

UDC 930.2=111:321.64:327.57(100)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.22.253734

Anatoliy MOROZOV

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Chair of Archeology and Special Branches of History, Cherkasy Bohdan Khmelnytskyi National University, 81 Shevchenko Boulevard, Cherkasy, Ukraine, postal code 18000 (anacid2012@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0003-3832-4513

ResearcherID: 4989473/morozov-anatolii

Victoria HRON

PhD (History), teacher of the state educational institution “Cherkasy professional lyceum”, 13 Oleksiy Panchenko Street, Cherkasy, Ukraine, postal code 18034 (ghron@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-1221-3658

ResearcherID: AAE-6353-2022

Анатолій МОРОЗОВ

доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри археології та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Черкаського Національного університету імені Богдана Хмельницького, бульвар Шевченка, 81, м. Черкаси, Україна, індекс 18000 (anacid2012@ukr.net)

Вікторія ГРОН

кандидатка історичних наук, викладачка державного навчального закладу “Черкаський професійний ліцей”, вул. Олексія Панченка, 13, м. Черкаси, Україна, індекс 18034 (ghron@ukr.net)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Morozov, A. & Gron, V. (2022). Vision of the Essence of the Totalitarianism Transformation at the Stage of Globalization in Modern English Historiography. *Skhidnoieuropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 22, 240–250. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.22.253734

**A VISION OF THE ESSENCE OF THE TOTALITARIANISM TRANSFORMATION
AT THE STAGE OF GLOBALIZATION
IN MODERN ENGLISH HISTORIOGRAPHY**

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is to clarify the economic and ideological and political foundations of the transformation of the concept of “totalitarianism” at the present stage. The methodological basis of the research is premised on the principles of systematics, objectivity, comprehensiveness and historicism. The investigation was carried out by applying the methods of induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis, abstraction, as well as comparative, problem-historical and retrospective methods. The novelty of the study is based on the approaches common in the English-language segment of the scientific literature on globalization. A comprehensive comparison of this concept with the concept of the nation-state was made, and the potential for the development of new forms of total control of political actors over society was considered. The Conclusions.* *The study makes it quite obvious that globalization is a process of formation, development and transformation of a system of unilateral advantages in the context of permanent capitalist competition and selective modernization. At present,*

these benefits are increasingly concentrated in the financial and information sector. The development of electronic means of control and communication, on the one hand, repeatedly strengthens the official ability of the world's leading nations to monitor the natural and mechanical movement of the population. On the other hand, it contributes to the limitation of the state powers by this function and accelerates the international money circulation outside the governmental competences, which especially weakens the position of political regimes in developing countries. In parallel with the degradation of national sovereignty, supranational corporate and sub-national ethnic clusters are rising. At the same time, together with the real power, the potential ability to create radical totalitarian forms flows here from the national level. In other words, the traditional notion of individual totalitarian and institutional democratic governance is contrasted with the concept of sub regional, national and supranational control.

Key words: totalitarianism, globalization, nation-state, "failed state", sovereignty, transnational corporations, competition, migration, technological progress.

БАЧЕННЯ СУТНОСТІ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ ТОТАЛІТАРИЗМУ НА СТАДІЇ ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЇ В СУЧАСНІЙ АНГЛОМОВНІЙ ІСТОРІОГРАФІЇ

