

THEORY, HISTORY, CULTURE AND ART OF MANAGEMENT

Socio-Cultural Management Journal

Volume 7 (2024), Number 1, pp. 3-30

doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.1.2024.304773>

p-ISSN 2616-7573, e-ISSN 2617-1104

Original Research Article

© Ya. Martynyshyn, O. Khlystun,
2024

UDC: 316.7:005.44]:316.4.063

JEL Classification: F01, F69, Z13

Received: 24/01/2024

Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Olena Khlystun

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

Culture as “Object” and “Tool” of Global Governance: Social and Metaphysical Consequences and Threats

Abstract: *Introduction.* The relevance of the research topic is due to the problems caused by the globalisation of society. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is a philosophical analysis of comprehensive changes in society under the influence of globalisation and determinants identification that influence the transformation of culture as a factor of modern society's existence into an “object” and “tool” of global governance. The methodological basis of the study is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, axiological, historical, typological, comparative and synergistic approaches. *Results.* The role and significance of culture in society as a means of formation, education, development, and humanisation are highlighted. The author analyses the socio-cultural reflections and contradictions of globalisation, which lead to the deformation of ethno-cultural identifications, which becomes an obstacle to the achievement of a true civilisational synthesis by humanity. The article reveals the essence of global governance and its subjectivity and identifies the reasons why culture is deliberately turned into an “object” and “tool” of this governance. The negative social consequences and metaphysical threats of turning culture into an “object” and “tool” of global governance, as well as possible means of counteracting this are identified. *Conclusions.* The scientific novelty of the research results lies in the disclosure of the socio-cultural essence of global governance and the identification of its negative consequences and threats to society, and the significance lies in the fact that they can be used in the practical activities of public authorities, as well as in the development of the theoretical and methodological foundations of the philosophy of socio-cultural management and global studies.

Keywords: globalisation, global governance, culture, subject, object, tool, social consequences, metaphysical threats.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. Modern society is characterised by a multitude of problems and contradictions, the main cause of which is globalisation. Globalisation is considered in various fields of knowledge as a process or a phenomenon, where economic, political and cultural components are distinguished. However, it is more than a process or a phenomenon, it is a new philosophy of world order and world functioning.

Globalisation can also be described as a period in history that began around the 60s of the last century, when the events of the expressive revolution took place, resulting in the spread of so-called new moral principles, norms and values in the world (a decrease in the value of the family as a social institution, changes in the nature and dynamics of interpersonal contacts, etc.)

The process that today is called “globalisation” has a long history of formation. Initially, and for quite a long period, the term “internationalisation” was used in the literature: the internationalisation of the economy, social and cultural life, etc. However, this is not just a change of terms, it hides a significant change in the processes taking place in the world. The process of forming a global historical space has been underway since the 16th century. It was called internationalisation. In the early twentieth century, this process was largely completed. And in the second half of the last century, a new process unfolded – the transformation of the global system of socio-historical organisms into one world socio-historical organism. It is to describe this process that the term “globalisation” was coined.

Globalisation ultimately involves the merging of the economies of all countries into a single economic system, which, unlike national markets controlled and regulated by governments, will be a “self-regulating system”, according to official statements by the authors of the globalisation project.

At the cultural and social level, integration processes are also taking place, which involve the formation of a single global society based on a new paradigm of socio-cultural development. Along with integration cultural processes, there are processes of regionalisation or localisation, which, again according to the authors of the globalisation project, “preserve ethno-cultural diversity”.

That is why globalisation is also characterised as a transitional period in human history, which results in a new society, new social values and a new individual, a citizen of the world.

Even though globalisation combines and synthesises science, economics and technological achievements of mankind, the opposite process is taking place at the social level – fragmentation and hostility – anti-synthesis. Such fragmentation is characterised by the Americanisation of the globalisation process,

an attempt to impose American values on the entire world society. The unification processes are resisted by nation-states and governments that do not intend to "exchange" national sovereignty for some illusory "benefits" of globalisation.

Today, there are various options for the development of the situation. It is not known which of them will prevail: whether society will follow the path of globalisation, regionalisation, or fragmentation. It cannot be ruled out that the development of technology may give rise to forms of economic organisation in non-Western countries in which they isolate themselves from the Western world in order to ensure their security and preserve their well-being.

Globalisation is exacerbating the interaction problems between cultures and people who identify themselves within these cultures. The growing internal contradictions of life, when people feel part of the global world on the one hand and part of local culture on the other, require a new paradigm of global governance that guarantees the harmonious structure of the future global society.

State study of the problem. The problems of globalisation and global governance are covered both within the framework of philosophy and within the framework of special scientific disciplines: economics, political science, sociology, cultural studies, and management. However, globalisation itself is the subject of a fairly new field of knowledge. Having originated in the last quarter of the 20th century, it began to receive scientific and philosophical understanding only in the 1990s. The phenomenon of globalisation and global governance, due to its interdisciplinary nature and blurred research boundaries, requires a multilateral consideration. In this article, the authors rely on a number of authoritative works that, to varying degrees, reveal the dangerous processes of transforming culture into an "object" and "tool" of global governance, their negative consequences and threats. All these works are divided into several blocks.

Firstly, these are socio-philosophical works in which scholars highlight the patterns and trends in the development of society: Nikolay Danilevsky (1869), Oswald Spengler (1918), Arnold Toynbee (1961), Daniel Bell (1980), Alvin Toffler (1980), Immanuel Wallerstein (1982, 1989), Peter Drucker (1982, 1994), Pitirim Sorokin (1989), Francis Fukuyama (1992), Samuel Huntington (1996), Nikita Moiseev (1998), Yuri Pavlenko (2002), Boris Kuzyk, Yuri Yakovets (2008).

Secondly, the works of scholars that reveal the essence and features of globalisation as a single holistic objective process: Roland Robertson (1992), Roland Robertson, Kathleen White (1992), Leslie Sklair (1995, 2011), Arjun Appadurai (1996, 2013), Anthony Giddens (1999), George Soros (2000, 2005), Henry Kissinger (2002, 2014), Joseph Stiglitz (2003), Manuel Castells (2005), Kenichi Ohmae (2005), Ulrich Beck (2006, 2015), Octavio Ianni (2008), Malcolm Waters (2013), Roland Robertson, Didem Buhari-Gulmez (2017), Walter Anderson (2020), Karl Popper (2020).

Thirdly, publications whose authors give mostly critical assessments of the globalisation phenomenon and propose a shift from unipolar to multipolar or even polar-free globalisation: Samir Amin (2006), Dilip Hiro (2010), Andrey Makarychev (2014), Paolo Pizzolo (2020), Alexander Dugin (2021), Boris Nad (2022), Fadi Lama (2023), Mher Sahakyan (2023).

Fourthly, the work of researchers on the ownership of global governance: Commission on Global Governance (1995), Anthony McGrew, David Held (2002), Henry Lamb (2008), Sophie Harman (2011), Ian Goldin (2013), Sophie Harman (2013), Mark Duffield (2014), Brian Frederking, Paul Diehl (2015), Zbigniew Brzezinski (2016), Robert Gorman (2016), Todd Huizinga (2016), Susanna Campbell (2018), Michael Zurn (2018), Elizabeth Ferris, Katharine Donato (2019), Thomas Weiss, Rorden Wilkinson (2019, 2021), Tarja Halonen, Ulla Liukkunen (2021), Augusto Lopez-Claros (2022), Jamie Martin (2022), Sorpong Peou (2022), Paul Tucker (2024).

