

**Тугаєнко Вікторія Михайлівна**

старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов

Київський національний університет

технологій та дизайну (м. Київ)

## **GLOBALIZATION OR WESTERNIZATION? PROS AND CONS**

In recent years, the topic of globalization and its consequences has remained at the center of the most lively discussions. In fact, international markets, the “free movement” of capital from one country to another, an increase in the number of migrants and tourists, the formation of “inter-” and “supranational” financial, economic and political institutions would have to unite peoples and countries into a certain global integrity. But globalization so far is going in such a way that it does not destroy, but preserves the planetary hierarchy of various peoples and nations. Its obvious economic advantages for the G7 countries, led by the United States, for many other countries turn out to be significant losses, causing a defensive reaction and counteraction. Does this mean that the future of globalization is associated with the inevitable "westernization" of the "periphery" and "semi-periphery" countries? To a greater extent, the answer to this question depends on whether these countries, having adapted to the current westernization, largely tailored according to American patterns, will develop their own forms of globalization strategies.

On the other hand, globalization can and should be considered as a megatrend towards the unification of humanity, embodied in the dialectics of space-time movements, interactions and transformations of culturally and politically related wholes. That is not only the dissemination of people, artifacts, symbols, language and information beyond regions and continents, but also a concomitant to this process and defining its subject-practical and spiritual organization and reorganization of the external and internal social, economic, political and other space of the mutual life of individuals integrated and integrating into societies, states and civilizations.

Accordingly, the sources and driving forces of globalization processes are the needs and interests of people united in social integrity. The impossibility of their satisfaction in the place of existence stimulated their spread within and beyond regions and continents. It is precisely this that is accompanied, in spite of the constant struggle for resources, by the development and establishment of values, norms and institutions of common life.

Of course, the overwhelming majority of the periphery countries have almost no chances to enter the global economy “on equal terms”. But the national forms of globalization strategies of industrial countries are quite real. They are associated with the refusal to blindly follow the recommendations of the existing institutions of international neoliberalism, in return for which the recognition of the priority of national interests and the modernization of the economy are proposed. Such "improvement" is based not only on the forms of economic and political life borrowed from the West, but mainly on their own socio-cultural and political traditions and resources. The main point of such national strategies is the measure of the combination of these - Western and own - forms of modernization. The options here can be very different: from a very high level of westernization of several spheres of state life to an insignificant one, covering mainly the economic sphere. An example of the first variant of globalization development can be seen in Japan, which borrowed Western economic and political standards without losing its civilizational identity. In this country, it is not culture that has adapted to the tasks of modernization, but the leading elites who want to implement the latter have adapted to the culture. The Japanese modernized without sociocultural changing and carried out a technological revolution. The industrial countries of Southeast Asia and India followed a similar path, and their long-term success turned out to be not so significant in comparison with China. This promising country has taken up the development of the economic and technological achievements of the West, without fundamental changes in the system of its own social and political values.

Other countries of the world are more likely to adapt to the existing globalization, rather than develop their own national strategy. For some, it succeeds, as, for example, in the Arabian monarchies. Others do not succeed at all, as, for example, in the sub-Saharan countries of Equatorial Africa. The reasons for both are more related to the use of the resources of these countries by the global economy than to national and cultural characteristics.

As the hegemonic aspirations of the United States grow and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) is strengthened, the perspective of creating a Russia-India-China triangle as a union of three multi-ethnic and multi-confessional civilizations, whose state interests are not ensured in a unipolar world, looms more and more. There are also more ambitious projects related to the possibility of Iran and Malaysia joining the SCO. So the future of globalization is by no means predetermined. And it may happen that after a few decades the "era of Asia" will come again.

#### REFERENCES

1. Иноземцев В.Л. Вестернизация как глобализация, и «глобализация» как американизация // *Вопр. философии*. 2004. № 4. С. 58.
2. Чешков М.А. Глобализация: сущность, нынешняя фаза, перспективы // *Pro et contra*. 1999. № 4. С. 114–127.