



УДК 330.8:303.02

## **NATIONAL ECONOMIC INTERESTS: CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND GLOBAL CONTEXT**

---

**TATARENKO N.O.,  
Diplomatic Academy  
of Ukraine of the  
Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs of Ukraine,  
Professor**

The paper considers current paradigm of globalization, its geo-economic implications and impact on national economies. The author analyzes the problems of realization of national interests, the impact of external factors that define the basic parameters of national economic strategies. The paper elaborates on the problems in formulation of independent national economic policies for the countries in the process of reforms and identifies the conditions that ensure economic sovereignty. Particular attention is paid to non-economic factors of national economic policies - the interaction of cultures within society that requires and provides, according to the author, the priority of traditional culture and mentality, secures priority of national interests above private.

**Keywords.** The national economy, national economic interests, individual economic interests, cultural space, the priority of national interests, culture, traditions, culture of innovation, communitarism, economic nationalism, ideology.

The current economic globalization project in its essence can be interpreted as the intention of the global economic space monopolization, that is realized on the basis of its unification: in fact the aim of the global economy liberalization declared by dominating states is its “atomization”, that simplifies the processes of submission and acquisition, and considers forming of a single-pole world ruled from one economic centre as its final goal.

Multivector direction of the globalization process, that is mostly implemented at the level of nation states and civilized entities, heterogeneity of the globalization flow in economic, political, social and cultural spheres

makes it possible to consider this surely nonlinear integration process from the perspective of synergetic approach: this synergy is provided by the effect of complementarity and mutual reinforcement of the monopolization processes taking place in all spheres of public life.

Of course, as it is correctly stated by A. Yermolayev [1], the problem of geoeconomic paradigm of the world development was formed objectively, and became relevant as a result of eliminating the principles of states cooperation. It should only be noted that these changes are the result of conscious imposition and dissemination of the ideology of liberalization, individualization (reduction to the level of interaction between individuals) of the cooperation between states, and therefore weakening their political and economic sovereigns. This means they have lowered down from the level of the cooperation between states to the level of cooperation between economic entities, which is possible only under the conditions of the absolutization of the idea of openness. The corresponding ideology makes no emphasis on the fact that these relations are built under the conditions of fierce competition. In the result of this interdependence and interpenetration of national economies, and following “mergers and acquisitions” at the global level, their division into dominant and peripheral takes place causing the destruction of the traditional characteristic of nation states, methods and instruments of national interests realization.

The current geoeconomic paradigm really denies the doctrine and ideology of protecting national interests that prevailed during the era of nation states. The idea of this doctrine was that each state and therefore, social entity, first of all realises, promotes and protects its national interests, subjecting individual ones to them. National interest implies the creation of conditions for economic expansion of the country and gaining certain positions on the world market, protection the interests of national capitals on the world (rather than domestic) markets, which creates conditions to provide internal balance, to maintain crisis-free production and living standards, which would correspondingly ensure sustainability, preservation of identity, traditions of sovereignty as the basis for the state development, protection of national security in the political, military and economic spheres.

This interest could not have been realised, if it had not implied the combination of the national capital interests with social interests, directly related to the

welfare state and distribution (being unfair in terms of national capitals) of social benefits. On the one hand there is a deep contradiction between these interests, since social interests are satisfied by producing forces of the national capital, and on the other hand - the national capital increase due to the use of social resources and human potentials, as well as the state's patronage on the foreign markets.

The crisis of the concept of national interests is in fact related to the “victory” of individualistic aspirations of national capital and cosmopolization of the nature of their activities. The idea of economic freedom is mostly suitable for the national capital, seeking release from the state power within the country, anyway it still does not refuse its patronage on the world markets. National capitals naturally accept the presence of the state where it suits them, and try to get rid of its interference wherever it threatens the income rates and freedom of movement. Even if such freedom leads to the destruction of statehood and harms the society, and far more has criminal consequences. That is, liberalism (derived from the concept of individualism) as an ideology favouring national capitals requires eliminating the state influence (and first of all the distributive one) on the economic processes in order to ensure freedom of movement and operation of these capitals (without any boundaries and limitations). Instead, the realisation of the concept of national interests, derived from communitarianism, the idea of statehood, require other approaches, i.e. an ideology that would advocate the right of the state to be a representative of the society's interests and to use the national capitals in its favour.