Fifth, specialised management literature. These are, in particular, the works of such scholars as Robin Mansell (2000), Nagy Hanna (2010), Joseph Stiglitz, Bruce Greenwald (2014), Mousumi Roy (2020), Peter Drucker (2021, 2023), Ichak Adizes (2023), as well as Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Olena Khlystun, and Yelena Kovalenko (Kovalenko, 2017, 2023; Martynyshyn & Khlystun, 2018; Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2016, 2018; Martynyshyn et al., 2020).

Unresolved issues. However, in general, there is a clear lack of literature that would provide a philosophical analysis of the use of culture as an “object” and “tool” of global governance, as well as reveal the factors of this negative phenomenon, its causal nature and reasonable ways to overcome it.

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose and research tasks. The purpose of the article is a philosophical analysis of comprehensive changes in society under the influence of globalisation and identification of the determinants that influence the transformation of culture as a factor of existence of modern society into an “object” and “tool” of global governance.

In accordance with this purpose, the following tasks were solved:

- to highlight the role and significance of culture in society as a powerful means of forming, educating, developing and humanising a person;
- to analyse the socio-cultural reflections and contradictions of globalisation, which lead to deformation of ethno-cultural identifications, which becomes an obstacle to the achievement of a true civilisational synthesis by humanity;
- to reveal the essence of global governance, its subjectivity and to determine the reasons why culture is deliberately turned into an “object” and “tool” of this governance;

– to identify the social consequences and metaphysical threats of the transformation of culture into an “object” and “tool” of global governance, as well as possible means of counteraction by the individual and society.

Methodology and methods. The methodological basis of the study is, first of all, the general philosophical laws and principles of cognition of social phenomena and processes, in particular, the laws of dialectics, which allow to consider the processes of social development in interconnection, unity and struggle of opposites, transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, cyclical repetition of the past on a new higher basis; the principle of systematicity, which allows to study societies, globalisation processes and their management from the standpoint of an integral system that is in a state of continuous development; the principle of historicism, which allows us to study social processes in chronological order, identifying the peculiarities of each stage of historical development.

In general, the study is focused on the systemic-dialectical approach, the principles of structural-functional analysis and axiology. The synergistic approach and methods of rationalism were also partially used in analysing the dynamics of traditions and innovations in the culture of a globalising society.

A special place is occupied by the interdisciplinary approach, which allows to obtain synthetic knowledge about globalisation, global governance and their consequences, obtained within the framework of individual scientific disciplines, in particular, political economy, political science, sociology, cultural studies and management.

Comparative and typological methods were actively used to identify the similarities and differences between different forms of globalisation and global governance, as well as the method of expert assessments, which made it possible to predict the course of globalisation processes and their consequences in the future.

Research information base. The study is based on theoretical and empirical information obtained from reliable, authoritative sources. The theoretical data used were the results of previous studies conducted by the most prominent scholars in the field of philosophy, sociology, economic theory, political science, cultural studies, global studies, global and general governance. The empirical data on the object of study are based on the authors' own observations, as well as on the expert opinions of specialists in the field. The chronological boundaries of the study cover the period from the middle of the last century to the present with a slight forecast for the next decade, and the territorial boundaries include all countries of the world.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Why is culture becoming an "object" and "tool" of global governance?

Human being is the main mystery of philosophical thinking. The complexity of cognition of human beings and humanity in general lies in the fact that a person simultaneously belongs to several worlds: material, social and spiritual. The basis of spirituality is culture, which is considered the second nature of man. However, its real role in the life of a modern person, in his or her self-perception and self-identification is such that in fact it takes the place of the first nature in terms of its significance, and becomes the main one, because in many cases it means as much to a person and defines him or her as the first nature did. This significance of culture, its role and possibilities have always been used by society to shape a person, to educate and develop him or her; being created by the person himself or herself, it appears as a powerful means of humanising him or her. But in our time, which has become a time of paradoxes and unexpected decisions, culture is increasingly being used for purposes other than its traditional purpose, and sometimes for purposes that are quite opposite. For example, the concept of information warfare has emerged, in which cultural achievements are used in a narrowly targeted manner, often for anti-cultural and even anti-human purposes.

Today, in the context of the ongoing globalisation project, the basic attitude and main idea of the new world order is becoming increasingly clear: "money solves everything". Not only the purpose but also the content of the globalisation project is reduced to solving financial and economic problems, and the economy itself is perceived as the ultimate justification and explanation for all processes taking place in society. One of the members of the Bilderberg Club, Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development *Jacques Attali* in his book "Millennium: Winners and Losers in the Coming Order" (1992), calls money the main and universal value, including the spiritual one. The modern world as an era of money, in his opinion, is formed on the principle of geoeconomics, which claims to be both the ideology of the new society and the philosophy of the globalisation era. According to J. Attali, the only universal form of organisation of society and the whole world means that power will be measured only by the amount of controlled money, which defines and symbolises all relations and thus becomes not only a general equivalent, but also a kind of language capable of being a universal expressor of all things and all relations.

And although economic ideas are thus recognised as universal and sufficient to describe all processes in the world without exception, there are still

notions and concepts outside of economic reality that are not reduced to it, which are still capable of influencing the shape and content of the globalisation era to some extent. It is in culture, which actually encompasses the entirety of a modern person's life, that his or her ideas about the world and about oneself are formed, and it is through culture that forms of behaviour, stereotypes of thinking, life ideals and values are offered and instilled in him or her. The cultural consciousness also searches for the optimal social structure of society, designs utopias and dystopias as models of the desired, rejected or possible state of social order from the logical development of trends. And precisely because culture is able to act as a relatively independent component of social regulation, it is becoming an object of close attention from the leaders of the globalisation project, who seek to use the possibilities of culture to form the images and stereotypes of thinking they need, which would help strengthen the idea of the merits of the new globalisation order and its values in people's minds.

Culture can and does become a subject of competition and a tool of competition in the context of cultural integration in a globalised society. The struggle for the predominance of the images and values of their culture becomes a condition for competing parties to be present on world markets, on film and television screens, at prestigious exhibitions that determine the victory of certain companies producing equipment, clothing, toys, etc. According to the laws of the market, the culture that wins is the one that benefits the most.

An even broader significance and, most importantly, use of the cultural factor is also mentioned by the American ideologist of the new world order *Zbigniew Brzezinski*, who, along with the economic, military, and technological factors, identifies the cultural factor as one of the four main dimensions of power (2000, p. 19). "The global cultural temptation is facilitated by the rapid spread of English as a means of international communication" (2004, p. 237). And today, "the historically unprecedented scale of American cultural superiority is unparalleled" (Ibid., p. 14). The formation of a global community with America at its centre is an undoubted goal and value for Z. Brzezinski, although he acknowledges "the rather obvious narrowness of the intellectual and cultural interests of American society" (Ibid., p. 57). However, if "the United States wishes to preserve at home the way of life and freedom to which it is so devoted, it needs to secure the legitimacy of its dominance outside America" (Ibid., p. 72).

And it is the processes taking place in the culture of the globalisation era that most clearly reveal the negative trend implemented in the practice of globalisation and can determine the failure of the entire global project, allowing it to be identified as a grand dystopia. The reality of these processes not only deprives many former supporters of globalisation of their illusions, but also marks the line beyond which a dangerous degradation of society begins. What appears to be the globalisation of culture is in fact often the degeneration

of culture into a cultural instrument of globalisation, a mechanism for reproducing a globally homogenised mode of consciousness.

So, if in the context of globalisation culture becomes an “object” and a “tool” of global governance, then who is the “subject” of this governance? To find an answer to this question, it is first of all advisable to refer to the world-system theory of the famous American sociologist *Immanuel Wallerstein* (1974-1989; 1982), from which we can conclude that the subject of global governance is the core of the world-system, or even more precisely, the United States as the leader of this system. However, such a conclusion, following the logic of *Jacques Attali* (1992), can only be considered preliminary, since not all core countries are direct owners of money.

