-economics", which includes more and more special and specified aspects and trends of the currently occurring and dynamically changing processes of development of productive forces.

Regardless of the emphasis on particular features and phenomena, the essential attribute features of neo-economics are related to two factors: the first is the informatization of production processes; the second is their globalizing nature. Thus fore, the new technological mode of production can be defined as the "global-informational" one. In the system of neo-economics, first of all, there goes an informational globalization of factors of production and its resource base: economic information becomes the main factor and result of production; mechanisms for the use of traditional resources and labour are also being globalized, and the qualities of workforce are increasingly unified in the context of increasing universalization of the elements of labour content. The economic mechanism undergoes an adequate transformation: globalizing TNCs act as the main production unit (complex); reproduction relationships are carried out through the world market, functioning on the basis of global information networks. Informational factors and production results initially have the potential for global universality; at the same time, the production of materialized forms of goods, while maintaining technological spatial discreteness, acquires a single economic quality and planetary unification through the formation of global value chains. Even at the end of the twentieth century in the value of the car, made in USA, 30% was accounted for by components produced in Korea, 17.5% from Japanese advanced technology and spare parts; 7.5% for design services of German firms; 4% - to Taiwan and Singapore parts; 2.5% - for services to British companies in the field of marketing and advertising; 1.5% - on cost companies to Ireland and Barbados for data processing, and only 37% of the car value was created in the USA itself. Since 2009, world exports of intermediate goods have exceeded the total exports of final products and investment goods combined [27].

There are obvious features of global-informational quality inherent in such sides and elements of neo-economics as digitalization, Internet business, Internet of things, artificial intelligence, robotics, additive technologies, nano- and biotechnologies, big data processing, distributed registries, sharing networks, electronic currency, exchange, credit, insurance operations, etc. Modern processes of reindustrialization are characterized in many cases by the synthesis of information technologies and the latest methods of production of embodied forms of goods, a typical example of which is, for example, additive technologies that synthesize the achievements of robotics, computer modeling and materials science.

Neo-economics is characterized by global unification of production and consumer standards, on the one hand, and individualization of consumer demands, on the other. Flexible automated production systems allow you to vary the consumer properties of goods in relation to the increasingly detailed

segmented demand, up to the demand made by individual individuals who can get information through an online trading system and make an order for a product produced anywhere in the world. Individualized demand is realized through global supply; at the same time, the production and supply of an individual product is correlated with global demand. Alongside this, commodity genetics of money determines the relationship of globalization of commodity relations with the globalization of the monetary system, which is reflected in the planetary mechanisms of traditional currencies and the emergence of a global-scale application of the virtual (crypto-) currencies.

Informational-computer technologies, personal computers included in global information networks radically change the technical and social parameters of the concept of "workplace"; the relationship between the concepts of "labour place" in the technical and ergonomic sense and "place of work" in the administrative and legal sense is changing. The territorial-geographical and economic coincidence or identification of these concepts, typical for the previous stages of economic civilization, is overcome. The ratio of the concepts of "working" and "free" time is also changing; their proportions in the system of information production are increasingly determined by the employee himself and are outside the sphere of official and administrative regulation, which is facilitated, in particular, by the spread of out staffing and freelancing.

Objective prerequisites are maturing and elements of institutional and legal registration of global property are emerging. The formation of global property is, at the same time, the objective basis of the genesis of global economic governance. Economic governance generally is one of the attributive aspects of the implementation of property relations; this general economic pattern is now manifested at the global level [9]. Global governance necessarily implies global goal-setting and systematic impact on global processes, as well as the formation of a resource base, tools, mechanisms and institutions of governance. The genesis of global property and global economic governance is contradictory; the causes and forms of resolution of these contradictions in the context of the laws of the evolution of neo-economics are of the essential aspects of the subject of global political economy [6;13]. Of particular importance is the fact that social management based on global informational-communication technologies contains the technical potential for the emergence of extreme forms of totalitarianism in the system of the so-called "transparent society", in which all aspects of life are under the absolute control of supervisory authorities.