The opposition of nationwide (communitarian) and individual interests (whether they are represented with the interests of the owners of capital, or sovereign lords, or a separate economic entity) in the historic and sustainable economic context is always irreconcilable and results in the dominating of one or another doctrine at certain stages of development (“pendulum effect” [2]). It should be noted, that the ideas of liberalism and communitarianism have not always won when there was a frantic need for this: in periods of weakening of the state power (at bifurcation point), a country can be pushed both from the inside and outside to select a new, often unjustified, ideology of further development. And if the logic of social transformations requires mobilization of efforts, coordination of interests and their integration around the national idea, then the history knows many examples when a country pushed from the outside chooses the path to liberalization,

which results in increasing confrontation of interests and destruction of statehood. In general, those countries, which took dominant positions in the world ratings of competitiveness and need new spaces for economic expansion, are concerned in the liberalization

In his time German economist F. Liszt [3] having analyzed the effects of the liberal theory in practice, discovered the following law: “Widespread and total establishing the principle of free trade, maximum reduction of custom duties and promotion of marginal market liberalization in practice strengthens the society that has long and successfully followed the market economy, at the same time it weakens, economically and politically undermines the society that has a different economic history and enters the market relations with other more developed countries when its domestic market is still in a rudimentary state”[4]. F. Liszt came to these conclusions by observing the disastrous consequences of uncritical perception of liberal norms of market trade, imposed by Britain and its German lobbyists, for underdeveloped, semi-feudal Germany of the XIX century. He placed the liberal theory in the particular historical and national context and draw the conclusion: despite the claims of this theory to be universal, it actually is not as scientific and dispassionate, as it pretends to be; market is a tool that operates based on the principle of enriching the rich and ruining the poor, strengthening the strong and weakening the weak.

It was F. Liszt who first pointed out the need to match market model with specific historical circumstances and, therefore, transferred the whole issue of the scientific sphere into the sphere of a specific policy and offered to put up the issue as follows: “We do not have to decide “market or no market”, “freedom of trade or non-freedom of trade”. “We have to find the ways to develop market relations in a particular country and state so that when faced by a more mature world in terms of market not to lose political power, as well as economic and industrial sovereignty, national independence” [4, p.127]. And it was F. List who, justifying the ways of building of an economically capable country drew the attention to the role of ideology in shaping the basis of such power. He also proved that the formation and public perception of a particular ideology are based on mentality, unique by its nature and generated by a certain national culture.

Actually ideology reflects the aspirations of the nation, and such aspirations are not static, though they are perceived naturally as ideology becomes effective

only through the adequacy of national culture and high level of communitarism.

In the context of these processes much sense is acquired by the attempt of monopolization (unification) of national cultural space, mentality of ethnic groups and peoples. The genesis of social and cultural systems according to current interpretations (e.g. U. Beck [5]) is to build a global community, or “global society”, that is social space, “special society” which is highly mobile and unstable, with blurred identity and value system, which is formed in communication process.

Such monopolization required by the current globalization concept is not new: it was F. List who noted that the classical school established in the countries that had reached a certain level of power and economic self-sufficiency, promoted the ideology of cosmopolitanism. Not all countries fitted into this ideology, that was why the dominant countries have implemented it through economic and military expansion. Modern improvement of the techniques of imposing cosmopolitanism ideology does not preclude the use of successful, historically proven ones. However, the opportunities offered by modern information and communication systems, simplify this task.

