

Metaphysics of power and current geopolitics in social and cultural contexts

Dmitry Garbuzov
 Volgograd State University,
 Volzhsky branch, Chair of Social and
 Humanities
 Volzhsky, Russia
 buendia@bk.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8321-8229>

Sergej Ramazanov
 Volgograd State University,
 Volzhsky branch, Chair of Social and
 Humanities
 Volzhsky, Russia
 sp-ram@yandex.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7942-2852>

Nikolay Nikolaev
 Volzhsky Polytechnic Institute
 (branch) of Volgograd State Technical
 University, Chair of Social and
 Humanities
 Volzhsky, Russia
 nikkam@mail.ru
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9878-4397>

Andrey Makarov
 Volgograd State University,
 Department of philosophy
 Volgograd, Russia
 andre_mak@mail.ru
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9056-3741>

Nina Kalashnikova
 Volgograd State University,
 Department of philosophy
 Volgograd, Russia
 kalashnikova@volsu.ru
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4072-0390>

Abstract — The article explores the phenomenon of power which covers a metaphysical aspect of human existence. It refers to the insufficiency of human being, to its imperfection and insecurity. The above-mentioned makes subjectivity and objectivity of power possible. The very possibility of domination is created by elements of human being that are a subject to destruction. In free social interaction, criminals have a certain advantage when struggling for power. Therefore, social systems have special mechanisms of non-random selection, generating the governing elite, which cannot exist in free social interaction. A specific feature of the newest management system, which is still being developed and exists only in the form of an imperfect prototype, is its networking cybernetic nature. The objects of domination are not just individual subjects but the social mass as a whole, each representative is cyber-coded and undergoes continuous control simultaneously over a multitude of parameters. This architecture does not require vertical measurement since control is carried out in a networked manner at the location of the subject of social interaction, which is in fact the inner side of individual existence.

Keywords — power, elite, social masses, Big Data world, network and pyramidal architecture of society, the value model of globalization

I. INTRODUCTION

We can formulate a kind of ‘stochastic’ justification for the elite. In the ‘unlimited’, nondeterministic state of society, criminals and rascals will have an advantage since they are not inclined to limit themselves to any obligations. Therefore, society forms a special institution - the elite which is, figuratively speaking, a special cultural programme requiring that potential applicants must undergo rigorous selection and testing based on a non-random and non-probabilistic principle. Only this makes it possible to eliminate the strongest social players, i.e. criminals. It is also worth noting that the elite are accused of destroying morality and active deviant forms of behavior that blur the

boundaries between good and evil. However, this statement does not seem completely objective. Modernism and a tendency for experimentation and innovation can be explained not by the particular viciousness of the elite, but by the fact that it is safely separated from the social masses exposed to innovation and that it tends to preserve the traditional forms of elite life, camouflaged by quasi-elites leading an unbridled lifestyle.

In the social battle the strongest wins, which means the cruellest one, cunning, unprincipled, not bound by any norms and obligations [1]. However, ironically, having won, ones needs an environment consisting of individuals differing from themselves. Any evil requires some goodness. Therefore, the Predator forms the aristocracy - the elite with an ethical code. However, it cannot exist isolated. As a social thing, it needs a leading predator who is capable of winning social battles. Thus, by the end of the day, good recruits evil. The above phenomena demonstrate the confusional insanity of power and this, obviously, explains a large number of villains rulling some of quite cultural and highly developed nations. On the other hand, an opposite situation is possible, when a vile elite and a highly moral ruler co-exist peacefully. This situation is also not accidental since the secret of power is, obviously, in the combination of evil and goodness, so that they stimulate each other. The confusional insanity of power is in the same dominating substance, which always has two opposing sides - the surface and the underneath.