As you know, the main currency of the world is the US dollar, which is used to buy almost everything around the world: politicians, companies, etc. And this money has owners. And these are not abstract persons, or states, or even the United States, but specific people who have power over money and can print it as much as they want, whenever they want – these are the owners of a financial organisation called the Federal Reserve System, which is formally considered the central bank of the United States, but in no way belongs to this state; it is a private organisation that controls virtually all central banks in the world. And if we agree with the thesis of *Amschel Rothschild*, the founder of this system, “give me control over the money of a state, and I will not care who writes the laws in that state” (cited in Elon, 2011, p. 33), then the FRS is practically the main power in the world. Its masters, owners are not elected or appointed, like, for example, any presidents; the power of these “emperors” is inherited. However, it should be borne in mind that this is not all power, but only material power, which seeks to take control of what is called the “sacred” or to offer humanity a substitute for the “sacred” with some false analogues and values.

3.2. Social consequences of global governance

There are not only different attitudes to globalisation, but also different ways of understanding the one world. For some, a united humanity is a dream and a subject of hope and work to bring it closer (think of Hryhorii Skovoroda, Panteleimon Kulish, Volodymyr Solovyov, Semen Frank, Mykola Berdiaev, Volodymyr Vernadskyi). For others, it is the object of ideal projects and utopias construction that embody the trends in the development of the world process and the idea of human progress (the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, humanist utopians Thomas More and Tommaso Campanella, the “Red project”, the “American dream”, etc.) For others, it is a rigidly structured society with a clear hierarchy, permanently fixed roles and unlimited (or limited availability

of money) power, supported by all possible (including dubious) methods and technologies (which is why globalisation strategies are implemented so rigidly on the periphery of the world-system that did not keep up and therefore is forever late); In other words, it is a realised dystopia like Jack London's "The Iron Heel", the novels of George Orwell and Aldous Huxley, or even the "Black NeuroSoc" of the post-singular world.

And culture also has different models and different roles. In one idealised case, globalisation is understood as the organisation of the unity of diversity, which is ensured by the interaction of different cultural traditions, patterns and values, and the commitment to preserve them to enrich the content of humanity's cultural life and its cultural space. This would be a way to ensure real development, which is possible precisely on the basis of the interaction of different things, allowing for an up-to-date (for each specific case) choice of the most appropriate (for this case) option. In the case of the proposed form of globalisation, cultural interaction is understood as the unification of cultural models, which will inevitably mean the homogenisation of the cultural space of humanity. At the same time, cultural unification, as it quickly became clear, should be based on the American model, and homogenisation means structuring the semantic space in accordance with American values. In other words, in reality, the instrument of globalisation is a variant of unilateral monologue dictation, in which other world cultures are displaced and suppressed by the culture taken as a "model".

All of this is in line with *Jacques Attali's* ideas about the crucial role of money as a new unconditional liberal value: the richest and therefore strongest state has the right to impose its will on others as losers who have failed to prove their right to success. In this regard, let us recall the content of some plots from the popular TV series "Her name was Nikita", where employees of the special department carry out their operations on the territory of foreign countries, without doubting that they have every right to do so. They are fighting for their own values, which must be imposed on the whole world at any cost. Any moral considerations remain beyond the consciousness of the functionaries of this Nikitin's World Organisation for Investigation and Terror, which, without the sanction of any international organisations, has arrogated to itself the authority to forcibly "make the rest of the world happy".

In this regard, it becomes necessary for others (in particular, and especially for us) to first of all clearly understand the mistakenness of our identification with the United States, our national interests with America's interests, without which it is impossible to give a sober and objective assessment of our own position in this project, nor to form an authentic basis for our own behaviour in it. *Zbigniew Brzezinski* (2004) writes that "Globalisation is a boon for America" (p. 212), and "the only possible world government can only be an American global dictatorship" (p. 275).

Here we should say a few words about this problem, which is specific to our time – the problem of false identification. Due to the organisation of the content of the massive influence of information media and technologies, people begin to identify themselves with certain individuals or groups, contrary to their actual social and cultural affiliation. Political and social myths force him or her to identify his or her interests with those of groups and people whose goals diverge from his or her own; a person seems to be split: in his or her real life, he or she remains with his or her reference group, but in his or her consciousness, he or she finds himself or herself inscribed in a system of completely different, sometimes completely alien views, interests, ideas, and patterns of behaviour. This forces him or her to participate in the implementation of programmes and goals that are not only alien, but also harmful to him or her.

Various informational influences lead to the formation of tolerance towards, for example, the functioning and legitimacy of the term “multiple identification”, or polyidentity, when a person simultaneously belongs to a number of reference groups with which he or she identifies himself or herself and his or her interests. It is true that human identity is exercised in a certain sense hierarchically (the individual, family, clan, professional or other group, country, civilisation, planet), but it cannot be exercised equally and in multiple directions. The multidimensionality of goodness is good, as long as it is not identified with the split personality or the disintegration of consciousness. And in this sense, is not Andrii, Taras Bulba's son, poly-identical, who apparently made his “civilisational choice” (referring to the story by Mykola Hohol) on the basis of such poly-identity. But this is how it is expressed in the post-traditional space. But in the reality of the human tradition in which Hohol worked, this was called betrayal. A betrayal of one's homeland, father, and comrades. And if this has become empty words for us, then why are these notions of defending one's own not empty for Americans, whom we sometimes copy so much: let's recall the film “Saving Private Ryan”. For the American mentality, such an ideology is invalid and only suitable as an “exportable commodity”.

When cultural theorists argue that the post-traditional society of the globalised world is not a society without traditions, but a society with a changed appreciation of traditions, this is not just ordinary postmodern terminology, but a war against common sense, which must be present in concepts if we want to clarify something with their help, and not completely confuse and obscure it. The quality of one's own thinking cannot be compromised by frivolously operating with logically invalid concepts that contain an internal contradiction.

The same applies to the national self-identification of entire nations. Here, too, we see the use of various concepts that are designed to obscure some obvious things. The influence of Americanised mass culture forces peoples to identify themselves with systems of other cultures and values, and they begin

to actively participate in the implementation of forced and seemingly only possible programmes instead of critically reviewing them and replacing them with those that are necessary for them. In this way, the group interests of the new global elite are presented as the interests of the entire world population. As a result, it turns out that 80% of the world's population is doomed to live in poverty, 15% – in satisfactory conditions, and only 5% – in wealth, mostly Americans. The dominant position of the United States has legitimised the convenient use of double standards in its relations with other countries, which has shown most clearly that globalisation is a well-organised and systematic one-gate game – in favour of one country that seeks to maintain and strengthen its status by any means necessary. Although, by and large, as shown above, although the United States is in the most privileged position in the world system, it is also today a kind of means of implementing the policy of the masters of money – the globalists.

Against the background of statements about integration into a single world culture, two seemingly opposite processes are taking place: on the one hand, there is a unification (homogenisation) of cultures through their absorption into the Americanised cultural model. On the other hand, there is a parallel fragmentation of national cultures, their disintegration into separate ethnically oriented loci, while the cultural space itself is disintegrating into many cultural fragments, culture is fragmented in these loci, fragmenting consciousness. All of this, on the one hand, increases the difficulties of self-identification, and on the other hand, by creating ever smaller socio-cultural groups, destroys the unity of society; while the appearance of a single culture makes people more divided than ever, it is increasingly difficult for them to understand each other, to sympathise with each other, to support each other; it is as if they are a cluster of identical atoms, each orbiting in its own individual orbit that does not intersect with others.