It is obvious that the cycle of the global market monopolization, which requires appropriate means of communication that can provide capital turnover and management with its help throughout the world economic space, we need the unification of cultures and ideologies rather than their synthesis. In addition, industrialization of production of spiritual benefits, that are intangible, requires the establishment of an adequate market for them and legal formalization of sharing these benefits. Therefore, in addition to sharing tangible goods, we need to share spiritual benefits in the form of information exchange, and so it is necessary to spread new forms and means of information exchange and processing, as well as to form the unique mentality, which will satisfy the requirements of the unification process.

Globalization, implemented on monodeterminant economic base, carefully covers its contents with the myths, cultivated means of mass processing of consciousness. The former should include the common belief that this cultural phenomenon appeared due to the development of technical means of communication, which brought together the most remote corners of the world; as well as due to the triumph of humanism that created the basis for “interaction and mutual enrichment” of religions, cultures, peoples and countries.

However, the authors of the new ideology do not focus on the fact that as long as in the early nineties the members of Bilderberg Club formulated the basic concept of “One World” with the subtext “one world - the single market”, prepared for the World Economic Forum in Davos in 1996. The declared aim of this project was connected with economic interests rather than with cultural adaptation, the task was to monopolize the power on the basis of the global economy monopolization.

According to this project human mind must have successively been loaded with “the latest regulations of social behaviour”:

- “individualism” which is declared to be the basis of competitiveness and therefore to be the shortest path to success and prosperity, although in fact it leads to societies and nations stratification, as well as to marginalization of the majority and the enrichment of the minority;

- “cosmopolitanism” that treats a person as “economic” one that belongs to the whole world, rather than to a separate community. At the same time this interpretation hides impingement of statehood, sovereignty, paternalism, everything that makes up the basis for any community;

- “openness”, that provides for the destruction of boundaries in terms of unfair competition, as a result such openness is used in one direction - real resources for the development flow from underdeveloped countries to the dominant ones;

- “high economic standards of living”, which hide the ideology of “consumerism”, ensurance of continuous demand, which has replaced the ideology of supply and rational use of resources. Other standards such as moral, social, cultural etc. ones, for the sake of which the states were actually formed, are out of the spotlight;

- “high-techcom” – “progress of high technology” is a tangible base for the implementation of the multiplier effect of consumerism ideology;

- “tolerance”, the sense of it is that the minority has the right to impose for the majority their vision of social and economic ways of global development;

- “freedom of conscience”, though being explained as religious freedom and freedom of thought, but in fact implied conventionalism of (consistency) moral standards and morality, updated to the new standard of globalization, when the principle of prevailing needs of the individual (a person belonging to the whole world) in theory makes up the basis of public morality development, while in fact this development “atomises

the societies from the inside”, preparing them for external expansion and further monopolization.

The formation of the corresponding “ideological outlook”, its distribution by the leading countries beyond the limits of domination, actually turned into an expansive global ideology, which was imposed to the countries that were unable to resist such expansion, had no leverage against it. It is worth mentioning the opposite example of France, which, after the Second World War closed its film and information space for the consumerist and immoral ideology of the U.S., rightly believing that its adoption would threaten the national mentality, and so the identity, and therefore sovereignty.

Globalization as the direction of cultural genesis is focused mainly on the social micro level – an individual: it is he who is addressed by the ideology of consumerism and multiculturalism. Such cultural genesis, based on the ideology of universalism and individualism requires an economic person, that enjoys full freedom, pursues only their own interests, which eventually always come into competition with others’ and always generate inequality. Like the economic sphere, the cultural genesis provided by the emerging of new information technologies, is uneven: the cultural gap is enhanced not only between the developed and underdeveloped countries that constitute the market for cultural industry products distribution, and passively share or, on the contrary, combine their values systems, but also between the center and periphery, as the globalization of cultural space spreads mainly in metropolises, indirectly affecting the periphery. S. Huntington has defined the conflict of interests according to the cultural differences as “clash of civilizations”. B.S.Yerasov, specifying the idea of the American political scientist, believes that in this case we have to state not only the clash of civilizations, but also the clash of ethnic communities that use the symbols of civilization. The problem of removing tension among local cultures has necessitated the formulation of some theoretical models, interaction mechanisms, such as glocalization, multiculturalism, communitarianism, etc.