Neo-economy as a phenomenon of information nature, which has a global scale, is objectively a qualitatively new stage in the development of world economic civilization, replacing the production of the traditional industrial type. In this context, it can really be defined as a post-industrial economy. The social and economic practice of the last decades has generally confirmed the truth of the predictive characteristics of post-industrial society developed by D. Bell, A. Toffler, P. Drucker and other post-industrial theorists. Neo-economics really developing as a knowledge economy based on the dominance of information resources and forms of wealth; there happen radical transformations of the sectoral structure of the economy, the labour content and place of the employee in automatizing production system; the importance of environmental factors and the transition to nature-protection and nature-saving type of

Economic activity dramatically increases. In connection with this, it can hardly be considered fair criticism of the concept of post-industrialism in the context of deindustrialization of developed countries, because the practice of de-industrialization is not due to the essential ideas of the theoretical concept of post-industrialism, but by the wrong economic policy.

Neo-economics as an objective phenomenon, as a new qualitative stage in the development of world economic civilization, necessarily implies, by virtue of its global information nature, the further development and deepening of globalization. However, specific forms, processes and mechanisms of globalization interactions may differ significantly, and in their social manifestations act as alternative, opposing and counteracting each other. Herewith the objective contradictions of globalization can be supplemented and strengthened by subjective contradictions that arise as a result of attempts to consciously manage globalization processes <sup>[22]</sup>.

Due to the fact that the intensive development of neo-economics is currently continuing, and many of its parameters, sides and elements have not yet fully revealed their technical and social nature, have not reached the full realization of their essence, - then the processes of neo-globalization adequate to this essence can be characterized only in their main contours, in the context of the most clearly manifested to date alternative trends. Objectively there are technical possibilities of the different models of neo-globalization, and the actual implementation of only one of the alternatives in the future will be due to the ratio and form of manifestation of social factors and contradictions.

### **Neo-globalization by means of glocalization**

Theoretical justifications of unipolar globalism, and in particular, the concept of "hegemonic stability", argue that the hegemonic country should "assume most of the costs of maintaining this system and is especially ready to be the first to commit to support unprofitable for itself measures, namely: to buy surplus goods, maintain the flow of investment and provide discounts on its commercial paper" <sup>[15, p. 28]</sup>. In fact, rather than incurring the cost of ensuring the effective functioning of global structures, the United States sought to fully extract economic benefits from its leading position and the privileged role of the dollar in the global financial system; for several decades, the seignorage mechanism provided the US with the ability to carry out up to 40-45% of world consumption with a share in world production of about 20%. The indeed majority of global costs are accounted for by this country in the military sphere, but achieving military hegemony is no less correlated with national and state interests of the US than with the economic interests of the international financial oligarchy, for which today it is necessary to attract resources, not only of the US but other countries that is reflected in the requirement of President D. Trump to them to increase their military spending.

Dynamism of the neo-economics development has strengthened the law of uneven economic and social development in the world and contributed to the emergence of new centers of power and influence. This leads to changes of the flows of international capital, fragmentation of the interests of the geo-oligarchy and the discreteness of national-state instruments for the implementation of these interests. The emergence of new centers of geo-economic and geopolitical influence promoted the reformatting of the world economic system in the direction of

multipolarity. The role of global institutions that embody the mechanisms of a multipolar world order has increased, for example, within the G20 (the functions of the Financial Stability Board are particularly important); the IMF is considering a possible transfer of the headquarters of this organization to China <sup>[16]</sup>; global financial and economic projects are being developed within the framework of the BRICS; many countries are trying to diversify their monetary policy and limit their dependence on the monopoly dominance of the dollar, etc.

In addition, in contrast to the processes of global unification in the production and consumer spheres, similar (and, in fact, objectively inevitable) processes in the spiritual-cultural and, in part, in the political spheres cause psychological discomfort among the population of many countries of the world, representatives of many ethnic groups and religious confessions. The problem of preserving national-state, regional and ethnic identification has sharply worsened, and supporters of the principles of national-state sovereignty and regional autonomy have become more active <sup>[20]</sup>. As the antithesis of the modern form of globalism, anti - and alterglobalist movements emerged. The trends of multipolarity formation are most relevant for large countries and their coalitions, while the problems of ethnic and cultural self-identification and protection of state sovereignty and regional autonomy have become more acute not only in these countries, but also in others – medium and small countries, and in all regions of the world.