Continuing the subject of ‘evil spirits’, we can recall that according to many folk legends, it does not cast a shadow and is not reflected in the mirrors. This is a good metaphor when talking about modern political leaders. For example, the leader of Russia, on the contrary, has a substantial number of shadows and reflections. Using a dramaturgical dictionary [2], one can say that he wrote and directed his own play in which most of the characters are his shadows and reflections. Among them, there are liberal, national-

patriotic, popular-socialistic, rebellious-oppositional, technocratic and other reflections. Does it prove the 'pure power' of the ruler of Russia? On the other hand, the leaders of the modern West are mostly so non-charismatic that they themselves resemble the shadows of an anonymous functionary administrator. Is this a proof of the infernal origin of the western leaders?

Most likely the answer to these sacramental questions is quite simple. The leader of Russia is a representative of the political power system inherent in the traditional pyramidal type of social structure, and most of the Western leaders represent the political system of the 'networked' society, the Big Data world. Accordingly, the leader of Russia is the embodiment, the face of the hierarchical society, the continuation of the tradition of the pharaohs and emperors, and the leaders of the West are nothing more than system administrators that provide functioning of certain sections of the interactive network. If the leader of Russia is a 'Tzar', as he is portrayed by the Western media, then the leaders of the West are 'Mr Smiths' from the Matrix, who are not supposed to have their own particular face. In this context the personalities of the previous and current US presidents are curious. The fact is that, apparently, if Barack Obama was a typical embodiment of the new generation of Western leaders - a system administrator 'Mr. Smith', although with the specifics of the American media culture, then Donald Trump is most likely a bright incarnation of a traditional charismatic leader, reviving the spirit of America's 'founding fathers'. His personality and style of behavior do not correspond to the newest network type of social interaction, and therefore he is doomed to be an object of constant criticism of Western media institutions, and the prospects for his presidency are very uncertain. The very phenomenon and incident of Donald Trump, most likely, is an expression of the clash of the traditional pyramidal and the newest networked social architecture within the framework of modern American society, which in the coming years will have to make the final difficult choice between two of them.

There are two types of ruling groups (elites). M. Cantor quite cleverly calls them 'new Guelphs and Ghibellines': 1) the autonomous elite, ruling on its own behalf - 'Ghibellines'; 2) a representative elite, ruling on behalf of other groups - 'Guelphs' [3]. The most powerful governing instrument of the former is war, which means direct action aimed at a particular goal and based on the principle of 'billiard strike'. This is a precisely measured blow to the target, which should withdraw it from the game. The main tool of the second government type is revolution, more exactly, a bypass action indirectly aimed at a certain goal according to the 'domino principle'. In this case, the blow is not applied to the main target, but to the nearest one triggering a chain reaction, when the main goal should be in the zone of defeat at a certain point in time. However, since the chain reaction is difficult to control, it is desirable that the one who strikes (the initiator of the revolution) is out of the zone of active events. Therefore, the first type of elite has a national, conservative, patriotic character, and the second one is cosmopolitan, modern and transnational by its nature. That explains the fact that the main form of international politics in the era of globalization became the

so-called 'color' revolutions, initiated and deployed primarily in the media space.

The first type of elite is focused on traditions and evolution, the second - on innovations and revolutions (political, scientific, cultural, sexual and other). The problem of political analysis is complicated by the fact that there are practically no pure forms of the first and second elite today, but both are mostly present in the format of oligarchy. The first ones imitate election, representativeness, lead, being behind the scenes. The latter ones imitate freedom of choice and equal competition, while some players always have an advantage over the others. This situation causes a mixture of the first and second elites. Among the first type of elite, there are those who participate in the electoral, representative theater. Among the latter, there are those who transfer power and influence by inheritance. In addition, the inheritance of power may not be of a generational nature, but of a professionally-class nature when management is exercised by a certain corporation, an order, but it is retouched by a representative process.

The combination and complementarity of 'humanitarian bombings' and 'color revolutions' observed in the modern political life is an indicator that modern 'Guelphs and Ghibellines' have come to an agreement, some kind of a convention. The heterogeneity of the ruling elites leads to their complex aggregations and configurations, which can explain the incomprehensible facts of the correlation of the national and transnational components in the modern management system.

