



UDC 339: 303.8

## **POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GLOBAL PROBLEMS**

---

TATARENKO  
NATALIIA,  
**Vice-rector of the  
Diplomatic Academy  
of Ukraine under  
MFA of Ukraine,  
PhD, Professor**

The article is devoted to the search for a methodology for studying globalization processes in terms of their social and economic effectiveness for national states. The author states that globalization, based on the principle of individualism, presupposes stratification of countries, their division into the dominant and dependent ones, thus provoking economic nationalism.

**Key words:** globalization paradigm, communitarianism, solidarism, cameralism, individualism, liberalism, competition, economic nationalism.

Throughout all the years of optimistic following the path of globalization the community component of the global development scenario could not be implemented. The world community could not create a global consolidated system based on the dominance of a collectivist management organization, the most effective form that would ensure its functioning. Considering that the organizational culture in which the preference is given to the common interests, but the interests of subordinate subjects become the goal is inherently inherent to such systems this system is responsible for the development of regions, countries, various social groups, including the individual interests of the private industries. Such a global consolidated system is usually characterized by hierarchy and the existence of common, collective forms of ownership since the property is the pivotal point of managerial influence and the contentive filling of economic interest. The function of self-regulation under

such a system is weakened, In contrast, the collectivist mechanisms of social mobilization are strengthened. The main ethical value of this archetype is social justice, and the basic principle is communitarianism.

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

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

In addition, for example, the USA invest over a third of total investments in the information sphere only which is about 7% of GDP (the same situation is in the other developed countries). However, such a high-tech model of a competitive advantage has its own negative consequences. The additional income is invested mainly in the same industry in which it was obtained which leads to a structural imbalance of the national economy, the development of one sort of industries at the expense of others. The stability of surplus profits leads to attempts of the state to

redistribute the funds through taxes for public interest, while in order to enhance the competitive advantages the funds must be invested in the further development of technologies, but on the other hand, the relatively mild taxation of the large corporations is socially unacceptable. Specialization in the production of commodities in the production of which there is a tangible technological superiority makes the economy more vulnerable in the event of a change in the structure of demand for the commodities or a decrease in the demand for products of key industries. The competitive high-tech industries provide a high level of income and low employment in the country, as a result of the outflow of medium-technology production and medium-sized businesses from the country takes place, the employment problem aggravates. With each workplace in the industry transferred by the companies to other countries 1.7 workplaces in education sphere disappear. In addition, more and more workplaces in research and development, services and management sphere disappear from the labour market.

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

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

In this sense, the ecological problem in dominant countries acquires a particular specificity: firstly, the immediate threat to life and health of the population of developed countries is growing due to the increased environmental burden on the territories of these countries; secondly, the state of the environment is deteriorating as a result of the activities of technologically underdeveloped industries in peripheral countries (including harmful ones, transported from developed countries); thirdly, the quality of life, the high level of consumption in the leading countries of the world causes a change in the structure of needs, shifting the emphasis on their quality characteristics, such as the consumption of environmentally friendly products, the state of the environment, etc., moreover, in the social plan, social inequality is aggravated.

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

Based on an individualistic basis, globalization enhances the phenomenon of confrontation. The culture of individualism, which covers the world society, leads to its unification according to the pattern typical for national spaces: the relationships between subjects are based on competitive principles; Subjects

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

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

The confrontation between the periphery and the center under the conditions of the individualistic scenario of globalization should be based on the principle of confrontation between states, and not economic entities. The type of management on which confrontation is based is the application, at the national level, of communitarian technologies: the state form of ownership and rational behavior of economic entities whose interests are subordinate to

the national and effectively ensure mobilization and the necessary redistribution of resources. Under these conditions, sustainable development in the country can be secured by the nation itself. At the same time, an economic entity protected by the state becomes more competitive, and its activities are subordinated to its interests.

The opposition of states under the current scenario of globalization is built on the model that the leading countries define, imposing on the less developed countries the conditions of individualism - self-regulation, openness, competition, free pricing - and leaving the terms of communitarianism for personal consumption. To reach the level of interstate competition, underdeveloped countries must mobilize their efforts in the model of economic nationalism and build national competitiveness to ensure equal conditions for participation in confrontation. "The real lesson is that taking advantage of globalization requires the development of internal potential along with the development of international relations," says D. Rodrik [1].

