

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ПОЛОЖЕННЯ СОЦІОЛОГІЧНИХ РОЗВІДОК

UDC 316.33:316.1:316.2

Ivanova, A. (2021). Capitalism as the Global Social Order: A Critical Perspective. *Sociological Studios*, 19 (2), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.29038/2306-3971-2021-02-31-40>

Capitalism as the Global Social Order: A Critical Perspective

Anna Ivanova –
*PhD Student, Department
of Political Sociology,
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National
University, Ukraine*
E-mail: a.k.ivanova6@gmail.com,
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6898-7951>

DOI: 10.29038/2306-3971-2021-02-31-40

The article studies the concept of the global social order as a subject of social research. The author starts with pointing at the changes in the structure and the character of the today's global social order (acceleration of exchanges and flows, gradual disappearing of a single hegemony, multipolarity) and claims that it is exactly capitalism that becomes a foundation for multipolar but yet unequal constitution of the global order. The article proposes to deal with the global social order as an example of a global subject – alternative to world system or global system – which can be placed in focus of social research. Also, the paper offers a definition to the notions of social order and global social order. Then the author provides several possible classification of the approaches to the study of the global social order, and then moves on to pointing out their mutual positions. The paper considers capitalism as a special form of global social order and suggests to analyze imperialism and neocolonialism as, on the one hand, the products of this order, and on the other hand, as instruments for its legitimation and hegemony. In the further research the suggested model can be used, first, for the improvements in the study of sociology's global subject, and, second, for deepening the knowledge about the process of (re)production of global social order.

Received: October, 2021
1st Revision: October, 2021
Accepted: November, 2021

Key words: global social order, capitalism, imperialism, neocolonialism, globalization.

Іванова Анна. Капіталізм як глобальний соціальний порядок: критична перспектива. У статті розглянуто концепцію глобального соціального порядку як предмета соціологічних досліджень. Автор починає із вказівки на зміни в структурі та в характері нинішнього глобального соціального порядку, що полягають у прискоренні темпів обмінів і потоків, зниканні єдиної гегемонії та формуванні мультиполярності. У статті пропонується розглядати глобальний соціальний порядок як приклад глобального предмета, який по-різному може потрапити у фокус соціологічних досліджень. Для цього дається визначення понять соціального порядку й глобального соціального порядку, а також наводиться декілька класифікацій підходів до вивчення глобального світового порядку, після чого виділяються його основні складові частини. У статті капіталізм розглянуто як особливу форму світового порядку, а також запропоновано аналізувати імперіалізм і неокolonіалізм як, з одного боку, продукти цього порядку, а з іншого – як інструменти його легітимації та гегемонії. У подальших дослідженнях запропонована модель може бути використана, по-перше, для вдосконалення вивчення предмета соціології в глобальному масштабі, а по-друге – для поглиблення знань про процес (від)творення глобального світового порядку.

Ключові слова: глобальний світовий порядок, капіталізм, імперіалізм, неокolonіалізм, глобалізація.

RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE AND RESEARCH QUESTION

Over the past two centuries, society, analyzed within the borders of a nation-state, has been considered as the most universal subject of social research and has often fallen into the trap of equation with the nation-

state. And this is not surprising, since this subject was characterized by a certain cohesion, could be measured and compared, and possessed features that distinguish it from similar research units – other nation-states. Moreover, Eurocentric sociology of that time was formed under an influence of western worldview, for which the notion of nation-state was the core analytical and political category (Bentley, 2004, p. 70). Thus, the historical development of sociology's subject rather went the path from macro to micro, and only at the end of the 20th century, large (even world-scale) systems appeared in the focus of social researchers again.

Although the world has never been «the site of discrete, unconnected communities» (Bentley, 2004, p. 78) and cross-cultural interactions and exchanges have always taken place, industrialization and technological development have significantly influenced the social reality. The bonds between all subjects of social relations (individuals, societies, states, international organizations, and transnational corporations) have tightened, the traffic of information, resources, and capital flows has accelerated, the relationship between the constituent units of the world system has become more intense. Moreover, this strengthening of connectedness occurs at all social levels and in various spheres – economy, politics, culture, education, science, etc. We are not stating that these processes are new – they should be considered rather as a permanent context for our social reality. However, today their scale reaches unprecedented levels.

Gradually, the structure of the global world has become more institutionalized by such organizations as the UN and the WTO, supranational structures such as the European Commission, and transnational corporations that operate all over the world, as well as by various unformalized practices (Polyakova, 2019, p. 157). All of them, on the one hand, affect the form and the substance of social reality, and on the other hand, are themselves formed under its influence. This gives grounds to assert that the global social order exists as a social, normatively formalized, phenomenon, and, accordingly, should be studied by social science.