Processes considered, of course, can't become an obstacle to the objective trends in the evolution of neo-economy, and above all - for the development of information technologies and the spread of global value chains that make up the objective basis of the production unity of the world economic system. But these processes can cause the features of the early stages of neo-globalization, correlated with the phenomena of glocalization. Glocalization constitutes as a reaction to the accumulated contradictions of modern globalism and a form of their resolution or, at least, mitigation. Through glocalization, the tendencies of fragmentation of the world economy are activated; the procedures for making globally significant decisions are transferred to the level of individual countries and their integration groups; protectionism mechanisms are partially revived <sup>[1]</sup>. The gravity center of the genesis of global governance is moving from the bureaucratic instances of global corporations and international organizations to regional associations, within which there are formed structures that are the prototype of future global management institutions.

However, herewith the essential feature of glocalization is not the revival of the primacy of local laws of development, characteristic of previous eras, but the functioning of local processes under the determining influence of the laws of globalization. Therefore, it's hardly correct to correlate the phenomena of glocalization with the concept of deglobalization. The development of the processes of modern glocalization takes place in a constant increase in quantitative parameters and a variety of forms of global information flows, which takes place regardless of fluctuations in the dynamics of world trade and international capitals migration. Over the past 15 years, since 2005, the volume of global economic information flows has increased by about 40-45 times, many times ahead of the dynamics of other macroeconomic indicators <sup>[18; 24]</sup>. The unity of the modern world neo-economics (and the entire modern world

as a whole) is, first of all, its informational unity. In this regard, glocalization does not appear as an indication and form of deglobalization, but as a new, historically necessary stage and form of the evolution of globalization.

The activity of individual countries and their groups to ensure local interests are carried out in the conditions of integration of the economic systems of these local structures in the global information and production processes, financial relations and mechanisms for the formation of value chains. The "corridor of freedom" of actions of local subjects is limited only by the possibility of choosing the most favorable forms of adaptation to the laws of globalization, in the absence of the possibility of changing the essence of these laws. But even with the limitations of this "freedom corridor", there is a wide range of decision-making options, and the optimal choice of the right decisions requires a skillful economic policy. The specific proportions of the ratio of positive and negative consequences of globalization for a particular local subject depend on the degree of correctness of these decisions, and in modern world practice these proportions differ very significantly. The chosen directions and forms of economic policy can contribute to both benefit from the deepening of integration into world economic processes, and joining the number of "victims" of globalization and neo-economics.

From a further historical perspective, it is obvious that glocalization, multipolarity, the renaissance of the principle of state sovereignty and neo-protectionism can only be temporary and exist only at the early stages of neo-globalization (in this context, we can also consider the projects proposed by China, which now claims to be the leader of globalization against the background of D. Trump's anti-globalist declarations). In the subsequent strengthening of the internal integration of global economic processes will inevitably lead to an increasing role of more effective and the displacement of less competitive local entities, submission, or eliminate the last, priority implementation of the interests of global capital through the state structures of the most powerful nation or through the supranational bodies of strongest integration groupings.

As an intermediate stage of global interstate competition, it's possible to form a bipolar world economic configuration, the contours of which are already visible in the contradictory symbiosis of the US and Chinese economic systems. The current distribution of functions within the "big two", with the US playing the role of financial and scientific, and China – the production center of the world economic system, is likely to change. On the one hand, the United States will try to re-industrialize and strengthen the material base of the real economy by maintaining the role of scientific and financial leader and using the tools of neo-protectionism; on the other hand, China is stubbornly striving for leadership in high-tech areas and to complement the already achieved status of the "workshop of the world" with the functions of a "world scientific laboratory" and a financial center.

The existing interdependence within this bipolar structure will change its shape as the balance of forces changes. The contradiction between the unified and consolidated interests of global capital, on the one hand, and the national-state interests of the leading powers, on the other, is likely to be resolved through a chain of compromises that consistently reflect the changing

Balance of power<sup>[5]</sup>. In this respect, the dynamic development of new industrial countries, their transformation from local and regional leaders to the global ones through the effective use of the opportunities of the neo-economy is of particular importance. The most obvious and promising example of this is India, which has already become one of the centers of a multipolar world economic configuration and is intensively strengthening its geo-economic and geopolitical role. As it's known, in recent years, India has demonstrated one of the highest growth rates in the world, outpacing even China in this indicator<sup>[6]</sup>.