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

Absolute conviction that the scenario of globalization can only be liberal-individualistic and, accordingly, the values and institutions in the countries of the world are to be transformed to the needs of such a model, and also the belief that imposing it will not cause significant resistance, was expressed by F. Fukuyama, who claimed: "We are at the end of history, because there is only one system that must continue to dominate in world politics, namely, the liberal-democratic West ... Time is on the side of modern era and I see no reason why the US will not rule" [2].

The inability to implement another scenario of globalization, which would include solidarity instead of confrontation, as the leading component of relations between countries in the era of globalization, was reaffirmed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002. In the framework of international efforts to

achieve sustainable development, taking into account the problems that societies create for the global environment, technologies and the world financial systems in which these countries play a decisive role - developed countries have assumed their responsibility. They also acknowledge that the standards applied by some countries (in particular market self-regulation) can be destructive and cause serious consequences, cause unreasonable additional economic and social costs in other countries in developing countries in particular.

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

As the outcome of the summit, two documents were signed: the Johannesburg Declaration of Sustainable Development and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development at the Top Level. Particular attention was paid to solving social problems of sustainable development: poverty, health, etc., and new problems - the development of trade, the effects of globalization, the sustainability of the financial system, and the financing of sustainable development. However, no specific mechanisms for solving these problems were worked out, especially, with regard to the main component of communitarianism - solidarity [3].

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

formulated, it would be the starting point for changing the scenario of globalization.

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

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

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

At the same time, it should be noted that, firstly, countries-"Westernizers" do not perceive any attempts to question, let alone deform their own values, and, secondly, to unify their economic space on cosmopolitan principles. To this end, they have effective mechanisms for protecting national economies, information and cultural spheres. And, as noted, despite the declared principle of individualism "less than the state", the state management of socio-economic processes in the leading countries is effective

and is all-pervasive, and the tool for protecting the economy varies from direct and macroeconomic to "expansion of broad fields." It is noteworthy that most of these tools cannot be used in peripheral or transitional countries because of their postindustrial content or a direct ban on their use by the dominant countries.

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

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

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

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

At the same time, global system-stage changes provoke the autocracy of civilization world and countries, under which internal civilizational value systems and communitarian basic components of the

social structure (the controlling and corrective role of the state, the processes of nationalization, etc.) are strengthened.

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

Communitarianism prompts the need for the formation of an extra-historical and extra-civilizational phenomenon - the noospheric paradigm - that will push for a transition from local to general relations, such as attitudes toward nature, the universe, man, communications, i.e. it will require a change in the psychology of the global society. These are the reasons why it ought to turn into the fundamental principle of the formation of a new paradigm of globalization. However, so far it has not been possible to carry out such a scenario, the states (if they want to remain so) are forced to look for ways to protect themselves from external challenges, strengthen community security. These ways are connected with strengthening of own solvency, primarily, competitiveness.

The current stage of globalization is really characterized by the active borrowing (or imposing, exporting) of institutions generated by cosmopolitanism, and the expansion of the transnational “ideological assistance” of libertarian content. “All countries undergoing economic modernization must be very much like one another: they must have national unity on the basis of a centralized state, they urbanize, replace the traditional forms of organizing societies like tribes, sects and clans with economically rational forms based on function and efficiency, and provide their citizens with a universal education, “wrote F. Fukuyama” [4, p.7]

But in this context, the experience of developed European countries is interesting, and in the context of the uniqueness and not the unification of their economic models that underlie social progress, determine their institutional structure and ensure its successful functioning. According to Oiken’s definition, “ideal types of economy” can act as an object of such analysis, where sufficiently expressive and closely related to national identity and economic mentality, [5]. From this point of view, the economic history of a number of European countries, among which a stable and rational France, is of interest. Despite the prevailing view of the completely individualistic foundations of

the formation and functioning of national archetypes, its economic and administrative institutions, specific cultural archetypes inherent in the hierarchical system of institutions are typical for this country when, against a background of equal (democratic) active communication between leaders and subordinates, decisions are made by managers and are carried out without discussion, respect for authority is referential, based on confidence in the person who represents it and who assumes sole responsibility (not collective responsibility) for the work performed. Such a business culture can be fully attributed to the communitarian principles of the organization of societies, however, in fact, it is a form of organization of democratic processes and, at the same time, a manifestation of the special features of the mentality formed together with the emergence of modern developed countries of Europe. Moreover, most interestingly, it was in these countries that it was influenced by a special economic theory and practice of a communitarian, in its essence, cameralism, more than under the influence of mercantilism. These countries were approved using a special libertarian policy, which was imposed on other countries, thereby turning them into a servicing periphery.