Accordingly, the emerging of endogenous factors of the genesis of a particular cultural system nowadays is the “response” to the “call” of the environment, rather than consistent transition phase of one cultural system into qualitatively different state. The impact of exogenous factors on cultural genesis in the form of information flow dwells on the issue of cultural heritage preservation. Unconditional acceptance of the



values of “other” cultures causes the exclusion of one’s own culture, but this does not mean integration into different cultural space at all. However, transformation of the managerial, communication and other functions of culture associated with the production of cultural innovation, signals about the preservation and support of the inheritance, code of the culture. Culture - is tangible evidence of another process, namely anthropogeny, human genesis. Significant changes in the cultural sphere signal primarily about changing the coordinate system, i.e. persistent ideas of the humans about the world and their place in it. Footprints of the transformation of cultural space reflect the migration, demography, partly - the type of relations between generations, between layers in society.

Ideology of cultural monopolization according to a single cliché, still does not eliminate the problem of the country development meeting the needs of the society and does not answer the question of what lies at the heart of sovereignty in the era of globalization, as well as does not reveal the ways modern nations reach a high level of welfare or lose power and their positions, they used to have.

The ideal form, the ideal model of cultural interaction in the XXI century would have been the equal dialogue of cultures that differ by their historical path of the evolution, core values, mentality. This would mean in the cultural sense the presence of a wide range of national economic forms and national institutions that would ensure the competition among the countries as representatives of their own national economic interests. Meanwhile the history has not offered any example of such interaction, as equal dialogue has always been made impossible because of the efforts of the powerful to impose their vision of the development, which, in fact, is observed nowadays.

In the vertical profile there has also appeared a significant gap between the culture of post-industrial society that shares pragmatic and tangible values of consumer society, based on establishment and maintenance of efficient, competitive production in the society giving preference to individual interests, and cultures of the countries, which are at the periphery of the world development, where as before due to slow pace of economic development, low social level, political instability any economic breakthrough continues to be associated with communitarian values and autarky. “Deliberate isolation” in this case is an expression of the society needs, that is left alone with its needs and abilities and is subject to attack by a stronger economy and a stronger culture. This

is not a flat refusal from dialogue; it is rather forced localization that allows protecting the society from blurring.

The concept of “cultural globalization” used by the American global studies until recently, nowadays according to American researchers has become unusable, inapplicable to realities: “Instead of cultural globalization we should recognize the complex and ambiguous process of global cultures establishment that as a rule tend to originate from national and regional ones. Constituting a new system of values, based on codes of local cultures, results in identity crisis and generates localization” [6]. Meanwhile the increasing dominance of one social or regional culture over the other, cultural homogenization is the apparent result of monopolization. This opinion is supported by R. Robertson [7]; however he suggests putting the emphasis onto heterogeneous basis of globalization, which is implemented into the idea of glocalization that accumulates and synthesizes current trends of globalization and localization. In addition to this it can be noted that such localization is often the basis of confrontation rising between states, behind which there are always economic interests, and what is more of a stronger country, more powerful and currently post-industrial culture.

A famous Russian globalist Z. Bauman [8] criticized the concept of glocalization, noting that mutual adaptation of cultures is out of the question, when the strong reserve their own right to put pressure upon mentality and values. Therefore, the resistance of imposed values is inevitable and eventually can only increase (the example of Iraq, Afghanistan proves that).