Анотація. Мета дослідження полягає у з'ясуванні економічних та ідейно-політичних засад трансформації поняття "тоталітаризм" на сучасному етапі. **Методологічне підґрунтя** роботи сформоване на основі принципів системності, об'єктивності, всебічності та історизму. Дослідження здійснювалося шляхом застосування методів індукції й дедукції, аналізу і синтезу, абстрагування, а також порівняльного, проблемно-історичного та ретроспективного методів. **Наукова новизна:** відштовхуючись від підходів, поширених в англomовному сегменті наукової літератури з питань глобалізації, було здійснено комплексне зіставлення вказаного поняття з поняттям національної держави, а також розглянуто потенційну можливість розвитку нових форм тотального контролю політичних суб'єктів над соціумом. **Висновки.** Проведене дослідження робить цілком очевидним, що глобалізація – це процес становлення, розвитку і трансформації системи односторонніх переваг у контексті перманентної капіталістичної конкуренції та вибіркової модернізації. Наразі згадані переваги дедалі більше концентруються у фінансовому й інформаційному секторах. Розвиток електронних засобів контролю й комунікації, з одного боку, багаторазово посилює офіційну здатність провідних держав світу наглядати за природним і механічним рухом населення. З іншого – сприяє загальному обмеженню державних повноважень вказаною функцією та прискорює міжнародний грошовий обіг за межами урядових компетенцій, що особливо послаблює позиції політичних режимів країн, які розвиваються. Паралельно з деградацією національного суверенітету відбувається піднесення наднаціонального корпоративного та субнаціонального етнічного кластерів. При цьому, разом з реальною владою сюди ж з національного рівня перетікає потенційна здатність витворювати радикальні тоталітарні форми. Інакше кажучи, традиційним уявленням про одноосібне тоталітарне й інституційне демократичне управління протиставляється концепція субрегіонального, національного та наднаціонального контролю.

Ключові слова: тоталітаризм, глобалізація, національна держава, "неспроможна держава", суверенітет, транснаціональні корпорації, конкуренція, міграція, технічний прогрес.

The Problem Statement. For more than a decade, the problem of globalization has been of concern to the world scientific community. After all, despite the rapid dynamics of universal change, scientists have not been able to establish clear boundaries of the term, as well as the causes, consequences, direction of further development, the "winners" and "losers" of the successive integration and unification of modern life. The only thing that the vast number of researchers have reached a relative agreement upon is the conclusion about the economic basis of globalization (Al-Rodha & Stoutmann, 2006, pp. 9–20). At the same time, the obvious effects of the fourth industrial revolution (Ford, 2016) and the gradual departure of central banks into the zone of zero and even negative interest rates force some of them to talk about the end of the era of classical capitalism. In turn, the instability of

economic institutions entails structural changes in the political superstructure, which again makes the issue of totalitarian methods of control and management relevant (Liodakis, 2005).

The Analysis of Recent Researches. These circumstances against the background of the intensified struggle of “old” and “new” economies with different types of regimes for world leadership (Rodrik, 2019, p. 26) causes to abandon the established views on the essence of global processes. All participants in this virtual discussion can be divided into two camps: supporters of systematic and non-systematic approaches. The first of them consider globalization to be the result of endogenous policies and, consequently, an irreversible outcome of the development of a market economy. Their opponents insist on the exogenous nature and reversibility of the outlined phenomenon and also seek to some extent to return the function of the main subjects of geopolitics to the nation-states (Fotopoulos, 2001), (Inglehart, 2001).

In fact, we are dealing with a specific categorical system in which the terms “global” and “national” are polar concepts relative to each other. Of course, no one is talking about the complete dismantling of nation-states in the context of globalization, although significant transformations are inevitable. However, some scientists, such as the British economist Martin Wolf (Wolf, 2001) believe (at least until 2008) that all is changing for the better. The others, such as Paul James, a professor at the University of Western Sydney, speak of the ambiguity and complexity of the process, in which not all elements have a positive meaning (James, 2005).

The Purpose of the Study. Since the term “totalitarianism” in scientific circulation is strongly associated with the system of state power, to clarify the essence of its latest modifications, it seems necessary to compare the concepts of “globalization” and “nation state” (given how this terminological pair is presented in the English-language scientific literature) comprehensively. Next, we should focus on the so-called “levels of globalization”, in other words, to explore how consistent unification and integration affect different spheres of public life and the distribution of power. Finally, we should provide a systematic assessment of the principles of formation of ruling elites in countries with dissimilar income and cultural and spiritual traditions in terms of the dilemma “political personality – political institution”.