What is happening today has already happened many times in history: cosmopolitanism (libertarianism, individualism) in the economy gave way to new trends - countries that were in crisis and did not want to continue to serve the leaders inevitably turned to the idea of national identification. Historically, one of the key events that initiated the formation and spread of cameralism as the basis for the formation of statehood in the peripheral part of Europe was the Treaty of Westphalia, concluded in 1648 after eighty years of multinational armed conflicts in Central Europe. Its main message is the right of states to sovereignty and choice of their own way of development.

When the Holy Roman Empire was replaced by a complex system of relations between states surrounded by larger and powerful neighbors - Sweden, France, Spain, Russia, Britain and the Ottoman Empire, all countries had a chance to implement the idea of economic nationalism based on the principle of “economic egoism”. After gaining sovereignty almost all of them, were forced from the very beginning to build new institutions of governance and form sovereign competitive economies in the environment where the rules of the game were dictated by neighbors that were more powerful. As mentioned

above, these rules were implemented through the libertarian economic practice of mercantilism and reflected the basic requirement for national economic policies: affirmation of priority of individual interests over the interests of the society, entrepreneurship, which is free from state intervention and the free movement of goods, money and values across state borders. Of course, implementation of such rules only strengthened postures of more powerful, competitive countries – both material values and money quickly went to them in exchange for those goods, which production was not launched in war-torn countries. This, in turn, stimulated further development of industries, which only exacerbated economic decline in those countries.

Socio-political and economic challenges, which all sovereigns of the newly-formed states had to deal with, demanded specific approaches. Generally, they implied solution of several basic tasks: accumulation of the means of development of the country's economy, social consolidation, formation of defensive potential as well as the potential for economic expansion.

Cameralism developed on the basis of mercantilism, however, it was rather a set of practically applicable rules for ensuring effective functioning of the state mechanism than pure theory; it was a set of general recommendations (aimed at increasing the amount of money in the country), such as modern neoliberalism: it testifies to the pragmatism of economic policies of sovereign states. Cameralists, who were advisors to kings, had direct obligation and access to the development of state-political, managerial and economic decisions being responsible for their functionality.

Due to these approaches, many peripheral countries in Europe were able to become successful. However, all the leading countries of that time were forced to change their approaches to the modeling of economic policy keeping in mind the pressing effectiveness of the sovereign communitarian practices of the growing new states. In particular, the French economist and statesman J.-B. Colbert, who determined industrial development of France and supported mercantilism in interstate relations, actively promoted the development of state autarky.

Without claiming to be the conceptual basis for the development of countries, the practice of cameralism acquired a special status and was later reflected in a number of historical, theoretical and economic-methodological research papers. Cameralism and its absolutist communitarian philosophy played an

important role - these ideas formed the basis for the economic policies of many great reformers - Otto von Bismarck, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Ludwig Erhard, Charles de Gaulle, Lee Kuan Yew, Deng Xiaoping, and many others who took into account and adopted the basic communitarian tenet – primacy of social interests over the individual ones. Due to this fact, despite relevant circumstances, they were able to provide economic breakthrough in their respective countries along with resistance to external challenges.

Cameral political philosophy and political economy still remain in opposition to Anglo-Saxon approaches. Both new concepts and the concept of cameralism regard the state primarily as the unity, the integrity of various autonomous spheres - the state, society and economy, and not as an external and socially hostile institution being above them. The state is not identified with the government: the government is an instrument for state policy implementation; the state is a large family; its integrity and unity are provided by the government; state interests are inseparable from individual interests - state welfare and welfare of individuals and citizens are inextricably linked; prosperity of the state is the basis for the prosperity of individuals.

In other words, the ideology of communitarian cameralism contradicts the ideology of liberalism: the Smithian conception of the “economic man” is based on the fact that the aggregate welfare of the country's citizens is the total wealth of this country, and, on the contrary, communitarianism assumes that a rich state is a guarantee for the well-being of every citizen. Both cameralists and modern communitarian “statists” regarded strengthening welfare of the state as a single organism as interrelated phenomena, and this was possible only within this entity (see, for example, 6). Hence, the state, as a family and as an entity, is opposed to the outside world. Development of goals, ethics and principles of the existence and development of the state as an entity became the goal of cameralism in the post-crisis time in the newly formed sovereign countries that were close to the economically developed countries, which could afford liberal practice.