Modern representative power, despite its external similarity with ancient democratic roots, is a construct of medieval theocratic culture. The representatives do not rule themselves but represent the power of others which is a religious, theistic type of thinking. This principle contradicts the natural will to power [4] and can be convincingly justified with the help of supernatural authority within the framework of religious thoughts. This is monotheistic thinking referring to the absolute, supernatural source of being and power. And, on the contrary, autonomous power is a construct of pagan, polytheistic culture. To rule on one's own behalf means to embody the natural will to power, to be the bearer of natural forces, defending their right to live in the conditions of evolution as a non-stop selection and struggle for existence. It contains an echo of the pagan heroism paradox - to win to rule and rule to win.

Even a superficial glance at the political events taking place in the modern world demonstrates that the elements of the so-called and so different cultural traditions of ruling have mixed up in an incomprehensible way into a complicated confused state. The observed surge in military activity ('humanitarian bombing', etc.) and the non-stop sequence of 'color' revolutions unequivocally signal the accumulated energy of violence and unresolved problems. Obviously, this explains the popularity of the images and ideas of the Apocalypse in modern culture. An exact but more chambered analogue of 'humanitarian bombing' and intervention is the famous and demonstrative media murder of a giraffe in the Copenhagen zoo, which obviously contains two meanings: rational-purposeful and value-aesthetic. Firstly, it is the rational necessity and legitimacy of a controlled murder. Secondly, it is perceived as the

demonstration of the brutal aesthetics of violence - brutal beauty, sexual violence. Everything indicates that humanity is again entering an active phase of unrelated, uninhibited violence as a pure essence of power [5].

However, an important part of the problem lies in the fact that the above-mentioned confusion of the cultural traditions of ruling makes it very difficult, almost impossible, to analyze and forecast the development of the situation. From a historiosophical point of view, revolutions are referred to monotheism, representative power, innovation, cosmopolitanism and transnational globalism, and wars to paganism, autonomous power, tradition, nationalism and evolution. However, the real political forces and players use complex combinations of both cultural traditions as their ideology.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS (MODEL)

The power refers to self-evident concepts for everyday worldview and common sense. It is unlikely that there will be a person who will say that he/she does not understand its meaning. There are also many private scientific definitions of power emanating from the subject area of individual scientific disciplines and spheres of reality. And nevertheless, there is something mysterious in this phenomenon, a certain philosophical plan revealing an invisible, metaphysical perspective of reality. A profound perspective of this problem is revealed by J. Derrida. He writes that power is possible only if something of value, capable of undergoing destruction, participates in social interaction [6]. That is, above all, something tangible. The indestructible, indivisible, ideal substance does not create a relationship of power. The reason for this is quite obvious. Power is the ability to use force, to bring upon violence. However, it is possible only if the object of the application of force can be destroyed, selected, damaged. This creates a situation of the danger of existence, a threat, manipulating which, one can exert influence and achieve obedience.

If the object of impact is indestructible, cannot be selected and damaged, then the threat is powerless and the power, in this case, is possible, but not necessary. In the case when the object of impact is indestructible, power is possible only through deception. Considering the above, what is there in the existence of a man that cannot be destroyed? It's ideal. It is no accident that Plato associated the exercise of power with the knowledge of an ideal being. In his ideal state, the role of rulers exercising power should be performed by philosophers [7]. According to Plato, they, unlike other people, are able to know, to realize the ideal foundation of their being and, therefore, on the one hand, cannot become objects of domination (which Socrates demonstrated in his experience [8]), but on the other for the same reason, they should not become actors, actors of violence.

Therefore, the phenomenon of power depends critically on the material carriers of human existence and its self-identity through these carriers. The more the material elements of different hierarchical levels that are accessible to the destruction enter the ego (the individual's conscious self), the more total it is included in the relations of power.

The revolt of the masses, which Ortega-i-Gasset wrote about [9], changed the strategy of power. The rulers of the

past divided all people into friends and enemies. They pursued enemies, rewarded their friends, and paid no attention to others until they switched to one of the first two categories. Administrators of the modern world realized that this way is not rational. The object of power should be exactly everything, and you need to sacrifice friends and enemies. The object of power is now a mass, a statistic set, material for total administration.