The Main Material Statement. Thus, as noted by the above-mentioned Paul James, the institutions and structures of modern globalization and the modern nation-state arose almost simultaneously as a result of the deployment of parallel processes. And this is another common idea that unites representatives of various trends and schools. The differences between them begin at the stage of monitoring the interaction of the two processes. A large group of researchers consider them complementary, opponents insist on existence of a tangible tension between them (James, 2005, p. 198).

Proponents of the first approach start from the general rule: for legitimate functioning in the modern Westernized World, communities must be formed as nation-states of the Western model (Steger & Lames, 2013, p. 21). Only this way can they claim official recognition from major global players, most notably the United Nations. Moreover, some states exist only because of their membership in the UN (Thomas, 2007, p. 93). Nowadays, the popular term “failed state” become widespread due to, on the one hand, the rapid spread of quasi-state (sometimes overtly criminal) territorial and trans-territorial entities, which would, in other circumstances, simply reshape the political outlines of entire regions. On the other hand – due to the established system of international relations and activities of supranational bodies, which have made the dismantling of even completely insolvent states quite a troublesome affair (Krishman, 2016, p. 160).

In general, the logic of the defenders of the idea of a harmonious combination of global and national construction is based on the concept of constant transition from simple to complex forms. The evolution of statehood began with the control of tribes and polis cities and later rose to modern systems of governing nation-states. Further development of organized society went beyond national borders. But even in the future, the ability of people to enjoy the opportunities of international integration will depend on the quality of services provided by states – guarantees of property rights, security, basic education, etc. (Hosseni, 2015, p. 4).

However, not all scientists support the outlined concept. The famous American sociologist and historian I. Wallerstein called the modern world system a hierarchy of national communities, within which he distinguished among the “core”, “semi-periphery” and “periphery”. The scientist considered the division of countries into zones of high and low value added to be the basis of this hierarchy, which was directly related to the monopolization of production processes: the higher the monopolization, the higher the profitability (Deruder, 2003). Since the existence of monopolies (quasi-monopolies, according to Wallerstein) is not possible without strict protectionist measures, the “core” states are certainly strong ones. Accordingly, the quality and volume of services provided by such states significantly exceed all possible social benefits available to residents of the “periphery” (Wallerstein, 2004).

With the exception of the critique of traditional ideas about the progressive nature of the historical process, I. Wallerstein’s views also show fundamental differences with the Marxist doctrine of socioeconomic formations. Capitalism, from the researcher’s point of view, is not a capitalist mode of production, but a world economy formed as a result of the involvement of regions with different systems in the market system of Western countries, which did not become world empires, although this happened in the past, but remained nation-states (Wallerstein, 2002, pp. 1–6).

By the way, in two thorough publications, published under the same title “Trade and Empire”, the problem is presented somewhat differently, although entirely in the context of the “core-periphery” scheme. In particular, it is believed that there is a direct bilateral link between the expansion of empires and the expansion of international trade. “Trade policy of the metropolises may have been shaped by the colonial ties,” – say the authors of the first study and add: according to economists, European countries perceived the colonies as a means of introducing preferential trade relations (James & Weidemer, 2008, p. 18).

The authors of the cognominal work base their conclusions on the well-known but unpopular fact that in the first millennium AD Western Europe was the most backward peripheral region within Eurasia. But until the XVIIIth century it was able to become the geographical and political center of the continent. Comparing Western Empires with China, scholars emphasize the dependence of the former on external sources of gold production as opposed to the self-sufficiency of the latter. Thus, it turns out that it was the lack of own resources that pushed Europeans to aggressive expansion, making Europe the starting point of globalization processes (O’Rourke et al., 2008, p. 1). Of course, empires seem to have long since disappeared from the scene of humanity, but most of the states formed on their wreckage continue to consider international trade exploitative (Wolf, 2014, p. 23).

This observation, however, contrasts sharply with data on the assessment of globalization in developed and developing countries. People in France, Italy, Spain, South Korea, Japan, and Germany (and to a lesser extent in Britain and the US) are more likely to say: “Globalization is growing too quickly”. In contrast, people in Turkey, the Philippines, Indonesia, Brazil, Kenya, Mexico and the countries of Central America are more likely to say: “Globalization is proceeding too slowly” (BBC World Service Poll, 2008, p. 1).