Double standards are also being applied to education, which is being deliberately stripped of its general scientific basis and humanistic content, turning into a “service sector” that begins to produce narrow specialists who usually have only a certain amount of necessary practical skills. The education system is destroying the mandatory general standards that characterise a broadly educated person who would be able to see the world as a whole; such a vision is replaced by a set of unrelated fragments of knowledge about individual phenomena. Rising book prices, closing a large number of libraries as unprofitable, and introducing fees for using information that cut off economically unable users from it fit into this strategy. At the same time, for a small group of the new elite, called upon to exercise power and ensure its heredity, education is subject to completely different standards, and the model of education itself is different; the system of educational institutions for the elite in the West is becoming increasingly closed.

In fact, globalisation can reasonably be regarded as a new sophisticated colonial policy, which is carried out, among other things, through cultural expansion, which prepares, ensures and reproduces – through a special influence on public consciousness – economic dependence on the global centre of the rest of the globalised world.

In addition to the already mentioned factor – the fact that globalisation has actually taken on the form of Americanisation, the fact that the extreme degree of materialisation of all social relations in the situation of the continuously created and expanding global market, and the monetary form of their measurement and evaluation, means not just the triumph of a very specific way of organising society, but also a completely different form of existence and functioning of culture itself, is also worrying. And this, in turn, ultimately means a revision of the very idea of man, the meaning of his being in the world and the purpose of his development not as a biological species, but as a generic being.

In a global society, economics is turning from a tool for organising economic life and a technology of relations in the financial sector into both a philosophy and an ideology of the globalising world, i.e. directly formulating a strategy and shaping the meaning of human existence, as well as the way people understand the world. All spheres of life are being commercialised, which is unjustified from the point of view of the overall costs of this process, but seems to be an absolutely logical and inevitable consequence of this policy; it is also inevitably associated with the degradation of culture and the decline of the spiritual component of society and individuals, and the curtailment of social programmes. The gap between the economic and cultural models of development of different societies is widening and consolidating, which further aggravates the civilisation crisis.

The transformation of culture into a factor in the implementation of power strategies is particularly evident in the existence and conduct of so-called “soft” or “quiet” wars. Wars in general would be superfluous in the first variant of globalisation, unnecessary in the second variant, but they become necessary and inevitable in the third of the above cases. These are not necessarily hot wars or even so-called cold wars. It is a centralised system of softly and imperceptibly carried out information influences in the socio-cultural space of a country, the object of which is the consciousness of the people living in it, the content of their worldview, traditional beliefs and values. The spectrum of manifestations of information weapons ranges from emotional discomfort and uncertainty to disorganisation of entire life support systems of society.

Unfortunately, a special kind of information warfare can be considered modern mass culture, which everywhere, in Ukraine, Germany, France, Japan, has an American face and preaches the American way of life, American values, American food, and American character. The modern mythology, which is

created according to certain orders and models and implemented through images actively imposed by the masculine, not only displaces traditional national myths that ensure national unity, continuity of national culture and values of the traditional way of life, but also aggressively debunks them, showing their harm in comparison with American myths of strength and success.

The visible colourfulness of cultural life, the proclaimed pluralism of values, the diversity of searches, the cultivated attention to “loci”, various deviations and strangeness of existence, anomalies and reversals in the world and human life, demonstrated by the practice of another cultural trend, post-modernism, do not in any way cancel the tendency towards unification of cultural life. Ultimately, postmodernist practice in philosophy and art contributes to a kind of softening of consciousness, increases its disorientation towards basic values and norms, encourages mental uncertainty and relativity, which makes it easier to fix any artificial, fictitious, false values imposed by masculinity and advertising in the mind that has lost its natural hierarchy of values. And postmodernism itself, if we strip away the veneer of linguistic and figurative associations and allusions, often looks in its ideas and content like the same masculine culture, just, as modern teenagers put it, more “sophisticated”.

As a result, we have war (and not only information warfare) as an everyday reality, lies and deception as a way of life, and absurdity as a way of organising existence, as a form of consciousness. As for the use of culture as a weapon of war for globalisation, the very nature of culture is such that such attempts in their forced form can lead to exactly the opposite result.

As already mentioned, globalisation has not become a synthesis of cultures that would allow them to acquire a new quality and a new space, but is carried out with the help of cultural support in the form of a unified mass culture, which has actually led to the impoverishment of spiritual space. The famous sociologist *Nikolai Danilevsky* in his book “Russia and Europe: The Slavic Worlds Political and Cultural Relations with The Germanic-Roman West” (1869), based on a comparative historical analysis of cultures, concluded that it is impossible to speak of the universality of cultures in general and to consider the culture of the West in particular as such. Danilevsky considered each culture to be a separate living organism with its own history and its own system of worldview. He gave a negative answer regarding the unity of humanity and the possibility of a single universal culture. There is no unity, he argued, and there is no unidirectional process of cultural development. Therefore, it is more correct to ask not about a universal culture, but about the universal and the individual in each culture.

On the same grounds, the German philosopher *Oswald Spengler*, who developed the ideas of N. Danilevsky in his book “The Decline of the West” (1918). He believed that cultures are isolated, and only the similarity of the

logic of their change can be considered common. Similar views were also held by the famous English historian *Arnold Toynbee* in his work “A Study of History” (1934-1961), as well as by many other scholars who argue that a universal culture, the same for all nations, is impossible (Trubetskoï, 1980; Gumilev, 1992; Billet, 1993; Touraine, 1995; Attir, 2020; Saxena, 2013; Simon, 2020, etc.).

Humans survived on Earth thanks to the diversity of cultures, which ensured a variety of adaptation forms to the conditions of the world, its flexibility. It is the diversity of cultures that means the possibility of making the choice necessary in certain conditions, and therefore the development of a particular society should be based on this most optimal choice for it. Therefore, it is necessary for humanity to have such a choice

Many researchers provide a clear geographical and ethnological justification for the impossibility of a common culture, especially one identified with Western Europe. For example, the representative of Eurasianism *Nikolai Trubetskoï* (1980) categorically states that “the brotherhood of nations bought at the cost of spiritual depersonalisation of all peoples is a vile deception” (p. 78). Such cultural unification inevitably leads to negative social consequences and serious metaphysical catastrophes.

3.3. Metaphysical threats of global governance

Attempts at unification also apply to such a sphere of cultural life as religion. And in this area we see the desire for a rationalised unification of different religious confessions into a single religion of ecumenism. Let us recall that *Vladimir Soloviev* in his “A Story of Anti-Christ” (1900) created the image of an ecumenist: he is none other than the Antichrist; it was he who, elected president by earthlings, decided to unite religions. It is the Antichrist, who later became an earthly emperor, who, through the hierarchs he seduced, reunites the churches, i.e., actually implements the ecumenical globalisation project.

European researchers have been writing about the dangers of the Americanisation of European life since the 1970s. Thus, back in 1982, the socialist *Jack Lang*, who was then the Minister of Culture of France, raised the question that “not only financial expansion, but also the dominance of standardised American culture can be seen as a dangerous form of US interference in the internal affairs of European states” (cited in Streeten, 2001, p. 47). Nowadays, *Zbigniew Brzezinski* (2016) not only does not deny this fact, but also believes that the task of maintaining America's global dominance will continue to require “an international order that not only copies but also reproduces many features of the American system abroad” (p. 44).

Culture, by virtue of its nature and content, can act as a soft means and the most natural way to unite peoples, integrate them in order to implement a

programme of just and conflict-free life built on the foundations of such cultural values as truth and goodness. It seems that the pursuit of these values and their realisation would not be a contradiction to the idea of progress, understood in its authentic sense – as the development of humanity and the improvement of a person capable of building harmonious relations with the world. But this is not what the leaders of the globalisation project wanted, or rather, what they were aiming for.