The transition to a new model of globalization through the struggle between the leaders of a multipolar glocalization system will inevitably have an ethnic and ethno-state aspect, acting as a modern modification of the struggle between "historical peoples" (by Hegelian terminology). As for ultimate development of neo-globalization processes in the form of glocalization, it can lead to victory of the one of the localized centers of neo-economics defeating in the global competition, and secure the domination of geo-oligarchy in the social shell of total world domination of one of the States (or interstate alliances). Alongside this, the statehood of other countries can be eliminated or subjected to extremely subordinate formalization, and the ethno-ideological dominance of one of the civilizational systems may be fixed on a global state-institutionalized scale.

### **Neo-globalization as a process of forming a single corporation**

With the further development of the neo-economy, the processes of neo-globalization can also be realized as an inertial evolution of the principles and mechanisms of globalism that have already been formed to date on the basis of the established dominance of international financial capital. This implies a further evolution of TNCs, transforming into global corporations (GCs), but in the ultimate, maximum possible embodiment of these processes, giving them a new quality. To put it simply, this option of neo-globalization assumes the complete omnipotence of the "iron heel", which, according to some authors of dystopias, will suppress all mankind and bring to the limit the omnipotence of the top geo-oligarchy. Organizationally, the "iron heel" will take the form, prospects for the emergence of which were analyzed at the beginning of the twentieth century in the concepts of "world trust" or "world corporation", the contours of which were then characterized over the next decades.

The development of global property relations can lead to the control of all planetary resources and the disposal of all types of public wealth by an extremely narrow group of "finite beneficiaries", i.e., the final stage of processes will be achieved, during which the capitals of the 8 richest businessmen have already reached a volume equal to the amount of funds of half the world's population<sup>[21]</sup>. In the early stages of this variant of neo-globalization, the erosion of the principle of national-state sovereignty will continue, and the government apparatus of even the largest States will increasingly perform the functions of the hardware structures of the global oligarchy. Further interweaving and interpenetration of corporate capital, unification and strengthening of integrative "coherence" of financial and organizational processes on the production basis of the spread of global value chains are objectively focused on the formation of a single global information, production and financial system; this system is characterized by an essential historical novelty, but,

Taking into account the influence of the terminological tradition of the previous era, it can be conditionally defined as a single global corporation.

The formation of a multi-level and complexly structured management system of a single global corporation will inevitably weaken, and in the future -overcome the relics of the "Westphalian system". Hardware functions will be completely transferred from States to global organizational structures that have grown out of the consolidating inter-corporate management apparatus of the GCs and radically transformed international organizations, or to new bodies specially created to ensure the interests of the global financial and corporate oligarchy, using the experience of already emerging globalizing non-state actors (similar to private military companies).

At the same time, the development of global hardware tools based on the consolidation of the GCs capital will be correlated with the institutional design of the real "world government", which is currently represented by informal structures that unite the leading representatives of the globocracy. Thus, among the most important goals of the Bilderberg club, analysts include the creation of a "single World Government (global Corporation) with one global market, the security of which will be provided by the global world army, and the financial regulation of one (world) Central Bank using a single world currency»<sup>[11]</sup>; it's also of crucial importance the adoption of "global legal system... and the overall goal of a global government and the end of national sovereignty"<sup>[17]</sup>.

So, one global production and financial corporation, a single global market, one world Central Bank, a single world currency and a world government that guarantees their functioning, and a single global army are the main elements of the neo-globalization project designed to ensure the absolute domination of a quantitatively extremely limited global financial oligarchy. In the following, as monetary relations become virtualized, the financial oligarchy will be transformed into a geo-oligarchy "in general" as the subject embodiment of universal social power and domination. It can be interpreted as "information geo-oligarchy" - ownership of information and its material media is by its social role of adequate ownership of land in traditional societies, the ownership of industrial enterprises in the conditions of classical capitalism and of financial capital – in terms of its monopoly stage.