Against this background, many scholars again spoke about the positive impact of globalization in the context of global convergence, overcoming inequality and reducing absolute poverty (Karatasli, 2016, p. 25). Particularly optimistic statements are made in China, which in some circles is associated with the reboot of integration processes or the launch of an updated version of “Globalization 2.0” (Barber, 2016).

However, the problem of the relationship between the global and the national can be solved not only in terms of the flow of sovereignty or interstate competition. Thus, the Brazilian economist Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira, considers globalization a modern stage of capitalist development, while the nation-state – a territorial and political unit designed to organize space and population in the era of capitalism (Bresser-Pereira, 2008, p. 557).

The author disagrees with the proponents of the theory of the transition of sovereignty from lower to higher forms of government, because his deep conviction is that instead of the gradual concentration of power in the hands of hypothetical world government or leadership, we have a global society without global state nowadays (Bresser-Pereira, 2008, p. 563). The vast majority of modern states, the researcher recalls, was formed not as a result of consolidation but as a result of collapse of great empires, and together with like-minded people wonders: why have the talks about the demise of the nation-state begun at time when it became the dominant world phenomenon (Bresser-Pereira, 2008, p. 564).

The solution to the essence of the paradox, oddly enough, can be found in the work of Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira. Firstly, the scientist asserts that nowadays the class struggle has long receded into the background, giving way to competition between countries with high and low labour cost (Bresser-Pereira, 2008, p. 564). This conclusion confirms the steady devaluation of internal social relations within a single country compared to the increasing importance of external conjuncture.

Secondly, in the above-mentioned interstate competition, rich countries use financial and other instruments to force poorer partners to adopt their own liberal economic model, which is characterized by a reduction in state competences (Bresser-Pereira, 2008, p. 558). Since states, as holders of power, must lose their significance everywhere under such circumstances, the distribution of world power should tend to be evenly scattered on the political surface. But in reality, the concentration of world power under the conditions of a total domination of the market economy and the free market not only does not disappear, but on the contrary increases (Fotopoulos, 2001). Thus, there is every reason to believe that in addition to states, there are other accumulators of force that are not under the control of democratic procedures. We are talking about corporations.

Thirdly, in the search for an adequate definition of the term “globalization”, Luiz Carlos Bresser-Pereira chooses an option where the phenomenon is described as a modern stage of capitalist competition for higher economic growth between corporations with the support of the respective nation states. He supports his thesis with the remark that “in absolute majority, ‘multinational corporations’ are national corporations, because they are controlled by the capitals and the knowledge of one or two countries. The cleanest evidence of this fact lies in the activities of the ambassadors of rich countries in developing countries. Each ambassador knows well which ‘his corporations’, i.e., which are the corporations whose interests he is supported to represent” (Bresser-Pereira, 2008, p. 560). In other words, in today’s world, the lines separating the spheres of influence of mega-corporations are beginning to play a more significant role than state borders.

The conclusion that national and transnational processes are not always structurally compatible is supported by many studies, including the English-language ones. Martin Wolfe,

already known to us, sees the reason for the instability of current life in the desire of states to continue to resist economic interconnectedness, while technical progress pushes economies to further integration (Wolf, 2014, pp. 23–25). The logic of free enterprise – the essence of globalization, is the constant search for new territories suitable for capitalist expansion. The crisis of traditional markets leads to unprecedented pressure from transnational agents (starting with the IMF, the WTO and ending with various NGOs) on the governments of nation states, forcing the latter to reduce budget expenditures (Hanspeter et al., 2006, p. 922). As a result, businesses are gaining more and more access to areas that until recently were considered the exclusive object of public care for society.

The elimination of the state monopoly on the use of military force has an even more impressive impact on the realities of today. Officials in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, or any other country are required to disclose information on military rearmament and defense expenditures to their own public and to oversight international organizations. At the same time, private companies mustn't disclose the details of their business operations. In numerous hotspots, stakeholders are increasingly turning to mercenaries instead of using regular troops.