However, the change in the object required forming a new technology or algorithm of power. It received the contradictory title of 'soft' power. In particular, it is cybernetic, hyper-rational invisible management of its society and cultural invasion of other people's societies, which are carried out by manipulation 'on the edges'. This explains the active and obviously controlled process of marginalization of modern societies - all kinds of tolerance, support for immigration, religious pluralism, diversification of markets, etc. The main goal, obviously, is to create societies entirely consisting of 'rhizomatic', fragmented structures, devoid of the center, the bases that are always 'on the edge' [10]. Such a society will be maximally receptive to any managerial decisions that are totally controlled. It will be an ideal cybernetic machine.

The peculiarity of this new type of society is that in its architecture the horizontal network structure replaces the vertical pyramidal structure. This is primarily due to the fact that thanks to new technologies, the authorities no longer need to localize in one place, center and lower orders from top to bottom. This is the world of Big Data, in which power is holographically localized at every point of its space and time. The above means a sentence to all the remaining structures of the pyramidal type. World power will finally become cybernetic, anonymous. Confirmation of this, perhaps, is the 'incident of Edward Snowden'. In fact, it represents an attack on the idea of a sovereign (that is, centered), nation, and state. He fixes in the mass consciousness the understanding that even the best state is Leviathan, that repression and violence are the very nature of the state, which cannot be changed [11]. Consequently, the nature of national state must be overcome as such. Let us also note the eschatological expectations associated with the election of the last two US presidents. Barack Obama expected that he gently transforms the American empire into a modern transnational type of society. However, he was not able to do this. About the nationalist Donald Trump, who came to replace him, they say that he, without understanding the essence of modern culture, will lead America and the world to the catastrophe.

There are two principles that determine how to exercise power - freedom and will. According to Sartre, the mode of being freedom is anxiety [12]. Continuing this idea, one can say that liberalism is the ideology of people who are constantly in an alarming state. If this is so, then, one must say that ordinary citizens provide profit to the bodies of power. Despite some comicalness of this conclusion, Sartre's thought reveals a very profound content, revealing the societal meaning of freedom. In particular, the precise definition of freedom: the recognition of powerlessness, the renunciation of force. This is so since freedom cannot be conceived in any other way than separation, exclusion from inclusion in the existing being, from seizure by elements and substances. The strength, on the contrary, is contagious, it

seeks to find the object of influence. To have power means to go beyond individual borders. Accordingly, freedom can be the basis of society only where there is a total, continual, structuring reality, a legitimate source of power, which, encountering the powerlessness of freedom, does not produce a conflict. If such an influential basic source of power is not available, then the principle of freedom cannot be realized, since it will generate an unviable system of anarchic type.

If the basis of social ties is will, i.e. the power of setting and achieving goals (anti-freedom), then this, paradoxically, presupposes the existence of a discrete, non-comprehensive source of power. This is a state of power, in which there are many gaps, voids, holes. The inadequacy of the authorities compensates for excessive will power as a way of implementing social interaction. The total organization of power required the creation of a liberal type of social interaction. It was this kind of configuration that Roosevelt managed to create in the 30s and 40s of the 20th century and this, obviously, predetermined the success of the United States. As for the principle of will, only a weak, amorphous source of power capable of condensing is capable of its realization only in special, singular, and not regular conditions. It is similar to the Russian 'Third Rome'. Therefore, Russia is a culture of will, and the West is a culture of freedom. The apparent brutality of the will and the invisible powerlessness of freedom create a kind of optical illusion that hypertrophies a really weak Russian center of power and camouflages a really strong Western control center.