«Globalization of the modern world leads to the formation of a new social reality, which cannot be studied in terms of local experience» (Fomichev, 2000, p. 24). There is hardly a school in social sciences that denies the existence of globalization processes. Regardless of the normative assessment – whether it be universalization, Westernization, civilization, McDonaldization, glocalization, the global village, or other approaches to explaining the connectedness of the world units – most social researchers agree that world societies (even those that are quite isolated) turn out to be more involved in a certain system of relations, which are characterized by the consolidation of all connections, the acceleration of flows, as well as by the strengthening of the mutual impact of all subjects of this system.

Even despite the isolationist policy of certain states and the geographical remoteness of others, it is impossible to imagine a society or a state that is not subjected to global changes. Today they are all getting more interconnected: climate change and environmental disasters in one region inevitably entail consequences (including social ones) for others; local epidemic turns into a global pandemic in a few months triggering not only biological changes but also social ones; the economic crisis in leading countries affects the world economy, as well as the local economies of dependent countries; political events in hegemonic states lead to a reshuffle of forces in other regions; cultural phenomena occurring in one part of the world quickly become popular all over the world.

Although certain scholars (Bentley, Gunder Frank) believe that globalization is a process that has always unfolded throughout history and others argue that it could only occur in connection with modernity (Wallerstein, Arrighi), it is rather a mutually accepted fact that global processes and phenomena of 21st century differ from those from previous centuries (Nederveen Pieterse, 2018). If previously we could talk about connectedness of detached states, regions and societies, then today we are able to talk about global order, less centric, multipolar, but still guided by a general principle – capitalist domination. Today there are no obvious geographical centre of domination (the regions which used to be subordinate become more developed in certain realms). Now it is not a geographic position, race or gender, but the relations toward capital that define the state's and the individual position in the globalized world.

Since the character of global world changes, there is a need to find suitable methods and approaches to its analysis. Today sociology offers a few approaches to how globality can be perceived via sociological means. In our paper, we **aim** to focus on the perspective of the global social order, and to look at capitalism

as a guiding principle for its formation. To do so we will first consider how sociology studies a subject of such a scale and what challenges it faces; what approaches to the study of a large-scale social subject already exist; then we will move on to analyze the notion of global social order and its main characteristics, after which we will try to map a perspective for further research.

The research is conducted from a critical theory perspective, which is based on the idea that the knowledge production is one of the mechanisms for establishing power, and always includes a normative assessment. The very formulation of the research question is always a reflection of the value position of the researcher. Thus, the critical approach is aimed at producing interpretations and explanations of areas of social reality; at the same time it points to the source of social «deviation» and produces knowledge to eliminate it (Bronner, 2011).

REVIEW OF RELEVANT STUDIES

There are multiple theoretical traditions that focus on globality in its various expressions: some of them use the notion of empire, other – the world order, world system, globalization, etc. So, several theoretical groups can be distinguished within this domain.

There are several «classical» approaches the study of globality developed in the middle of the 20th century. For example, the cultural-discursive approach represented by Edward Said, Stuart Hall¹ considers the West and the East, the West and the Rest as special forms of discourse that mutually form mass images about each other; or the psychological approach of Franz Fanon², focuses on the psychological characteristics of subjects within the colonial and postcolonial system of relations.

By the end of the last century Leslie Sklair, a scholar who tries to systemize approaches to globality under the umbrella term of sociology of the global system, identified five approaches, which include both early theories of globality and the theories developed in the 1980s–1990s (Sklair, 1995, pp. 32–41).

– **Imperialist (Marxist) Approach,**

which explains the structure of the world order in terms of the struggle between dominant forces for new markets, resources, and the spread of their economic, political and cultural influence. The theories within this approach are based on the intrinsic need of capitalism in constant expansion. The main representatives are Vladimir Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Nicolay Bukharin, Karl Kautsky, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (a postmodern wing), and others.

– **Modernization (Neo-Evolutionary) Approach,**

which views globalization as a logical consequence of social development. In this context, the whole world is seen as developing along a single path, while different states and societies are found at different stages of their development: some for some reasons have advanced further than others. Accordingly, any inequality is seen as naturally occurring and surmountable if enough effort is made.

– **Neo-Marxist Approach (Including Theories of Dependent Development),**

which is based on the Marxist-Leninist tradition of analyzing imperialism, but pays more attention not to the economic component, but to the cultural and political ones. The main representatives are David Harvey, John Belamy-Foster, Raul Prebisch, Enzo Faletto.

– **World-Systems Approach,**

which is based on the division of the world into the center, semi-periphery, and periphery on the basis of the world division of labor. The core is viewed as the dominant, capitalistically developed part of the world system and the periphery and semi-periphery as regions dependent on the center. The main representatives: Immanuel Wallerstein, Andre Gunder Frank, Giovanni Arrighi, Samir Amin, Boris Kagarlitsky.