As Armin Krishman writes in the monograph “War as Business. Technological Change and Military Service Contracting”, “The death of soldiers in action has to be reported by the government and this usually receives a lot of media attention, which affects public opinion. On the other hand, contractors killed in action, hardly make it into the news” (Krishman, 2013, p. 154).

Thus, attracting contractors is convenient and profitable for both states and contractors. The states avoid international publicity; the contractors have a guaranteed income (which, incidentally, calls into question their status as a disinterested player). All this, combined with the considerations of expanding the participation of large corporations in shaping the global agenda, refutes the optimistic claims that the expropriation of “excess” sovereignty from nation states in favour of business should lead to greater peace and stability. In a broader sense, the current stage of social evolution is characterized not only by competition between countries with high and low wealth, but also by the struggle of state and corporate clusters for the right to determine the future of civilization.

Translating the issue of redistribution of power into the human dimension, it should be noted that one of the features of the Western (which is considered the standard of progressive nowadays) worldview is the idea of reducing human responsibilities to the state. The real catalyst (more precisely, the factor of autocatalysis) of the spread of such ideas in this case is the acceleration of migration processes. However, the reverse side of the coin remains out of the attention of the general public. It is a question of loss by citizens of guarantees at formal preservation of the rights. Only states can guarantee the rights of citizens. International organizations that have assumed much of the sovereignty can only demand that states fulfill their functions. As a result, the global economy has faced a new serious challenge, the name of which is precariat.

From the point of view of the material possibilities of the social system, the concept of “a person” is limited to the actualization of two functions – a producer and consumer, the meaning of which is constantly changing depending on the replacement or permutation of other elements of the social mechanism. These include the means of production, means of consumption and the unifying link of the whole system – finance. These elements respond differently to the demands of “open” space and restructure the responsibilities and perspectives of nation-states. The formation of a new format takes place in the framework of two main projects: the management of migration flows and capital movements. Thus, let's move on to the next task of the research – the study of the so-called “levels of globalization”.

“While the movements of bodies, objects of exchange and process of disembodied inert-relation are all increasingly globalized, what most commentators miss is the relatively obvious point that they are globalized in different ways. In empirical terms, finance capital flies across “deterritorialized” national borders... while refugees are administered by states with a heavy-handed vigilance unknown in human history” (James, 2005, p. 197).

This remark by Paul James conveys the essence of the question: the easiest way to move money is without citizenship, the most difficult – by people who must have citizenship. “The Citizen – now the global taken-for-granted base condition of political normalcy in the world – is allowed to cross the borders of their own nation-state in the prioritized or facilitated fashion (James, 2014, p. 214). Despite the interconnectedness of the concepts of citizenship and the state, it is not difficult to be tempted to take such a remark as evidence in favour of strengthening the position of the nation-state until it acquires totalitarian traits. But in reality it may be a question, firstly, of concentrating the remnants of sovereignty around one function – controlling the dislocation of the population. Secondly, as Paul James rightly pointed out, the excessive fascination with the idea of free choice of residence, based on the belief that the right to “freedom of choice” will belong exclusively to the European race, more precisely, the residents of rich countries (James, 2006, p. 215).

“The people we want to slow down or restrict are those who move ambiguously and require resources from us – specifically, asylum seekers and irregular migrants” (James, 2006, p. 215). Because, as Paul James further argues, modern technology makes it possible to analyze, systematize, and codify vast amounts of information, easily separating “desirable” migrants from “undesirable” ones, “states can present to themselves data, which suggest that the number of refugees... are not going up. At the same time, however, those individuals called ‘internally displaced persons’ or IDPs – that is, those who are displaced but do not cross a national border – have been increasing, as have been the number of irregular migrants” (James, 2006, p. 216). Thus, reducing access to citizenship and strengthening official oversight of legalized migration multiply human flows beyond state capacity. If these flows are not controlled by the state, then someone else does. Accordingly, the role and importance of the state in the new political subordination is fatally reduced.