The social stratification inevitable for such a model of the world order presupposes the existence of a privileged servant staff, quantitatively limited by the needs of the oligarchy, and by the need to perform bureaucratic functions in the administrative, industrial, military and ideological spheres. To perform the functions of technical control and management in these areas are intended, if extrapolating existing trends, representatives of the anglo-saxon ethnic community. Further, as the degree of privilege decreases, the romano-germanic ethnic groups of Western Europe will be represented – and so on, meanwhile the vast majority of the world's population will actually be in the status of slaves - with all possible external modification of this status, but the certainty of its social nature. Besides, it should be borne in mind that in accordance with the already well-known plans of the current world "backstage", the world's population should be repeatedly reduced and not exceed 1 billion people in the future (although particularly zealous "friends of humanity"

even this figure consider overstated; they offer a "limit" of 200 or even 100 million people)<sup>[2]</sup>.

It's quite obvious that the existence of such an extremely totalitarian social system can be ensured through a comprehensive repressive apparatus, continuous monitoring and control of all aspects of the life of each individual and comprehensive ideological processing of the population. And for this just the modern information and communication systems provide technical capabilities unprecedented in previous history, on the basis of which traditional democratic procedures and institutions are already undergoing full formalization and becoming a fiction.

As for ideological dictate and control, modern technology can turn it into a psychological-mental, far surpassing in this respect the most-gloomy predictions of the authors of dystopias. The simplest and actually achieved level of control is to identify the mindset of each individual through continuous monitoring of information in personal gadgets. It is well known that the world's intelligence agencies monitor tens of billions of electronic messages every day, each of which is stored in computer memory databases and, if necessary, can be immediately extracted. Recently, the technical capabilities of the Internet of Things and Artificial Intelligence have been actively used to monitor individual electronic content - the content of individual messages is tracked by a multi-level system of automatic computer control. By code words and other programmed signs, computers determine whether a particular message should be immediately sent to the archive, or transferred to a higher level of computer processing, and if necessary, from its highest levels, presented for analysis to a human operator. New, much broader opportunities for this kind of control will arise as the transition to quantum computers and the further development of artificial intelligence. However, the identification and subsequent "neutralization" of the unreliable is only the initial and simplest level of ideological control and political dictatorship of the oligarchy. Much more important is the fact that information technology allows, starting from the first days of human life, so "format" the consciousness of each person and affect his subconscious mind, that the mental and psychological type of personality, in principle, can't become an opponent of the oligarchy, perceiving its dominance as a natural law of nature and being unable to imagine any other type of social order. With this, it will become unnecessary and control of "thoughtcrimes" due to the disappearance of such ones. One of the well-known and already widely implemented in practice areas of mental and psychological manipulation can serve the recipes of "behavioral economics" with its applied developments to "push" the consumer in the direction of "correct" choice, even while maintaining the illusory freedom of this choice, in fact, strictly predetermined by the "architects" of the social world order.

The ability to control the flows of information through existing technologies confirms the validity of the arguments of those analysts who critically assess the perception of modern terrorism – both international and domestic - as a spontaneous, spontaneous and unmanageable phenomenon. All channels for the movement of information related to terrorist activities in one way or another – the spread of ideas of terrorism, its financing, the organization of terrorist attacks, the movement of criminals – can be fully monitored. The root of the problem is that today terrorism is one

of the tools of "controlled chaos", consciously and systematically used by the international and national oligarchy as a method of social management, manipulation and repression against the objectionable. Attempts not only to counteract, but even the most moderate opposition to the dictates of the oligarchy, sponsoring terrorism, neo-fascism, aggressive anti-social and anti-humanist extremism are suppressed through an increasingly sophisticated arsenal of globally coordinated repressions, provocations, harassment, "hybrid wars", "color revolutions", "humanitarian interventions", "sanctions", which, in particular, had to face in recent years, many states.

When describing social differentiation under the domination of geo-oligarchy, we cannot ignore the potential for the development of genetic engineering, neo-eugenics and transplantology, which can turn social differences into biological ones in the future. The high life expectancy, far exceeding the world average, and the continued effective working capacity demonstrated today by some representatives of the financial, political and ideological elite, is, of course, due not only to the high quality of medical care and a healthy diet, but also to the replacement of organs – often multiple, and in some cases – criminal by methods of obtaining them. Technically, there are no obstacles to the predicted even deeper biological transformation of representatives of the privileged elite of the oligarchic society, leading to the emergence, if not a new biological species, then at least a subspecies, with simultaneous biological degradation, especially mental and psychological, of the main part of the human community<sup>[23]</sup>.