So what does a country that is convinced of its superiority and exclusivity offer us culturally, and what are the grounds for such feelings? On the one hand, *Zbigniew Brzezinski* (2016) is indeed correct when he argues that “cultural superiority is an underrated aspect of American global power. Whatever some may think of its aesthetic values, American popular culture exudes a magnetic pull, especially for young people around the world. American television programmes and films account for nearly three quarters of the global market. American popular music is also dominant, and American hobbies, eating habits, and even clothing are increasingly imitated around the world” (p. 41). But, on the other hand, the real ability to impose one's values does not equal their actual merit.

A country without deep own cultural traditions, with a population (and corresponding heredity) whose psychological basis does not imply rooted cultural, ethical and moral ideas, cannot use quantitative factors instead of qualitative ones for a long time. Christianity here is superficial, a kind of social (rather than spiritual) ritual; the very spirit of Protestantism as a local variant of Christianity is in many ways the same as that which once made Christ expel traders from the temple; the philosophy of pragmatism that was born there and expresses the spirit of the nation consolidates this spirit in private and public behaviour; individualism in its extreme forms consolidates the unwillingness to take anyone into account, especially if they are weaker in some way. Power, which manifests itself in various aspects and expressions, is becoming the dominant factor in solving all problems, including cultural ones. To regulate and regulate its manifestations and control, the so-called system of legal institutions, which America is so proud of, is used, but which is the only way for it to create a system of formal restraints capable of ensuring the normal functioning of society. In other societies, with different traditions and priorities, the role of such restraints is played by religion, as in Israel or Islamic countries, ritual and order, as in Japan or China, household culture, conscience, the spirit of collectivism that prevents individualism from becoming a threat to the well-being of others, etc.

The destruction of fundamental values makes people helpless and easily controlled in a certain sense. Russian-American sociologist *Pitirim Sorokin* writes in his book “Man and Society in Calamity” (1989) that “people with a

transcendental value system and a deep sense of moral duty have values that no man and no disaster can take away from them. In all circumstances, they maintain clarity of mind, a sense of human dignity, and self-respect. With these qualities, they can withstand any test, no matter how severe” (p. 61). At the same time, people who rely on the so-called worldly values: wealth, fame, power, find themselves without a footing in a crisis, because they have neither the highest goal in life nor the highest motivation for it, which would support them in a situation where their usual position, material well-being, etc. are lost. Therefore, the conversion of people to market values simultaneously facilitates the task of managing them by making them unrooted in existence.

Art and the media involve people in an endless game that turns into the main form of life. The conventionality and conformity of everything, even reality, are essential attributes of the interpretation of any fact of life, even the dramatic ones. Scandals, shows, carnivals, everything is meant to hide the main thing, to divert attention from the main human and social problems, the main meaning of life, and what is happening in politics under the radar. The continuous “carnival” pushes the essential, semantic forms and manifestations of life into the background. Not only culture, but also the world itself is subject to showmanship. For example, even the tragedy of 11 September in America was turned into a grand and spectacular show.

“Pluralism”, which combines the incompatible, equates the incomparable, creates a sense of absurdity in what is happening. For example, the phrase “humanitarian bombing” (so to speak, wars waged by altruists and philanthropists who are ready to introduce and assert “humanitarian values” by force) has become commonplace; according to this logic, cannibals, who in their own way also love people very much, would look no less humanitarian. The loss of control over semantic categories, arbitrariness and even deviance of semantic associations indicate not only degradation processes in the mind, but also a deliberate deformation of the mental space. This is the case, for example, with the use of the word “fundamentalism” only in a negative context and in conjunction with the word “terrorism”. However, fundamentalism is only a desire to return to one's cultural and religious roots, to one's foundations, to the deep foundations of the traditional way of life, way of thinking and perception, which is a generally natural reaction to globalisation, indicating a desire to neutralise cultural levelling by returning to one's cultural sources.

Consciousness fragmentation, confusion of concepts, the formation of a kind of virtual logic that organically includes absurdity lead to a kind of utopianisation of consciousness itself, which becomes unable to realise its own utopianism. It seems that this utopianism of consciousness, a kind of infantilisation of the mental process, is the basis for the crisis in many areas of modern science, when a theory is built on false, erroneous (or deliberately distorted)

premises using scientific conceptual apparatus and conventional logic; sometimes this appearance of scientificity can camouflage the falsity of the premises underlying it. The deformation of consciousness, the general spirit of absurdity, and the breakdown of the mental “topology” of space lead to the formation of a kind of degradation funnel that draws in, absorbing entire areas of reality.

The main idea of the information war for globalisation is to create a subjective sense of freedom in the face of objective unfreedom. A similar idea was expressed, in particular, by the Grand Inquisitor from “The Karamazov Brothers” *Fyodor Dostoevsky* (1880). The Inquisitor considered it necessary to kill the very instinct of freedom in man. What kind of freedom can we talk about when a person is increasingly turned into a function? Even special drugs (e.g. Benzedrine) are used to program human consciousness for a specific purpose. Just remember the film “Her name was Nikita” or look at the faces of soldiers of paramilitary law enforcement units, who are a function personified.

The lack of deep rootedness of the US right to leadership was written about by the American sociologist *Daniel Bell* in his article “The End of American Exceptionalism” (1980), where he argued that the weakening of power could make the US an ordinary country, because it has no other grounds for exceptionalism. Another well-known American sociologist, *Samuel Huntington*, in his article “The West Unique, Not Universal” (1996), also states that the claims of one of the centres to exclusivity destroy the real pluralism of cultures. Therefore, he believes, the West should not build illusions about its universality, but rather take care of preserving the viability of its own civilisation in a world of different civilisations.

It is also important to note here that the inevitable “levelling up” offered by Americanised mass culture cannot take place at any sufficiently high level. It takes place on the level that is common to all and accessible to all, that is, the level of material values, because it is only on the spiritual level that people differ most. Thus, in a unified human culture based on the American model, the primacy of purely material needs is inevitable, and as a result, the spiritual primitivisation of culture, which is quite understandable from this perspective, is also inevitable. That is why today the cultural capacity of the Americans as the only superpower willing to dictate all standards and models to the world is increasingly being questioned. Given that the majority of the US intellectual elite is by no means “American-made”, it becomes obvious that their claims to act as a “elder brother” in the globalised and post-globalised world are highly questionable.

At the same time, power is becoming increasingly alienated and anonymous. Many political figures in the West argue that in this world, the most important decisions are made by someone who is unknown and to whom no complaints or criticism should be addressed. Above, we have already lifted

the veil a little from the face of this invisible "big brother", the master of money, who holds the strings of the fates of all who live, because, as *Fyodor Dostoevsky's* (1880) legend of the Grand Inquisitor says, "who should own people but those who own their conscience and in whose hands their bread is" (p. 307).

The exercise of power is taking on new, unprecedented forms: mind control; conducting controlled conflicts; "correcting" the population, etc. Science and cultural achievements are increasingly being used against the person who created them. Cloning, the possibility of achieving personal immortality by manipulating the genetic code and the use of "spare organs" will soon reveal the reality of new immortal gods, which will finally and irreversibly divide the world, marking a qualitatively new dystopia.