“As decision-making power moves away to trans-state or supra-state agencies, so sub-state ethno nationalist groups are encouraged to bypass what they perceive to be their unresponsive nation-states and seek solutions either higher level, where the real power is thought to be located and/or at more local level, where autonomy seems possible. Globalization and “tribalism” may, therefore, not only co-exist but mutually support each other” (James, 2005, p. 198). This quote reflects the logic of a new stage in the evolution of the world governance model. It began with the collapse of empires after World War II and was widely accepted as a process of emancipation of nation-states. However, the further course of events clearly testified to the continuing fragmentation of the political space with the disintegration of the now nation-states along the lines of ethnic enclaves. At the theoretical level, this transition was recorded in the 1980s and was called “unlimited disembodied globalization”. Since then, the notion of nation has been forever separated from the notion of the state [27, 4], which has faced an alternative in the form of a new system of control and exploitation of resources based on electronic trading, computerized information storage and relentless movement of capital (James, 2005, p. 206).

“When, in July 2008, the then-American presidential candidate Barack Obama spoke as a self-declared “world citizen” in Berlin, he oscillated between the national and global

imaginary in his call to nations to work together for global progress” (Steger & James, 2013, p. 26). The existence of national and global clusters in the structure of modern world elites means the presence of related genetic forms in the economic and political plane. National government is inherent in societies of industrial order, based on material production, the end product of which is an industrial commodity. Global governance dominates the post-industrial sector of intangible production with the final product as a service.

New types of conflicts are unfolding, primarily within individual states, according to the authors of the article “Europeanization and Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared”, because the effects of globalization are not the same for different members of national communities. From the public’s point of view, these are the so-called “winners and losers of globalization” – categories that have long been adopted by political parties in a radical restructuring of ideological orientations. Scientists consider employees and owners of companies, whose business is traditionally based on state support, which is to ensure high social standards and protection of property rights, to be “losers”. In contrast to “losers”, “winners” include firms whose business is integrated into international market structures that are interested in implementing world prices into the system of national economies. This usually means reducing the cost of local labour while reducing any government guarantees. Thus, it is concluded that globalization leads to the transformation and blurring of class contradictions and brings to the fore the conflict between integration and demarcation (Hanspeter et al. 2006, p. 922). In addition, the situation has long been aggravated by the factor of mass migration, which makes citizens of rich countries feel anxious about their own national identity and fear of further degradation of living standards (Hanspeter et al. 2006, p. 927).

If human flows move mainly from the countries of the “poor south” to the “rich north”, the production capacity since the late 60’s of the twentieth century is travelling in the opposite direction. Diverse graphs show the structure of the conflict between national and global regimes in the interstate plane. In the article on the highly specialized topic of gender inequality in developing regions, the authors, Stephanie Sequino and Caren Grown, unexpectedly reveal the full depth of the conflict, using its only aspect.

Firstly, the researchers point out that an unconditional stimulus to investment inflows and increased exports is to limit wage growth in the relevant industries. Secondly, they emphasize the disproportionately large number of women employed in industries financed by the so-called “vertical” foreign direct investment, which are used by large corporations to exploit “differences in factor costs among countries, concentrating labour-intensive activities in those countries with lower labour costs” (Sequino & Crown, 2006, p. 1091).

Thirdly, the ability of states to influence the economy through support for highly productive industries has declined markedly recently. States are under pressure from the World Trade Organization, which demands to liberalize trade, abandon protectionist measures, including preferential lending to strategically important enterprises, and expand access to foreign direct investment (Sequino & Crown, 2006, pp. 1092–1093).

According to scientists, what should be done to improve the situation of women employed in the export industry while maintaining positive economic dynamics? The answer is simple: it is necessary to strengthen the role of the state in monitoring the physical and financial flows of capital, as well as in the implementation of industrial or agricultural policy. From further reflections by Stephanie Sequino and Caren Grown, it follows that these recommendations are difficult to implement because young industrialized countries are under pressure from the financial interests of large powers (Sequino & Crown, 2006, p. 1098). Thus, the current

stage of the global political confrontation is nothing more than an updated version of the classic conflict between labour and capital, in which national groups seek to take control of the financial movement, and transnational – the labour movement.