The tendency noted above of neo-globalization in the form of a single global corporation with the strengthening of the rule of geo-oligarchy and while maintaining the exploitative capitalist socio-economic principles of society order is fundamentally possible on the basis of the potential of technology, already achieved and projected for the immediate future. At the same time, the question of the fundamental possibility, and even more so – the mechanisms for getting out of this kind of anti-human state of society, is characterized by complete uncertainty today.

### **Problem of panhuman interests and humanistic alternatives of neo-globalization forms**

The objective necessity and inevitability of further development of globalization processes is quite obvious, and we can talk about finding new forms of globalization that allow, at least, to mitigate, and in the future – to overcome the contradictions discussed above. In recent years, scientific developments and speeches by a number of world political leaders have repeatedly characterized the principles and features of the desired new world order, adequate to the interests of all mankind: equality and mutual respect, freedom and justice, expansion of the number of subjects for making globally significant decisions involving representatives of all civilizational systems, rejection of the desire for unilateral benefits, social harmony and social responsibility, respect for traditional values and human dignity, resolution of disputes by peaceful means, through negotiations taking into account the interests of all parties, a combination of interdependence, integration and openness while preserving the unique identity of each nation and region, recognition of sovereignty as the basis of the system of international relations, etc.

The formulated ideas can, apparently, be considered as the conceptual core of the humanistic project of neo-globalization. This project is intended to "look beyond the horizon of events" in order to overcome the conflict between technological progress and humanism, which is characteristic of the forms of globalism that are now established and have demonstrated their historical limit. How realistic are these ideas and what are the prospects for a humanistic model of neo-globalization in the context of the continued dominance of alternative inertial concepts and projects?

The inertial models of neo-globalization discussed above, with differences in the mechanisms of their evolution and in the tools for asserting the dominance of the global oligarchy, are characterized by a common formational nature, subordination of universal interests to private ones, and preservation of the capitalist-exploitative essence of the world economic civilization, regardless of the variety of modifications of this essence. The priority probability of implementing these models is due to factors of social inertia and, in particular, the preservation in the foreseeable future of full control of the international oligarchy over all the main instruments of global governance in the economic, political, ideological and military spheres.

At the same time, this control, while ensuring the realization of the interests of the oligarchy, is not able, however, to eliminate the deep objective contradiction between the achieved and increasing level of socialization of production on a global scale and the continuing private appropriation of the results of general planetary production, including world (global) profits. The potential universality of information consumption as its internal technological attribute, the global nature of the use of basic traditional production resources, the formation of global value chains<sup>[14]</sup>, the need for goal-setting and planning on a global scale<sup>[7]</sup> characterize not only the achievement of a global level of socialization of production, but also determine the role of post-capitalist transformation as an adequate social shell for the development of the neo-economy.

The various contradictions discussed above are largely predetermined by the inadequacy of private-capitalist attribution to the social character of globalizing production. It is impossible to achieve optimal economic movement of a global phenomenon based on the principles that embody the laws of the previous stages of economic civilization. Optimal forms of development of global production and appropriation of world profits are possible only in the system of global property relations, the subject of which is the whole of humanity and the economic implementation of which involves the appropriation of the results of production in the interests of all mankind<sup>[10]</sup>. But the emergence of such a system of relations would mean that there is a formational transition to post-capitalist development.

The technological basis of the neo-economy contains an objective potential for post-capitalist formational transition, but the prospects for the actual realization of this potential are very limited (at least at the present time) due to the marked discrepancy between the required changes in the social world order and the interests of the oligarchy and its continued dominance in all spheres of public life. It is obvious that the implementation of global interests can be achieved instrumentally through the activities of global structures that have universally recognized supranational functions.

Meanwhile, their current prototypes, performing some of the technical functions of the world government (the WTO as a prototype of the global Ministry of trade; the FRS, the World Bank, the IMF as the actual departments of the global Ministry of Finance) are clearly focused in the main content of their activities not on the interests of all mankind, but on serving global capital and the state interests of US. To a slightly greater extent, the stability of the global economy as a global value is subject to regulation by the Financial Stability Board created under the G-20; there is a focus on universal interests in the activities of global organizations such as WHO, ILO, UNESCO and some other structures within the UN. But in general, the role of this organization as a global regulator of social relations and contradictions is rather insignificant (especially in the economic sphere), and more – most its departments act as a hardware tool for private interests of international capital and the leading group of countries headed by the USA that leads to many proposals for UN reform.