Thus, in terms of primacy of social interests, economic viability of the economic entity depended on successful development of the national economic system, and the public ideology, which implies primacy of national interests over the interests of world economic development, becomes pivotal. This approach does

not deny the importance of individualistic incentives for economic progress within the country; however, it presupposes conscious formation of a socio-economic environment by the state with a view to streamline relevant activities of national economic entities. This is another interpretation of the role of the “economic man”, who is both a producer and a consumer as such: this man, above all, belongs to a certain community – the nation, and therefore he/she has to coordinate his/her individual interests with the interests of the entire nation. Hence, one can conclude the following: since individual and public interests may not coincide, only the state that should fulfill the role of an arbitrator – it should provide conditions for social development and manage it in due course. That is, the state is to formulate both domestic and foreign economic policy providing its subsequent implementation, since the concept “economic progress”, like the notion of “public interest,” always has national boundaries. Logically, considering a specific national economic entity, its political economy should be “national” while performing an applied function: it should result in distinctive recommendations related to economic policy for a certain period of time, which should reflect the existing opportunities and prospects for social development – the strategy for national economic development. Thus, communitarianism obliges political economy to be the science dealing with state policy components based on the doctrine of economic development of an individual state.

Formation of “national economies” based on communitarian concepts and their development and management doctrines has always occurred in the European history with regard to the “transnational context”. Independent states and their economies, already in the context of conventional interpretation of the Westphalia system, developed from 1648 up to the beginning of the 18th century in close interaction: a modern system of interstate relations was formed in the ideological, trade, military, cultural and other spheres. These relations were regarded as relations among “independent states”. These relations refer to many modern definitions of integration components. However, at the same time, the sovereign right of states to conduct their independent economic policies was not violated: no one could impose an economic model that did not meet economic realities and mentality referring to the needs of the pan-European community.

Sovereignty of these states was based on national institutions - state monopolization of instruments

of violence. Governments were delegated the right to implement international politics, control over the armies, diplomacy and the right to conclude treaties, and thus economic relations transformed from cosmopolitan to international ones. Moreover, the need for a *raison d'Etat* policy, which implies definition and implementation of national interests (economic nationalism), leads to the isolation of such interests from the general, European interests.

The above predetermined the fact that in the period between the Treaty of Westphalia and the Peace of Utrecht in 1713 one could witness formation of modern forms of international relations in the European system of states, which affected institutionalization of national economies and their relevant tasks. The existence of states within the new conventional system demanded other systems of knowledge and management technology, so over time, the formation of unity within the state and competition for the interests of nations (a function performed by communitarianism) was eagerly sought. That is, it was believed that real, pure competition could be realized only among states. Inside the state, competition was regarded as harmful and destructive, in the case it was not streamlined by the state with a view to ensure public interest.

Naturally, communitarianism, as a policy of coercion, without which subordination of individual interests to the public ones given uncertainty of subjects of statehood and state attention could not be achieved as a goal, has always been a threat to private property. Therefore, at that moment states faced the problem of constituting relations referring to property rights and exclusive territoriality. If the issue of exclusive territoriality refers to the formation of state borders, property rights can be blurred in international relations. In his respect, it is important to note that the main mechanism for codifying property rights of state-political units was rather institutionalization of property rights within the country then external relations. Therefore, it was necessary to regulate the rights and property relations within sovereign states, which became the basis for the development of their economies. Communitarianism requires that property, both public and private, should acquire a certain status of equal and protected forms, including issues referring to taxation, redistributing income from it for public needs. Otherwise, without such certainty and codification, there is a threat of destroying the country's unity, undermining the individualist principles of efficiency.



The relationship between the formation of a system of property relations with the emergence of appropriate state institutions and the formulation of a nationally specific domestic and foreign policy of the state (economic policy being the primary one) is referred to in the works of D. Ruggie, one of the leading Western European historians [7, p. 148]. The emergence of private property and the formation of relations “closed” for state intervention, and on the other hand, public responsibility for creating favorable conditions for private development has become a revolutionary innovation, and remains very relevant in modern conditions, as a safety mechanism against the distortions of communitarianism.

At the same time, communitarianism itself is banned in the modern global system of economic relations. Moreover, formation of sovereign position of states as well as implementation of independent economic policies is not encouraged; in addition, it is a subject of permanent attacks from mature states. Nevertheless, one can presently observe how truly sovereign states such as the United Kingdom, the United States, France, South Korea, Japan and others actively use elements of the communitarian economic model in their practice, which is understood by their societies, keeping in mind the need to maintain their influence and competitiveness as key elements of stability in a global turbulent environment. This is determined primarily by the aggravation of contradictions and crises not only in the world economic relations, but first of all, in the internal economic development of countries. For the developed countries, this implies decrease in the potential for economic expansion and for the dependent ones – complete loss of international competitiveness.