Thanks to this optical illusion in the political life of the modern global society, substitution of concepts has occurred. It draws the attention of the famous modern Russian writer and artist M. Cantor - the power was substituted by freedom [13]. Power and freedom are inseparable binary structures. Freedom is impossible under conditions of existing a strong source of power. If the source of power is inferior, freedom is impossible, and the will principle prevails. However, power and freedom have turned into 'mirrors', which show and, therefore, hide the existence of each other. Accordingly, modern free societies are those in which total domination is hidden, veiled by tolerance and, as a result, does not cause rejection among the majority of population. On the contrary, modern authoritarian societies are those in which the inferiority and weakness of the organization of power are camouflaged by the brutality of external manifestations of power.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

West. The largest political player is the conventional West. The business card of the West is democracy, freedom, law, human rights. However, the modern West is not monolithic by its nature. Within it, two centers can be distinguished, the differences between which unexpectedly reached the critical points.

The United States of America. Until recently, they most closely corresponded to the ideal type of their cultural tradition of government: liberal democracy, religiosity, cosmopolitanism, transnational globalism, orientation to revolutionary innovations. However, the coming to power of Donald Trump testifies to the ongoing process of a profound

transformation of US political culture. The new cultural program, which was directly formulated during the presidential campaign and supported by the majority of American society, contains a fundamentally different set of principles: conservative democracy, when not everyone is to be a party to the government, based on the mere fact of its existence, but only worthy of it, thanks to a large number of reasons - signs; nationalism; autonomous uniqueness; orientation to a certain cultural tradition and selection of innovations in accordance with it. Figuratively speaking, we can say that in the dispute of the American "Guelphs and Ghibellines", the latter have now won and started a deep reset of the social system with vague prospects for the future.

Europe. In recent decades, has turned into a large test site, which is an experiment to create a fundamentally new socio-cultural system, which, strictly speaking, can no longer be identified with the West. It is a culture with a trans prefix: transnational, transstate, transgroup, transboundary, trans-religious, transsexual, etc. It is a "digital" social structure based on a "cybernetic machine" that does not have localization in one center but is present simultaneously in each and all points of the system. The machine itself and the interactive network generated by it are still under construction, but the presence of its prototype is already obvious. The events of recent years show that the experiment has entered a decisive phase - a change in the demographic structure of European society is taking place, which, as soon as possible, is filled with stateless persons, people who have lost their homeland and cultural tradition and have no idea about the European traditions and mentality. Obviously, they should, in the short term, dissolve the old European population and become pioneers of a new civilization. Such a prospect is likely to lead to a split in Europe, the beginning of which can already be observed with the example of 'Brexit'. There is every reason to suggest that European countries with a strong and deep historical tradition, not experiencing psychological complexes with respect to their past and capable of autonomous existence, will soon join Europe. This is mainly representatives of the old Europe, with the exception of Germany, which has experienced too deep a psychological trauma associated with its historical heritage, and, for this reason, wishing to create a new civilization that will nullify the accounts of the past.

Russia. Image, media business card of Russia is authoritarianism, legal nihilism, collectivism, archaism, aggressiveness. However, modern Russia is also not monolithic. After the collapse of the USSR, it went through a unique experience of anarchy for its history, when the central government retained the ability to control only a limited number of administrative options from the set, while the rest de facto remained outside its real powers. So, there were two Russias, which still coexist within the same territory. One - central, federal, the second - regional, local. The first is controllable, secured and civilized. The second one is abandoned, left to itself, free and wild. Two antipodes within one area - a kind of state and anti-state. This duality makes it extremely difficult to analyze and describe events. It is difficult for an inattentive observer to understand what is happening since the two-faced Janus of post-Soviet Russia combines two opposite qualities: poverty and luxury,

anarchy and authoritarianism, and so on. Accordingly, an inexperienced or biased observer, if desired, can find absolutely anything here.