Of course, in the modern world, there is an urgent need for radical changes, for liberation from the ugly and in many respects absurd state into which humanity has been plunged as a result of the domination of the global oligarchy and fulfilling its will state apparatus of the US. This acute need was manifested, in particular, by numerous calls for Russia and its leader to intervene and influence the course of events on various occasions and in different regions of the world <sup>[12]</sup>. Not all cases of assistance are possible, but these facts themselves strongly indicate the main thing: the world is waiting for a leader who could lead the fight for a radical restructuring of the global order, and above all - for limiting the omnipotence of the geo-oligarchy, one of the goals of which is to multiple reduce the number of inhabitants of the planet by unleashing wars, encouraging terrorism and other forms of crime, propaganda and imposing antisocial behaviors and lifestyles <sup>[19]</sup>. But the success of such a struggle, again, is possible only through a post-capitalist formational reconstruction of global society; while maintaining the private-capitalist social shell of global processes, the contradictions described above will only deepen, and their external symptoms will be suppressed by totalitarian repression.

In addition to regulating socio-economic, inter-state and ethnic issues, the fundamental problem of humanizing a post-capitalist society is the need to find an optimal and fair balance between information transparency of social interactions, on the one hand, and individual rights, on the other. Due to the socially indifferent parameters of modern technologies, information transparency has both positive and negative features in terms of the functioning of society as a whole and the interests of an individual. The necessary restrictions in this regard can only be the result of a new form of "social contract" that reflects both the inevitability and obligation of new forms of information control and its positive effect, and social guarantees of individual freedom and non-interference in private life that does not violate the norms recognized by society. Attitudes to expand control over the Internet and the creation of a system of personal social ratings (so-called "credits") in China can limit the negative impact of various anti-social and criminal structures, but at the same time, can obviously contribute to the deepening of subordination of individual life activities to comprehensive state supervision <sup>[25]</sup>. It's also necessary in the field of bioengineering to determine the relationship between freedom of activity and the principles of

humanism, justice and stability that is effective from the point of view of public interests. The humanistic alternative in social Evolution is incompatible with the extremes of neo-eugenics, which is fraught with a split of humanity into unequal biological subspecies. At the same time, there is a clear need for further development of the technical parameters of valeology, acmeology and genetic engineering in order to fight diseases and achieve active longevity for every inhabitant of the planet.

However, the practical prospects for the formation of a humanistic model of neo-globalization are extremely complicated by the realities of the modern domination of geo-oligarchy. No matter how obvious the emergence of the objective potential of humanistic transformations in the neo-economics system is, but the dominance of counter-trends of self-interest reproduction of the global oligarchy and its domination in the political, ideological and military spheres is equally unconditional. This blocks the potential opportunity for the development of forms of neo-globalization that meet the interests of all mankind, and sharply actualizes the problem of formational modification of global society.

### Conclusion

The necessity for neo-globalization is due, on the one hand, to the inevitability of further development and deepening of the imperatives of globalization, and, on the other, to the urgent need to overcome the shortcomings and contradictions of modern globalism. Herewith, there are significant features of the nearest and distant prospects of non-globalization.

The above-mentioned trends of neo-globalization are determined by the internal logic of the evolution of the globalizing production process, neo-economy, global property and global management, and organizational structures of GCs. The described model of strengthening the dominance of the international information and financial oligarchy within the global corporation is the most adequate, from the point of view of profit maximization, to the internal logic of the development of the social shell of the neo-economy system. However, the immaturity and inconsistency of this model at the present stage of development of world economic civilization, its inherent potency of anti-humanism, cause the emergence of other, alternative trends and mechanisms that in a different form embody the same objective laws of globalization. These alternative forms include the recent increasing trends of the globalization of economic and other social interactions. Alongside this, the most important feature of neo-globalization in the near future will inevitably be the continuation of competition between the two main models of global governance – the model of "the government of the strongest power as a world government" (with attempts to revive unipolar globalism) and the model of "GCs, global and interstate organizations as a world government". The prospects for the correlation and forms of competition of these models, as well as the possibility of implementing the humanistic version of neo-globalization, are characterized by considerable uncertainty, depend on many factors and reflect the uncertainty of the evolution of the neo-economy and the modern stage of civilization as a whole.