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

It is not by chance that the question of the intercountry nature of competition based on strengthening the competitiveness of individual countries achieved in the context of the promoting

national economic interests is acute already in the leading countries.

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

D. Trump's economic program is also communitarian and provides for the development of the United States on the principles of economic nationalism. It also emphasizes the decommissioning of international solidarist programs and focusing on solving the problems of their own solvency [8]. In fact, D. Trump returns the country to an economic policy well described and implemented by the author of the US accelerated commercial and industrial development program by A. Hamilton in the 19th century and that was repeatedly used later in the history, in particular by F. Roosevelt and R. Reagan in the XXth century.

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

On the road to economic nationalism, the country is offered to return by M. Le Pen, one of the leaders of the presidential campaign in France. She believes that the system of unified Europe “is based on the knowingly destructive ideology of globalization,” that “it must be destroyed and a free Europe created, of which indeed sovereign states are members.” She advocates France's withdrawal from the EU and holding a referendum so that “the French themselves could answer the question of leaving the EU”, as well as the need to “undermine the monopoly of the party of financiers and supporters of multiculturalism” who are interested in obtaining high profits at any cost, even at the cost of betraying national economic interests, but are not ready for the formation of a communitarian, solitary economy in one's own country.” [9]. Her program echoes the program of Charles de Gaulle

and is focused on increasing sustainability of the French economy to the challenges posed by the global environment. However, it is even more important to take into account the fact that the model of economic

nationalism has always remained popular in France and, like no other, was quite productive due to the reflection of the French mentality as an “ideal type of economy”.

## REFERENCES:

1. Rodrik D/ – [http://www.project-syndicate.org/series/the\\_open\\_economy\\_and\\_its\\_enemies](http://www.project-syndicate.org/series/the_open_economy_and_its_enemies).
2. Fukuyama F. The West has Won: Radical Islam Can't Beat Democracy and Capitalism // <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.
3. See Многоликая глобализация. Культурное разнообразие в современном мире. / Под ред.: П. Бергера, С.Хантингтона. – М.: Прогресс, 2004. – С. 24.
4. Фукуяма Ф. Конец истории и последний человек. – М.: «Издательство АСТ», 2004. – С.7.
5. Ойкен В. Основные принципы экономической политики. – М.: Наука, 1995.
6. Райнерт Э. Свободный рынок превратит Украину в страну эмигрантов: Интервью. //Новое время. – 2015. – №39 .
7. Ruggie J. Continuity and Transformation in the World Policy: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis.– New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.
8. Transcript: Donald Trump's speech in Gettysburg Pennsylvania, 2016, oct, 22. – <http://www.whatthefolly.com/2016/10/26/transcript-donald-trumps-speech-in-gettysburg-pennsylvania>.
9. Election présidentielle: ce que contient le programme de Marine Le Pen. – <http://www.lemonde.fr/election-presidentielle-2017/article/2017/02/04/marine-le-pen>.

**Татаренко Н. Політична економія глобальних проблем / Дипломатична академія України при МЗС України**

Стаття присвячена пошуку методології дослідження процесів глобалізації на предмет її соціально-економічної ефективності для національних держав. Автор констатує, що глобалізація, заснована на принципі індивідуалізму, передбачає апріорі розшарування країн, поділ їх на домінуючі і залежні, провокуючи тим самим економічний націоналізм.

**Ключові слова:** глобалізаційна парадигма, комунітаризм, солідаризм, камералізм, індивідуалізм, лібералізм, конкуренція, економічний націоналізм.

**Татаренко Н.А. Политическая экономия глобальных проблем / Дипломатическая академия Украины при МИД Украины**

Статья посвящена поиску методологии исследования процессов глобализации на предмет ее социально-экономической эффективности для национальных государств. Автор констатирует, что глобализация, основанная на принципе индивидуализма, предполагает расслоение стран, деление их на доминирующие и зависимые, провоцируя тем самым экономический национализм.

**Ключевые слова:** глобализационная парадигма, коммунитаризм, солидаризм, камерализм, индивидуализм, либерализм, конкуренция, экономический национализм.

*Стаття надійшла до редакції: 20.02.2017*

*Рекомендовано до друку: 03.03.2017*