Finally, we risk making some of our own assumptions about the “political personality – political institution” dilemma. It is usually considered in the context of the study of state elites in countries with different types of regimes. It is believed that under totalitarian rule there are individuals, under democratic – institutions. However, this thesis needs some clarification. Firstly, the very term “rule” is semantically related to the concept of “will”, which is defined as one of the highest mental functions of a man. Secondly, here we are based on the opinion of the famous British historian and journalist Neil Ferguson, the forerunner of modern forms of democracy are corporations – the first autonomous commercial organizations that emerged in a highly competitive environment of Western Europe in the Middle Ages (Ferguson, 2018, p. 78). Thus, in both totalitarian and democratic systems, the real subjects of government are human individuals who exercise their right to govern through political, administrative and economic institutions. But under totalitarianism, the state contour is the highest center of sovereignty, while in modern democracies, in combination with the most developed economies in the world, nation-states are already quite transparent about the secondary nature of corporate transnational networks.

The Conclusions. Traditional views on the nature of totalitarian regimes have their roots in the industrial age, when industrial production was the obligatory intermediary between resources and profit. Since then, we have received the misconception that the main purpose of business is to maximize supply to meet consumer needs. However, under the new conditions, the production link is losing its importance gradually. Accordingly, the political superstructure over the schemes of operation of raw material bases is changing. In other words, the change in technological systems leads to the rotation of management paradigms – national (production) and global (financial and digital). In this case, both paradigms have a genetic predisposition to the formation of radical totalitarian forms, and in this context, require separate research.

Acknowledgements. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-Rohan, R.F. Nayef & Stoutmann, G. (2006). Definitions of the Globalization: A Comprehensive Overview and a Proposed Definition. URL: [https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download? Doi: https://doi.org/10.1.1.472.4772&rep=rep1&type=pdf](https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?Doi=https://doi.org/10.1.1.472.4772&rep=rep1&type=pdf). [in English]

Barber, L. (2016). Globalization 2.0 – an Optimistic Outlook. *Financial Times, January 14*. URL: <https://www.ft.com/content/3dfc316-bad3-11e5-b151-8e15c9a029fb> [in English]

BBC World Service Poll. (2008). Widespread Unease about Economy and Globalization: Global Poll. URL: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/07_02_08worldservicepoll.pdf [in English]

Bresser-Pereira, L. K. (2008). Globalization, Nation State and Catching up. *Brazilian Journal of Political Economy, 28(112)*, 557–576. URL: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rep/a/dwRTqshRwh4v7KdB5cWFT7k/?lang=en> Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-31572008000400002> [in English]

Deruder, B. (2003). Viewing the Capitalist World-System Through (inter-)city Lenses: Rationale, Methodology and First Results. *Belgeo, 3*, 269–288. URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/belgeo/16717?lang=en> Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.16717> [in English]

Ferguson, N. (2018). *Tsyvilizatsiia. Yak Zahid Stav Uspishnym* [Civilization. The West and the Rest]. Kyiv: “Nash Format”, 488 p. [in Ukrainian]

Ford, M. (2016). *Pryshestia Robotive. Tekhnika i Zahroza Maibutnoho Bezrobittia* [Rise of the Robots. Technology and Threat of a Jobless Future]. Kyiv: “Nash Format”, 400 p. [in Ukraine]

Fotopoulos, T. (2001). Globalization, the Reformist Left and Anti-Globalization “Movement”. *Democracy & Nature*, 7(2), 233–280. URL: <https://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/david.harvey/AEF806/Fotopoulos.pdf> [in English]

Hanspeter, K., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornshcier, S. & Frey, T. (2006). Globalization and the Transformation of the National Political Space: Six European Countries Compared. *European Journal of Political Research*, 45, 921–956. URL: <https://ejpr.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2006.00644.x> Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.2006.00644.x> [in English]