### References

1. Biermann F, Pattberg Ph, Zelli F. The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis. *Global Environmental Politics*. 2009; 9(4):14-40.

2. Bilderberg Plans World Population Reduction of 80%. - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rpog5q5n-XE>.
3. Chistyakov AD, Eletsky ND. Fuzzy Set Theory Tools in Models of Uncertainties in Economics. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, 2020, 1095:604-612.
4. Cohn TH. *Global Political Economy: Theory and Practice*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed., Routledge, New York, 2016.
5. Desai R. *Geopolitical Economy: After US Hegemony, Globalization and Empire. The Future of World Capitalism*. Pluto Press, and Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, London, 2013, 328 p.
6. Doshi S. Why India can show us how to achieve growth with purpose.-<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/10/purpose-driven-growth-india/>
7. Global Action Plan. - <https://www.globalactionplan.org.uk/>
8. *Global Political Economy* / ed. by John Ravenhill. – 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Oxford University Press, London & New York, 2017, 504.
9. Eletsky N. Contradictions of Formation of the Global Economic Governance System. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, 2016, 2(10).
10. Eletsky N. Global Political Economy in Context of Evolution of Political-Economic Thought. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science: Economics*, 2017, 17(1).
11. Estulin D. The True Story of the Bilderberg Group. - [https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/1790841.The\\_True\\_Story\\_of\\_the\\_Bilderberg\\_Group](https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/1790841.The_True_Story_of_the_Bilderberg_Group).
12. Europeans turned to Putin. - <https://inforeactor.ru/85468-evropeicy-obratilis-k-putinu-hot-ty-i-kommunist-no-spastinas-bolshe-nekomu>
13. Issues and Actors in the Global Political Economy. - [http://www.academia.edu/5123463/Issues\\_and\\_Actors\\_in\\_the\\_Global\\_Political\\_Economy](http://www.academia.edu/5123463/Issues_and_Actors_in_the_Global_Political_Economy)
14. Johnson RC. Measuring Global Value Chains. *Annual Review of Economics*, 2018; 10:207-236.
15. Kindleberger Ch. *The World in Depression: 1929-1939*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 2013, 344 p.
16. Lagarde. International Monetary Fund might move headquarters to Beijing, China. - <https://www.technocracy.news/lagarde-international-monetary-fund-might-move-headquarters-beijing-china/>
17. Lendman S. “The True Story of the Bilderberg Group” and What They May Be Planning Now. - <https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-true-story-of-the-bilderberg-group-and-what-they-may-be-planning-now/13808>
18. Manyika J. *et al.* Global Flows in a Digital Age.- <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/global-flows-in-a-digital-age>
19. Maxwell J. *Matrix of Power: How the World Has Been Controlled by Powerful People Without Your Knowledge*. Book Tree, Escondido, 2000.
20. Naz N. A regional analysis of housing, availability of household amenities and modern facilities in scheduled tribe population in Uttarakhand. *International Journal of Humanities and Arts*. 2019; 1(2):16-21.
21. Oxfam International. An economy for the 99%.- <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/economy-99>.
22. Pedersen JD. Managing Globalization: India and China Compared. In: Patibandla M., Kumar R. (Eds). *Institutional Dynamics and the Evolution of the Indian Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2009.
23. Quality of Life in Conditions of Global Transformation of Mankind-<http://en.tsu.ru/news/quality-of-life-in-conditions-of-global-transformation-of-mankind/> of Mankind
24. Rise of information and communications technology. - <https://www.coursehero.com/file/p6koqk2/The-rise-of-information-and-communications-technology-Information-flows/>
25. Social rating in China. - [http://tadviser.com/index.php/Article:Social\\_rating\\_in\\_China](http://tadviser.com/index.php/Article:Social_rating_in_China)
26. World Economic Forum’s, 2019. Annual Meeting in Davos to Focus on Shaping a New Architecture for the Next Wave of Globalization. - <https://www.weforum.org/press/2018/11/world-economic-forum-s-2019-annual-meeting-in-davos-to-focus-on-shaping-a-new-architecture-for-the-next-wave-of-globalization/>
27. World Trade Organization. Annual Report. WTO, Geneva, 1998, 172.