The processes of controlled deanthropologisation, national depersonalisation, and cultural unification in the countries "managed" by the United States (and the vast majority of them) lead to the undermining of the foundations of social life and the destruction of traditional institutions of its organisation. It is as if the root system that nourishes and binds them is being pulled out from under them, and the structure of national life, which is losing its roots, begins to resemble a tangled tangle of tumbleweeds. Obviously, it is this fundamental loss of rootedness that *Jacques Attali* had in mind when he wrote in his book "Millennium: Winners and Losers in the Coming Order" (1992), he wrote that the cosmopolitanisation of humanity as the main goal of the new world order will make the spirit and mood of nomadism the main characteristic of the psychomental. Nomadism will become the highest form of the new society. The nomad, as it should be, will be on the move, without any stable landmarks in time and space. The new "nomads" will have no sense of homeland and native land, no faith of their ancestors – only a desire for "bread and circuses", presented, of course, in a modern, i.e. informational, version. Unfortunately, huge masses of people who have become migrants as a result of various conflicts accompanying globalisation, economic instability, which forces them to look for better places or simply escape, and think that this strange idea of nomads is being realised in the globalised world, which is subject to a rigid hand that stirs up the world and shapes it as if anew.

The evolution of children's toys is indicative of the human deanthropologisation. If earlier these were bears, foxes, bunnies, cheburashki (topples), similar to funny animals, now they have been replaced first by teletubbies, then by Pokémon, tweenies, etc. These are incomprehensible creatures of unknown nature, devoid of charm and aesthetic expressiveness, they have neither cultural roots nor objective appeal to the child's soul. This is a reflection of the general trend towards the deanthropologisation of man, when, along with his material and material "grounding", he is simultaneously removed from his own human nature – holistic and multifaceted and squeezed into a kind of virtual image of an entity constructed according to unknown technical patterns.

It should be noted that the contemporary cultural context, which is determined by the dominance of two major cultural paradigms: postmodernism and mass culture is best suited to the goal of bringing the cultural life of humanity to a certain “common denominator”. At the same time, as we remember, the larger the denominator of a fraction, the smaller the value it represents. First of all, culture, like a land on three whales, stood on three main and unconditional values: truth, goodness, and beauty. People have always felt the fundamental nature of these values internally, as if on an unconditional level. Nowadays, the postmodern context blurs the semantic and value certainty of the foundations of human existence in every possible way. Thus, truth is becoming more and more relative and ambiguous; goodness is compromised by the ideology of power and success, enshrined in the philosophy of pragmatism; beauty is being replaced by the ugly, which is aestheticised in various forms of deviation not only from beauty as a higher order of organisation, but also from the norm. A multitude of diverse and incompatible values (and their equal anti-values) form the “denominator” that turns culture into an infinitesimal value. And while the postmodern worldview blurs the value structure of the cultural space, equating truth and falsehood, good and evil, beauty and ugliness, mass culture, in turn, directly homogenises both the content of culture and the content of consciousness. These processes not only fragment society socially and ontologically, but also lead to the disintegration of the semantic foundations that define its very sociality.

Of course, high culture and high art continue to exist (which has become almost virtual), and artists continue to create works of true art, but their circulation is incomparably small compared to the number of detective stories that have filled the bookstore. They not only “physically” displace high art, but also shift the proportions of perception: it is not masterpieces that are the objects of advertising and popularisation in talk shows.

The deformations in the sphere of public attitudes and social psychology are not without cause. The well-known scientist *Nikita Moiseev* (1997) saw in the processes of active homogenisation of “human material” and culture the gradual establishment of “a regime of new totalitarianism, in which the zombified population of five billion poor countries will ensure the democratic and ecological well-being of the golden billion” (p. 18). Indeed, as a result of directed globalisation efforts, the reality of a new world empire with a single control centre, with the division of states into different worlds, with an even more rigid division of the population into elite and mass, into the “golden billion” of the metropolis and the colonial periphery, is clearly emerging.

At present, the real results of globalisation and disappointment with it, the feeling of its exhaustion with the use of the old means and the old ideology are forcing a reconsideration of its priorities, even by those who stood at the

source of its strategy. But, of course, it is not a question of returning to the idea of the true unity of humanity, which means not homogenisation and unification, but the realisation of the synthesis of cultures into a single human culture, but only of finding a more effective strategy, when a multiplicity of “points of support” could ensure the real stability of the building of culture and the building of the world as the foundations for the preservation of the new world order.

So, today we can observe a situation where the global elite is confronted by a mass with a decentred consciousness, incapable of self-identification and living in a phantom world of fictitious values, turning into a mere biomass, which, in order to ensure order and peace in society, must be covered by total control and a system of relentless manipulation of consciousness, the mechanisms of which have been developed in information wars and disguised by the new cult. And this will be a new totalitarianism, because, firstly, the former totalitarian regimes were local and did not cover the world as a whole, and secondly, never before have such regimes had such a powerful information support that would imperceptibly but universally cover the life of society. The emergence of the cultural industry, which puts people on a stream of programming through mass art, advertising, and television programmes, is described by German philosophers *Max Horkheimer* and *Theodor Adorno* in their book “Dialectic of Enlightenment” (2002) as “the most sophisticated and malignant form of totalitarianism” (p. 282).

The modern context completely ignores the fact that human nature has a level of “spiritual unconscious” identified by the Austrian psychologist *Viktor Frankl*. In his book “Unconscious God” (1975), he argues that human nature has a certain divine component that seems to be dormant in the unconscious layer of the human soul. That is why a person will always subconsciously resist attempts to place him or her in the Procrustean bed of schemes and projects if they do not take into account the meta-needs of human nature for spirituality and higher values.

The deeply negative metaphysical meaning of globalisation is that in order to achieve its goals, it creates conditions in which the very idea of man is put to the test. The emergence of man is a metaphysical cosmic megaproject, according to which conscious matter acquires the ability and becomes capable of actively opposing the global equalisation that condemns the world to endless swings between “big bangs” and “collapses”. Intelligent man as a cosmic project may be a way to escape from the bad infinity of the cyclic pulsation of the Universe's births and deaths. But for this to happen, a person must go through the path of development and improvement. A globalising human being appears as a degraded human being who may be incapable of continuity and continued evolution. Unless we assume that only the global elite, which retains the ability to improve its human psychological characteristics, will develop and

evolve. However, it is doubtful that it will retain the motivation to do so in the context of a rather narrow group, which, in turn, will sooner or later be stratified or its development will be carried out through artificial measures, eugenic experiments, etc. as presented in the dystopian fantasies of *Jean Parvulescu*.

As for the majority of the rest of the population, it will, as in *Jack London's* dystopian novel "The Iron Heel", sink "into the apathy of humility and hopelessness". The total deformation of the value hierarchy, the transformation of lifestyles, the threat of deformation of human nature itself as a result of the deepening schizophrenia of life and consciousness can create the effect of irreversible regression of humanity. Even the mere prospect of such an outcome shows how dear a price humanity can pay for a thoughtless attitude to its own destiny.

In general, it can be said that the implementation of the globalisation project, if it succeeds completely, will threaten the collapse of the metaphysical megaproject of man.

4. Conclusions

The conducted analysis allows us to conclude that the process of globalisation is a consequence of a whole range of reasons and manifests itself in various forms. The authors of the article sought to prove that globalisation is not aimed at transforming any sphere of life, economic or political, but at changing the entire paradigm of life: both for humanity as a whole and for each individual.

1. On the one hand, globalisation processes contribute to stabilisation of the economic situation, catalyse integrative trends in the political sphere, and are in line with the spirit of such ancient and idealised principles as internationalism and cosmopolitanism. However, on the other hand, the logical result of globalisation will be the removal of not only economic and political "barriers", not only the realisation of the old abstract idea of "Humanity", but also a rigid cultural and ethnic unification, the elimination of everything specifically national.

2. Globalisation processes, as well as the scientific, technological and information revolutions, have formed a fundamentally new situation of existence that requires philosophical understanding. The poor research of this situation, the situation of social globalism, is characterised by conceptual relativism, which complicates its analysis. The most productive position seems to us to be that of some researchers, according to which the current socio-cultural situation can be described as the "postmodern era".