Hosseni, S.A. Hamed. (2015). Globalization and the Nation-State. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276348393_Globalization_and_the_Nation-State Doi: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.5028.7528> [in English]

Inglehart, R. (2001). Modernization, Sociological Theories of. International *Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 9965–9971. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B0080430767019215> [in English]

James, K. & Weidmier, M. (2008). Trade and Empire. Cambridge. URL: <https://www.nber.org/papers/w13765.pdf> [in English]

James, P. (2005). Arguing Globalization: Proposition towards an Investigation of Global Formation. *Globalization*, 2(2), 193–209. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233428640_Arguing_globalizations_Propositions_towards_an_investigation_of_global_formation Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747730500202206> [in English]

James, P. (2006). Globalism, Nationalism, Tribalism: Bringing Theory Back In. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: “Sage Publication”. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270900449_Globalism_Nationalism_Tribalism_Bringing_Theory_Back_In Doi: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446217603> [in English]

James, P. (2014). Faces of Globalization and the Borders of States: From Asylums to Citizens. *Citizenship Studies*, 18(2), 208–223. URL: <https://www.academia.edu/7773440> Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2014.886440> [in English]

Karatasli, S. S. (2016). The Capitalist World-economy in the Longue Duree: Changing Modes of the Global Distribution of Wealth, 1500-2008. *Sociology of Development forthcoming*, (2). URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308764748_The_Capitalist_World-economy_in_the_Longue_Duree_Changing_Modes_of_the_Global_Distribution_of_Wealth_1500-2008 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1525/sod.2017.3.2.163> [in English]

Krishnan, A. (2016). War as Business. Technological Change and Military Service Contracting. London and New-York: “Routledge”, 205 p. URL: https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=lymrCwAAQBAJ&pg=PAPA157&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false [in English]

Liodakis G. (2005). The New stage of Capitalist Development and the Prospect of Globalization. *Science & Society*, 69(3), 341–366. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40404263> [in English]

O'Rourke, Kevin H., Leandro Prados de la Escosura, L. P. & Daudin, G. (2008). Trade and Empire, 1700 – 1870. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4849529_Trade_and_Empire_1700-1870 [in English]

Rodrik, D. (2019). Globalization’s Wrong Turn. And How it Hurts. *Foreign Affairs*, 98(4), 26–33. URL: https://drodrik.scholar.harvard.edu/files/dani-rodrik/files/globalizations_wrong_turn.pdf [in English]

Sequino, S. & Crown, C. (2006). Gender Equity and Globalization: Macroeconomic Policy for Developing Countries. *Journal of International Development*, 18(8), 1080–10104. URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jid.1295> Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1295> [in English]

Steger, M. B. & James, P. (2013). Levels of Subjective Globalization: Ideologies, Imaginaries, Ontologies. *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 12(1–2), 17–40. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269947119_Levels_of_Subjective_Globalization_Ideologies_Imaginaries_Ontologies Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1163/15691497-12341240> [in English]

Thomas, G. M. (2007). Globalization: The Major Players. *The Blackwell Companion to Globalization* (George Ritzer, Ed.), 84–102. URL: <file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/24003496-553431-1-10-20210930.pdf> [in English]

Wallerstein, I. (2002). *The Capitalist World-Economy*. Cambridge University Press. URL: <http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam034/78002955.pdf> [in English]

Wallerstein, I. (2004). The Modern World-System as a Capitalist World-Economy. URL: https://cdn.vanderbilt.edu/vu-my/wp-content/uploads/sites/1414/2014/04/14122105/Session_03_Wallerstein.pdf [in English]

Wolf, M. (2001). Will the Nation-State survive Globalization. *Foreign Affairs*, 80/1, 178–190. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20050051?origin=crossref> Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/20050051> [in English]

Wolf, M. (2014). Shaping Globalization. *Finance & Development*, 51(3), 22–55. URL: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2014/09/pdf/wolf.pdf> 10.1163/15691497-12341240 [in English]

*The article was received May 20, 2021.
Article recommended for publishing 23/02/2022.*