Two of Russia fractally produce itself at all possible levels. First Russia generates power, capital centers, offices, clerks, bureaucracy, the second – disasters, irresponsibility, tyranny, province, homelessness and loneliness. The uniqueness of the current situation is that a Russian person has historically become accustomed to be a prisoner of society. Russian people are accustomed to feeling themselves captured by the elements of sociality, to be her slave and sufferer. Therefore, in the post-Soviet society, in which the government was a pure imitation, he feels lonely, abandoned, defenseless and unnecessary. On the other hand, in such an unusual way, a Russian person at the end of the 20th century, perhaps for the first time in his history, received freedom, turned out to be alone with his will and mind. And at the same time, as an outstanding writer of the 20th century, A. Platonov, remarked very subtly, thanks to Russia's twinning, the Russian man is “a two-way act: he can live like that and back” [14]. Figuratively speaking, a Russian person always has two faces: one forward, one backward. And they turn over from time to time [15]. The order and the elements, power and arbitrariness, the center and outskirts in the Russian personality type are always in dynamic interaction, passing from the potential state to the actual and back.

Such subtle nuances predetermined the fate of liberalism in post-Soviet Russia. The liberal type is a society of legal hypertrophied individualism. Therefore, it presupposes a rigid system of rules and their strict implementation. If the above principle is not followed it causes a war of all against all. That's what happened in post-Soviet Russia. Both heads of the Russian heraldic eagle, both of Russia's incarnations, were unable to create this rigid system of rules that protect the privacy of every social actor. The center is too small for this, and an outskirt is redundant. In the ‘under-centered’ there is a lack of energy, strength, and in the ‘hyper-outskirt’ there is too much of it. This conclusion may seem paradoxical since Russia is customarily accused of the opposite - a strong power center and a weak society. However, the demonstrativeness of power testifies to its weakness, not the strength; extraordinary control measures signal that ordinary ones do not work.

It is curious that a similar fate was previously awaiting Russian (Soviet) socialism. Socialism is a society of hypertrophied collectivism. This type of society also presupposes a rigid system of rules that destroy the spontaneous privacy of human existence and support systemic collectivity. However, the USSR also could not maintain this type of social system for long. Communism, as it was thought of by its inventors, is a community of Robinsons, tired of loneliness and connecting their lonely islands to the multiple worlds. While really embodied socialism is a community of ants, tired of the unremovable collectivity of their anthill [15]. The same fatal error, by the way, is also characteristic of liberal ideology. It consists in the fact that democracy is not a synonym, but an alternative to the republic. Social management is not a right, but a duty of a citizen of the republic imposes a multitude of obligations, restrictions and expenses on him. You cannot take one and give up the other. If there is only an abstract

right to be elected and to be elected, then only a limited group of people inevitably implements it. To be elected and to be elected should not be the right, but an irremovable legitimate duty of every citizen. Therefore, real democracy in most cases is an informational cover for oligarchs of different stripes.

It is important to note that, despite the complex problems of its political and economic existence, Russia is, in fact, is a cultural twin, a twin of the West. The truth of this assertion is comically confirmed by the criticism that Western media and ruling political elites called Donald Trump's ‘agent of influence’ of Russia and, apparently, were unprepared for the fact that the political cycle that existed after the Second World War is close to its end and the new Era is coming. Accordingly, the program of the new US president - conservative census democracy, nationalism, autonomy, orientation to one's cultural tradition is not copying Russian political culture, but another long-term trend of historical development.

The Middle East. The media image of the Middle East is religious (Islamic) fundamentalism, authoritarian hereditary-oligarchic governance, traditionalism, archaisms. The most important characteristic of the states of Middle Eastern civilization is that it represents a direct alternative to Western civilization. If the West and Russia are variations of one civilization, then the West and the Middle East are fundamentally oppositional poles within the monotheistic cultural tradition. For the Middle East, as for the West, a representative type of power is typical. However, in the Middle East it is built on a different cultural and historical principle. As it should be in the monotheistic tradition, the ruling elite does not rule on its own behalf but represents the other, but the principle of elite formation in the general case is not accidental. Namely, everyone in principle cannot be representatives of the ruling elite, but only a descendant of the Prophet. Even if this principle is violated, then representatives of the ruling elites also, in this case, pretend to have a special relationship with the Prophet and the Creator. This means that the structural architecture of the society has here a fundamentally pyramidal character, the power is distributed from the top down from a single center. The most powerful instrument of government here is also a revolution, that is, a radical change in the situation that does not come from outside but from within. Despite that, the Middle East is the civilization of one victorious revolution. In this case, this type of a civilization is in a state predicted by the revolution theorists of the end of history, which therefore does not need further development, and is oriented not to structural innovations, but to territorial expansion.