Of course, such resistance weakens, when there have already existed glocalization synthesis of cultures, as, for example, in Ukraine. It should be noted that “diffuse institutionalization”, which is typical for Ukraine, unlike glocalization and multiculturalism, is related to the problem of identity and “lack of confidence” to the values of their own culture (the effect of inferiority), generates the phenomenon of “transition”, to be precise of “incomplete transition” into “the other” cultural space. Such examples are numerous: sincere commitment to Buddhism, Protestantism, etc. among the Ukrainians (like among many Europeans, as well as dissemination of the values of West European culture among the representatives of Eastern cultures) [9] is common nowadays. But that does not mean direct perception of another culture. Even “European values” are perceived by

the Ukrainians as something alien, which can be used declaratively, if required for pragmatics, i.e. in order to satisfy economic interests, rather than to assimilate with this cultural environment.

Taking into account resistance of cultures and nations from the pressure of powerful cultures and economies, globalization offers establishing transculture through the influence of mass technology, means of communications on the life of the society, monopolization, subordination of cultural and especially economic space. Such an influence resulted in emerging of interrelated phenomena as “virtualization in economy” and “virtualization in society” where there is no room left for either individualism, or communitarianism, or national values.

That is, in terms of an effective approach to monopolization of the world space (or national space) today’s “global” culture is a type of activity that does not define the ideology and strategy of social life, but on the contrary blurs the distinctions. This can be seen by the examples of the countries included to the global space on the basis of universalism: for example, nowadays in Ukraine, one could hardly formulate any acceptable ideology to reflect national interests. And on the contrary, limited access to the minds of people in the countries of periphery makes the ideological component more expressive and with deepening the gap between the poor and the dominant countries, it will deepen inside the dominant countries narrowing the market of the culture consumers (both tangible and intangible) of the countries monopolists.

The appeal to the spiritual potential of culture as a way of preserving the adequacy of the society is “the answer” of local cultures for the global challenge and demonstrates the impossibility of forming a new cultural space common to everybody, unlike common transnational material and economic infrastructure, and which is not their own economic culture as dominant countries are not interested in this: it is obvious that it is this absence of interest that causes only transnationalization and monopolization of culture, rather than provides the blur of national identity.

The principle of personal superiority over society, individual interests over the public ones, which was essentially transformed into moral norm by mundialization, is used by the agents of the “new world order” as a weapon of demoralization of society. First, their minds are technically defragmented and deprived

of critical perception so that they almost completely cease to perceive the boundary between the reality and virtuality, and fit well into anarchist ideological syncretism, that is a mix of consumer pragmatism, limiting scientific rationalism and superstition, as it is observed now in Ukraine. This could be considered as a natural consequence of a person’s being under the conditions of a hard cultural shock, an avalanche of information, the accuracy of which cannot be defined, and that fatally injures the world perception, and destroys the consciousness with ordinary events, real and virtual reality.

The protective function against such a shock would be fulfilled by the society with its state apparatus, by providing a system of protective measures, but in practice everything is quite the opposite; for example, the government in Ukraine supports the global players, in this way it destroys social ideology, and the ideology works for the deformed, immoral government, targeted at the principle of universal hedonism. This ideology advocates “common values, which should be followed by a person such as their life, freedom of speech and freedom of movement”. However, this can be realized only on condition of total loyalty and accountability of the governing authority, which determines the level of this loyalty and accountability; this system is represented by the world government, which together with the monopolization of economic space monopolizes this right. This confirms that the society with its communitarianism is cancelled at all and replaced by a different, global, “world society”, which is actually represented by a limited number of powerful and wealthy players who monopolize the whole world space. This particular society, subordinating the world, does not require the adaptation of other mentalities and values to transculture, it tries to break them instead.

These are modern realities, rather than backbone line of interaction of a separate country with the “new world order”, because in fact the dominating system of social order is actually communitarianism, which arises from common identical and expressive culture defining the content of the national interest. Such an interest does not fit into the cosmopolitan ideology of atomization of cultural and economic spaces, treats all so-called “compromise decisions” and transculture as those that always turn to be the ideology of the strongest, capable of dictating their own terms and conditions.