3. The strategic components of the cultural evolution are scientific and technological, economic and social progress, which develop according to a three-spiral model, in which one spiral (social progress) is objectively shifted "in phase" and lags behind the other two (economic and scientific and technological progress), the movement of the latter of which is now taking place with a certain

acceleration and advancement relative to the previous two. Globalisation intensifies contradictions in the development of these components, leading to strategic instability of global and local societies.

4. Culture has always been used by society to form a person, to educate and develop him or her. Being created by man himself, it appears as a powerful means of humanising him. However, in our time, culture is increasingly being used not for its traditional purpose, but for sometimes opposite purposes, in which the achievements of culture are used in a narrowly targeted manner, often for anti-cultural and even anti-human purposes.

5. In the context of globalisation, which is led by the global elite, the basic attitude of the new world order is becoming more and more pronounced – “money solves everything”. Under this attitude, money becomes the main and universal value, including the spiritual one. And power begins to be measured only by the amount of controlled money, which defines and symbolises all relations and thus becomes not only a general equivalent, but also a kind of language capable of being a universal expressor of all things and relations.

6. However, the implementation of this idea, which claims to be the ideology of the new society and the philosophy of the globalisation era, is hindered by culture, especially in non-Western societies, which actually covers the entirety of human life, shapes people's perceptions of the world, forms of behaviour, stereotypes of thinking, life ideals and values. And that is why the leaders of the globalisation project seek to use the capabilities of culture to form the images and stereotypes they need, which would help strengthen the idea of the merits of the new social order in people's minds. As a result, culture is turning into an “object” and a “tool” of global governance.

7. At the same time, the “subject” of global governance, and therefore of world power, are the direct owners of the world's money (the US dollar), which is used to buy almost everything around the world. And these are not abstract individuals or states, but concrete people who have power over money and can print as much as they want, whenever they want. However, without the power over culture, this is not all power, but only monetary and material power, which seeks to take control of what is called the “sacred” or to offer humanity a substitute for it with some false analogues and values.

8. The transformation of culture into an “object” and “tool” of global governance leads to a number of negative social consequences and meta-physical threats. First of all, this is the problem of misidentification, when the interests of the global elite are presented as the interests of the entire population of the planet; secondly, the unification of cultural life, including religions, according to the American model, as the “only right one”; thirdly, the destruction of fundamental values and pluralism, which tries to combine the incompatible; fourth, propaganda of various anomalies and perversions in human life

mposed by postmodernism, mass culture and advertising; fifth, deanthropologisation of man, mind control, formation of a nomadic spirit, conducting controlled conflicts; “correction” of the population, etc.

9. Ultimately, this contributes to the softening of human consciousness, increases its disorientation with respect to basic values and norms, encourages mental uncertainty and relativity, which makes it easier to consolidate any artificial, fictitious, false values in the mind that has lost its natural hierarchy of values. This, in turn, makes people in a certain sense helpless and easily controlled, creates a subjective sense of freedom with objective unfreedom, which gradually establishes a regime of new sophisticated totalitarianism, in which the zombified population of seven billion people in poor countries will ensure the democratic and environmental well-being of the golden billion.

Thus, globalisation has not become a synthesis of cultures that would allow them to acquire a new quality and a new space, but is carried out with the help of cultural support in the form of a unified mass culture, which actually leads to the impoverishment of spiritual space and calls into question the very idea of man, whose emergence is a cosmic megaproject.

The scientific novelty. The scientific novelty of the research results lies in the disclosure of the socio-cultural essence of global governance and the identification of its negative consequences and threats to society.

The significance of the study. The theoretical and practical significance of the study lies in the fact that its main provisions, conclusions, approaches and basic ideas on the study of the socio-cultural nature of global governance can be used in the practical activities of public administration, as well as in the development of theoretical and methodological foundations of the philosophy of socio-cultural management and global studies.

Prospects for further research. The problem of globalisation and global governance is so broad and multidimensional that there is always room for new research. In addition, the dynamics of the modern world is constantly transforming the situation, bringing new aspects to the essential content of the problem under consideration, and further research should take this into account in the first place. Almost all the issues discussed in this article require further study. The process of globalisation is systemic and covers all areas of the modern space, and an effective study of any one element of the modern world is impossible without a comprehensive study of the entire system of globalisation processes. For example, the problem of Ukraine's civilisational identity becomes clear only in the context of the general problem of globalisation of the modern world; an adequate understanding of the process of cultural globalisation is impossible without a thorough philosophical analysis of the current socio-cultural situation. All of these problems, taken separately, are elements of a single system, and in order to understand each of them, it is necessary to study the whole system. Further study of the prob-

lem of globalisation and global governance should be carried out primarily within the framework of social philosophy, since it is the philosophical method that allows us to form a holistic, complex picture of the world.

Acknowledgement

This publication has been made in accordance with the theme of the Research Institute of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts within the theme: “Formation of the Modern Paradigm of Management of Socio-Cultural Activity in the Context of Civilization Development” (Project No. 0118U100544).

References:

- Adizes, I. K. (2023a). *Mastering Change: Rapid Change Without Destructive Conflict*. New York: Adizes Institute Publications.
- Adizes, I. K. (2023b). *The Power of Collaborative Leadership: Tested Practices for Today’s World*. New York: Adizes Institute Publications.
- Amin, S. (2006). *Beyond US Hegemony: Assessing the Prospects for a Multipolar World*. London: Zed Books.
- Anderson, W. T. (2020). *All Connected Now: Life in the First Global Civilization*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2013). *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*. London: Verso.
- Attali, J. (1992). *Millennium: Winners and Losers in the Coming Order* (Trans. in Fr.). New York: Random House.
- Attir, M. (2020). *Directions of Change: Modernization Theory, Research, and Realities*. London: Routledge.
- Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beck, U. (2015). *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Bell, D. (1980). The End of American Exceptionalism. *Parameters*, 10(1), 2-18, doi: <https://doi.org/10.55540/0031-1723.1202>.
- Billet, B. L. (1993). *Modernization Theory and Economic Development: Discontent in the Developing World*. New York: Praeger.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2000). *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia*. Washington: Center for Strategic & Intl Studies.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2004). *The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2016). *The Grand Chessboard*. New York: Basic Books.
- Campbell, S. P. (2018). *Global Governance and Local Peace: Accountability and Performance in International Peacebuilding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castells, M. (2005). *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Commission on Global Governance (1995). *Our Global Neighborhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Danilevsky, N. (1869; 2013). *Russia and Europe: The Slavic Worlds Political and Cultural Relations with the Germanic-Roman West*. New York: Slavica Pub.
- Dostoevsky, F. (1880; 2008). *The Karamazov Brothers* (Trans. in Russ.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (1982). *The New Society: The Anatomy of the Industrial Order*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Pub Group.
- Drucker, P. F. (1994). *Post Capitalist Society*. New York: Business.
- Drucker, P. F. (2021). *The End of Economic Man: A Study of the New Totalitarianism*. New York: Hassell Street Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (2023). *Landmarks of Tomorrow: A Report on the New Post Modern World*. London: Routledge.
- Duffield, M. (2014). *Global Governance and the New Wars*. London: Zed Books.
- Dugin, A. (2021). *The Theory of a Multipolar World*. Budapest: Arktos Media.
- Elon, A. (2011). *Founder: Meyer Amschel Rothschild and His Time*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Ferris, E. G., & Donato, K. M. (2019). *Refugees, Migration and Global Governance: Negotiating the Global Compacts*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Frankl, V. E. (1975). *Unconscious God*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Frederking, B., & Diehl, P. (Eds.). (2015). *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*. London: Profile.
- Goldin, I. (2013). *Divided Nations: Why Global Governance is Failing, and What We Can Do About It*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gorman, R. F. (2016). *What's Wrong with Global Governance?* Rome: Acton Institute for the Study of Religion & Liberty.
- Gumilev, L. N. (1992; 2016). *Eurasia*. New York: Wiley.
- Halonen, T., & Liukkunen, U. (2021). *International Labour Organization and Global Social Governance*. New York: Springer.
- Hanna, N. (2010). *E-Transformation: Enabling New Development Strategies (Innovation, Technology, and Knowledge Management)*. New York: Springer.
- Harman, S. (2011). *Global Health Governance (Global Institutions)*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Harman, S. (Ed.). (2013). *Governing the World?: Cases in Global Governance*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Hiro, D. (2010). *After Empire: The Birth of a Multipolar World*. London: Nation Books.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Huizinga, T. (2016). *The New Totalitarian Temptation: Global Governance and the Crisis of Democracy in Europe*. New York: Encounter Books.
- Huntington, S. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Free Press.
- Huntington, S. (1996). The West Unique, Not Universal. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(6), 28-46, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/20047828>.
- Ianni, O. (2008). *Global Society* (Trans. in Span.). Rio de Janeiro: Civilization.
- Kissinger, H. (2002). *Does America Need a Foreign Policy?: Toward a Diplomacy for the 21st Century*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kissinger, H. (2014). *World Order*. London: Penguin Books.
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2017). Network Models of Organization of Post-Industrial Society and Management Mechanisms in the Political, Economic and Socio-Cultural Spheres. *Economy and Management of Culture*, 2, 5-24, Retrieved from https://nakkkim.edu.ua/images/vidannya/Ekon_i_Management/EIM-2-2017.pdf (in Ukr.).
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2023a). Civilizational Paradigm of the Study of Management Culture Phenomenon: Theoretical and Methodological Aspect. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 6(1), 27-54, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.1.2023.278647>.
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2023b). Linear Socio-Cultural Strategies of Society Development Management: Conceptualisation Problems in the Context of Cross-Cultural Differences. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 6(2), 3-30, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2023.291245>.
- Kuzyk, B. N., & Yakovets, Yu. V. (2008). *Civilizations: Theory, History, Dialogue, Future* (Vol. 1-4). Moscow: Institute of Economic Strategies (in Russ.).
- Lama, F. (2023). *Why the West Can't Win: From Bretton Woods to a Multipolar World*. Atlanta: Clarity Press.
- Lamb, H. (2008). *The Rise of Global Governance*. Washington: National Center for Constitutional Studies.
- Lopez-Claros, A. (2022). *Global Governance and the Emergence of Global Institutions for the 21 Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makarychev, A. (2014). *Russia and the EU in a Multipolar World: Discourses, Identities, Norms (Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society)*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Mansell, R. (2000). *Mobilizing the Information Society: Strategies for Growth and Opportunity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. (2022). *The Meddlers: Sovereignty, Empire, and the Birth of Global Economic Governance*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Martynyshyn, Ya., & Khlystun, O. (2018). The Phenomenon of Ideas in the Management Activity of the Society. *Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity*, 2, 7-25, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.2.2018.149294> (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya., & Kovalenko, Ye. (2016). Civilization at the Point of Bifurcation: The Emergence of a New Social Order and the Modern Model of Management of Political, Economic and Socio-Cultural Spheres. *Economy and Management of Culture*, 1, 5-32, Retrieved from https://nakkkim.edu.ua/images/vidannya/Ekon_i_Management/EIM-1-2016.pdf (in Ukr.).

- Martynyshyn, Ya., & Kovalenko, Ye. (2018). Formation of the Modern System Management of Life Society. *Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity*, 1, 7-24, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.1.2018.143383> (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya., Khlystun, O., & Blašková, M. (2020a). The System as a Socio-Cultural Phenomenon Philosophy of Management. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 3(1), 3-38, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.1.2020.219795>.
- Martynyshyn, Ya., Khlystun, O., Adamoniene, R., & Dibrova, V. (2020b). System Analysis in Socio-Cultural Management: Theory, Methodology and Technology. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 3(2), 3-29, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2020.222640>.
- McGrew, A., & Held, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Moiseev, N. N. (1997). Humanism is a Barrier Against the Approaching Middle Ages. *Common Sense*, 1(5), 15-19 (in Russ.).
- Moiseev, N. N. (1998). *The Fate of Civilization: The Path of Reason*. Moscow: MNEPU (in Russ.).
- Nad, B. (2022). *After the Virus: The Rebirth of a Multipolar World*. New York: Prav Publishing.
- Ohmae, K. (2005). *The Next Global Stage: Challenges and Opportunities in Our Borderless World*. Philadelphia: Wharton School Pub.
- Pavlenko, Yu. V. (2002). *History of World Civilization: Philosophical Analysis*. Kyiv: Feniks (in Ukr.).
- Peou, S. (2022). *Global Public Governance: Toward World Government?* Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company.
- Pizzolo, P. (2020). *Eurasianism: An Ideology for the Multipolar World (Russian, Eurasian, and Eastern European Politics)*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Popper, K. R. (2020). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Robertson, R., & Buhari-Gulmez, D. (2017). *Global Culture: Consciousness and Connectivity*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Robertson, R., & White, K. (Eds.). (1992). *Globalization: Critical Concepts in Sociology*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Roy, M. (2020). *Sustainable Development Strategies: Engineering, Culture and Economics*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Sahakyan, M. (2023). *China and Eurasian Powers in a Multipolar World Order 2.0*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Saxena, S. K. (2013). *Modernization of Indian Tradition*. London: Centrum Press.
- Simon, G. (2020). *Modernization and Socio-Economic Development in Thailand and Cambodia: 1950-2015*. London: Our Knowledge Publishing.
- Sklair, L. (1995). *Sociology of the Global System*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Sklair, L. (2011) The Transition from Capitalist Globalization to Socialist Globalization. *Journal of Democratic Socialism, 1 (1)*, 1-14, Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291776859>.
- Soloviev, V. S. (1900; 2012). *A Story of Anti-Christ*. Scotts Valley: CreateSpace.
- Sorokin, P. A. (1989). *Man and Society in Calamity*. London: Routledge.
- Soros, G. (2000). *Open Society: Reforming Global Capitalism*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Soros, G. (2005). *George Soros On Globalization*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Spengler, O. (1918; 2020). *The Decline of the West* (Vol. 1-2) (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Cosimo Classics.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2003). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Stiglitz, J., & Greenwald, B. (2014). *Creating a Learning Society: A New Approach to Growth, Development, and Social Progress*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Streeten, P. (2001). *Globalisation: Threat or Opportunity?* New York: Springer.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The Third Wave*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Touraine, A. (1995). *Critique of Modernity*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Toynbee, A. J. (1934-1961; 1987). *A Study of History* (Vol. 1-12). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trubetskoi, N. S. (1980; 2022). *Europe and Humanity*. New York: Springer.
- Tucker, P. (2024). *Global Discord: Values and Power in a Fractured World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974-1989; 2011). *The Modern World-System* (Vol. 1-4). Oakland: University of California Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1982; 2004). *World-Systems Analysis*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Waters, M. (2013). *Globalization*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Weiss, Th., & Wilkinson, R. (2019). *Rethinking Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Weiss, Th., & Wilkinson, R. (Eds.). (2021). *Global Governance Futures*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Zurn, M. (2018). *A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Information about the Authors:

Yaroslav Martynshyn, Professor, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, 36, Ye. Konovalts St., Kyiv 01601, Ukraine; e-mail: martinishin.ya@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8599-7206>

Olena Khlystun, Professor, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: with_joy@ukr.net; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1764-6559>