The technological backwardness, rigidly hierarchical structure of the society and the oligarchic control system, the sense of moral superiority as a civilization that has already reached the end of history, as well as the possession of a large share of energy raw materials, predetermined the present situation in the Middle East as arenas and victims of the political game [16]. The introduction of Big Data technologies and the spread of the global interactive network as a new type of social architecture made the societies of the Middle Eastern civilization with the traditional pyramidal structure vulnerable. They have become a zone of incessant conflict and instability.

The Far East (Asia-Pacific region). The media identity of this region is traditionalism, patriarchy, collectivism, authoritarian management of a non-representative rather than an autonomous type. These media stereotypes rapidly become obsolete and, in our time, less and less correspond to reality. This applies not only to the representatives of the region, affiliated with the West, but also all the others, primarily focused on China. In fact, they seized the initiative from the West and became the main engine of global economic growth. Moreover, it is fundamentally important that they successfully assimilated and mastered the mechanisms of a liberal market economy. Having changed a lot in themselves, but at the same time retaining their traditions and characteristics, they proved to be more adapted to the global liberal market than all other competitors, including the West, and now slowly but inevitably move towards global economic domination. Thus, the impetus of economic market globalization launched by the West led to an unexpected result - instead of the supposed process of Westernization, the world tangibly moved and drifted towards the East.

This allows a high probability of predicting significant changes in the process of globalization. In particular, it is obvious that the existing model of globalization, based on the principles of an open free market, has lost its constructive meaning for the West. Accordingly, there are not too many choices in this situation - either a fundamental rejection of the globalization development model, which does not seem realistic, since it is an objective process or an alternative pricing model based not on a free market and competition, but on certain restrictive principles, primarily of an ethical nature.

Established and widely used in recent years, the practice of sanctions, both for whole states, and for individual organizations and even individual people, clearly shows that the formation of this model is already in its active phase. The philosophy of this model is obvious - not every player has the right to economic income, growth and well-being, thanks simply to the very fact of his existence, but only one who meets certain criteria of the ethical order. However, one must understand that the West was late with formal legalization of this model, it missed the time when this could be done using the existing legal mechanisms for international decision-making.

Therefore, today the West is forced to unilaterally 'squeeze' the recognition of this model, relying on its economic, information and power capabilities and resources. However, since the time of the total supremacy of the West has already passed not only in the pure power but also the economic sphere, the attempt to change models continuously generates social conflict and a 'war of civilizations' [17].

The fact that Russia and the Middle East were chosen to be the object and the primary target of sanctions, and direct Western pressure is quite consistent with the goal-oriented logic. If the attack is successful, the West will receive the main sources of natural resources and eliminate the main powerful competitor (Russia). After this, it will be possible to start persuading China to adopt new ethical principles of economic globalization. To meet these principles to the full, for example, in terms of environmental standards, it will be

very difficult for China, and the West will regain its unconditional world leadership.

IV. CONCLUSION

Summarizing the existing practice, we can distinguish three types of existing political forces: 1) constructive, 2) destructive, 3) imitative. The political system of the United States is built on a combination of constructive and imitative forces. Destructive ones are eliminated in this case. It is difficult to find a more vivid example of this kind of political construction. In the political field of the country, one group of the ruling elite dominates, the two wings of which dominated all political space and marginalized all possible alternatives to their power. So far, they have been very effective in coping with their work, keeping the US at the top of the global social systems. At the same time, the political life of the country contains a critically large element of theatrical dramaturgy associated with the need to create a vivid image and dynamic plot of the struggle of two alternatives, irreconcilable political forces, which in fact are not parties of Republicans and Democrats in the reality. This led to the formation of the phenomenon of the mediocracy, pronounced domination of the mass media in the formation of the political agenda. The political conflict, which is absent, is vividly and entrancingly played out in the media space. The conflict between the newly elected President Trump and the American media community, on the one hand, makes this feature of the US political system obvious, and on the other hand, shows that reality does not always give way to media control. For the American media community, Donald Trump is a nightmare of the director of a popular TV series in which a rebellious character refuses to follow a scenario and spoils an expensive show.