## REFERENCES:

1. A. V. Yermolayev. From geopolitics to geoeconomics – challenges for the modern governments // Chief editor. – 2008. – 21.03.08.
2. The author of the theory is Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Yu.M. Pakhomov.
3. F. Liszt (1789-1846).
4. F. Liszt. National System of Political Economy. – Moscow: Europe, 2005.
5. U. Beck. What Is Globalization? – Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2001.
6. Crane D. Culture and Globalization. Theoretical Models and Emerging Trends. / Global Culture: Media, Arts, Policy, and Globalization. Edited by D. Crane, N. Kawashima and K. Kawasaki. – L., N.Y. : Routledge, 2002. – P. 112.
7. <http://www.credo-new.narod.ru/current/html/11.htm> - [\\_ednref14#\\_ednref14](#) – Robertson R. Globalization or Glocalization? / Globalization. Critical Concepts in Sociology. Edited by R. Robertson and K.E. White. Vol. 3. – L., N.Y. : Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2003. – P. 31.
8. <http://www.credo-new.narod.ru/current/html/11.htm> - [\\_ednref15#\\_ednref15](#) – Z. Bauman. Glocalisation, or globalization for ones and localization for the others. / Globalization: Outlines of XXI century: Reports, Chief editor Yu. I. Igritsky, P.V. Malinovsky. – Moscow, 2002. – P. 134.
9. For detailed information: Globalization and multiculturalism. Chief editor N.S. Kirabayev. – Moscow: PFUR, 2005; Madsen R. Global Monoculture, Multiculture, and Polyculture. // Social research. – 1993. – № 3. – P. 493-511.

**Татаренко Н.О. Національні інтереси: культурний вимір і глобальний контекст / Дипломатична академія України при МЗС України**

У статті, яка має методологічний характер, йдеться про сучасну парадигму глобалізації, її геоекономічні наслідки та вплив на національні економіки. Автором аналізуються проблеми, які виникають на шляху реалізації національних інтересів, вплив зовнішніх чинників, що визначають параметри національних економічних стратегій. Розглядаються проблеми самостійного формулювання національних економічних стратегій країнами, що знаходяться на стадії реформування, та визначаються умови, які забезпечують економічний суверенітет держав. Особлива увага приділяється позаекономічним умовам формулювання і реалізації національних економічних стратегій – взаємодії культур всередині суспільств, яка вимагає і забезпечує, на думку автора, пріоритетність традиційної культури, що ставить загальні національні інтереси над приватними.

**Ключові слова:** національна економіка, національні економічні інтереси, індивідуальні економічні інтереси, культурний простір, пріоритет національних інтересів, культура традицій, культура інновацій, комунітаризм, економічний націоналізм, ідеологія.

**Татаренко Н.А. Национальные интересы: культурное измерение и глобальный контекст / Дипломатическая академия Украины при МИД Украины**

В статье, носящей методологический характер, речь идет о современной парадигме глобализации, ее геэкономических последствиях и влиянии на национальные экономики. Автором анализируются проблемы, которые возникают на пути реализации национальных интересов, влияние внешних факторов, определяющих параметры национальных экономических стратегий. Рассматриваются проблемы самостоятельного формулирования национальных экономических стратегий странами, находящимися на стадии реформирования, и определяются условия, обеспечивающие экономический суверенитет государств. Особое внимание уделяется внеэкономическим условиям формулирования и реализации национальных экономических стратегий - взаимодействию культур внутри обществ, требующее и обеспечивающее, по мнению автора, приоритетность традиционной культуры, предполагающей в свою очередь, приоритетность общенациональных интересов относительно частных.

**Ключевые слова:** национальная экономика, национальные экономические интересы, индивидуальные экономические интересы, культурное пространство, пріоритет национальных интересов, культура традиций, культура инноваций, коммунитаризм, экономический национализм.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції: 19.02.2016*

*Рекомендовано до друку: 25.03.2016*