The political system of Europe is built on the combination (struggle) of constructive and destructive forces [18]. In other words, it is less technological and more natural than the American one. Although there are also dominant players here, the political space at the same time contains alternative forces, ready to strengthen their positions when circumstances change, which is happening recently. Accordingly, such a system is tactically less stable than the American one and, with less effort, can be withdrawn from a state of equilibrium, which, in combination with the general problems of the European Union, threatens it with serious conflicts.

The political system of China is based on the predominance of constructive forces. Confucius once again in the long Chinese history defeated his opponents. The political elite of China strictly follows a certain pragmatic order, severely suppressing destructive and imitative forces. This is a position for which the result is more important than goals and values. More precisely, the goal and value is everything that brings a positive result. This is a strong position, but potentially it is fraught with a crisis of the ethical plan, which can become a weak spot and a target for China's opponents.

The political system of Russia is based on the prevalence of imitative forces. Power, using favorable or unfavorable conjuncture, imitates effective activity, suppressing, simultaneously both destructive and constructive alternatives. In fact, the managing elite is committed to

maintaining a certain basic status quo, allowing the current situation to determine the course of events in both positive and negative directions. This explains why both critics and apologists of the current political power are mistaken in Russia. Mr Putin is as much not a Messiah as not a 'bloody dictator'. It is more like a Chinese Taoist practising the wu-wei principle, more exactly, non-action, non-motivation. He waits and does not prevent the Tao from fulfilling its destiny. However, the problem is that the Tao is in no hurry and it is not clear whether Russia will wait for the solution of its numerous issues.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Machiavelli, "The Emperor," Moscow: Publishing House AST, 2009.
- [2] I. Hoffman, "Representing oneself in other ways in everyday life," Moscow, 2000.
- [3] M.K. Cantor, "Textbook of drawing," Moscow, 2008.
- [4] F. Nietzsche, "Will to power: the experience of revaluation of all values," Moscow, 1994.
- [5] R. Girard, "Sacred and Violence," Moscow, 2000.
- [6] J. Derrida, "On the postcard from Socrates to Freud and not only," Minsk, 1999.
- [7] Plato, "The State," vol. 3, Moscow, 1994.
- [8] Plato, "Apology of Socrates," vol. 1, Moscow, 1990.
- [9] H. Ortega y Gasset, "The Revolt of the Masses," Moscow, 2002.
- [10] J. Deleuze, F. Guattari, "Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia," Ekaterinburg, Moscow, 2010.
- [11] T. Hobbes, "Leviathan," Moscow, 2001.
- [12] J.P. Sartre, "Being and nothingness: the experience of phenomenological ontology," Moscow, 2002.
- [13] M.K. Cantor, "Red light," Moscow, 2013.
- [14] A.P. Platonov, "Chevengur. The pit. Stories," Moscow, 2008.
- [15] N. Davis, O. Ergunova, V. Lizunkov, E. Malushko, "Phenomenon of migration and its manifestations in the modern world", in *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, vol. 26, pp. 550-556, 2017.
- [16] M.V. Konyshva, "Import substitution policy in the context of language diversity", *Materials of the International Scientific Conference on "Import substitution policy and development of non-resource export as the priority of today's industrial policy of Russian Federation. Conference proceedings"*, Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, 2016, pp. 159-167.
- [17] O.G. Demenko, I.G. Makarova, M.V. Konyshva, "The origin and development of municipal self-government in Russia", in *Man in India*, vol. 97, no. 20, pp. 381-390, 2017.
- [18] N.L. Shamne, E.V. Shishkina, "German popular scientific medical online media: structural and functional aspects", in *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta-seriya 2-yazykoznanie*, vol. 16 (2), pp. 143-151, 2017.