– **Mode of Production Approach**

refers to another direction of Marxist theorizing and is based on the idea that the causes of global inequality lie not in the system in which a society is immersed, but in the state itself. In contrast to the

¹ Said, E. (2006). *Orientalism*. Translated by A. V. Govorunov, Saint Petersburg: Publishing House «Russian World», 636.

Hall, S. *The West and The Rest* (1992). In *Understanding Modern Societies, Book 1: Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 275–333.

² Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, New York: Groove Press, 317.

representatives of the theory of dependent development, who believe that to overcome inequality, the state must move away from the capitalist path of development, the proponents of this approach believe that capitalist industrialization is the only way to close the gap. Key representatives: Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy.

In 2003 Jan Nederveen Pieterse offered a three-component classification for globalization theories based on their assessments of the effects of this process. He suggests to divide all theories in three paradigms: homogenization, differentialism and hybridization. The first paradigm covers the theories that see globalization as a convergence across the globe, especially through transnational corporations. The second includes theories that see globalization as a process leading to cultural conflict and fragmentation. The last paradigm consists of the theories that consider globalization as a combining power for different cultures and giving rise to a global melange (Nederveen Pieterse, 2003).

In the Ukrainian academic field an elaborate classification was offered by Taras Tsymbal, who suggested a similar division of scholars in three groups: «hyperglobalists», «sceptics» and «transformationalists». The researcher basically supports the idea of Nederveen Pieterse that one can look at globality as at the unified, fragmented or synthesized state. However, the author also offers to look at the global order as at either objective, subjective or mixed phenomenon, which means that it can be considered either as an objective or socially constructed phenomenon. Moreover, he offers the third ground for classification – ideological or teleological position. According to the latter ground, theories could be divided on normativist and realist ones (Tsymbal, 2013).

Russian researcher Natalia Polyakova identifies (Polyakova, 2019, 2020) two research strategies within the framework of global sociology and, accordingly, two approaches to the analysis of the global social order: universalist and civilization strategies. The first unites theories that consider the world space as universal, developing according to uniform law. The second is born as an alternative to the first one, which demonstrated its weaknesses in explaining decolonization processes and the postcolonial world. It postulates the absence of universalism in the development of the world space and emphasizes the diversity of ways of existence.

In our work, we consider systemic approach inappropriate and refer to the category of the global social order as to a more suitable analytical category than the sociology of the global system. The notion of global social order describes the global research subject better than the global system approach because after all, we are not dealing with a single unified organism in the Parsonian (and not even in Wallersteinian) sense, – this is exactly the interpretation of globality that we would like to avoid – but with a special way of organizing social reality on a global scale (Nederveen Pieterse, 2019).

In this paper, the social order is considered as a way of organizing social reality, which is characterized by a certain stability and cohesion, non-randomness of social interaction and its probability, non-spontaneity of occurrence (and therefore, the presence of certain social institutions and organizations that perform the functions of social control), interdependence with individual actions, as well as the possibility of its objectification. Social order does not arise spontaneously, but its maintenance is based on certain norms, rules, formal and informal social institutions and specific organizations aimed at ensuring the stability of the social order (Kleimenova, 2014, p. 23). In turn, global social order refers to a similar principles, but transported on a global scale. So, this category allows us to analyze organizing principles, which define the relationship and development of the world units, its influence on a separate states and regions and their contribution to the constitution and character of the global order.

Despite the lack of a unified classification and regardless of the theoretical approach and normative position, all these approaches, in one way or another, come to certain common conclusions:

- the sociology's subject takes (or, for the world-systems approach, has always been of) a global scale;
- this global subject (for various reasons) is in a (multi) polarized condition, so, the category of social inequality also reaches the global level;
- the local (in its various manifestations) is in a dialectical relationship with the global;
- capitalism is a key characteristic for the understanding of the world order.

Since there is no unified classification of approaches that work with the category of globality, and there is also no single basis for classification of all these approaches, it is impossible to carry out their full-fledged

synthesis. Therefore, instead of synthesis, we propose to combine different ideas from the theories we have considered to highlight the key characteristics of the global social order.

THE RESEARCH RESULTS

Technological development, which has contributed to the processes of globalization, has strengthened and accelerated the development of another global phenomenon – capitalism. As a product of the Western world, capitalism could have probably reached its limits and dissolved in it, if technological capabilities had not supported its natural expansiveness. As Andrey Maliuk, following Wallerstein, notes, «the key characteristic of a “modern society”, that is, the modern historical system, is capitalism» (Maliuk, 2015, p. 173). Accordingly, researchers should understand how capitalism produces, structures and organizes the world space.

As noted by Giovanni Arrighi and David Harvey (Arrighi, 2005), who consider capitalism a key characteristic of modernity, this phenomenon can exist only when it has the ability to expand and subjugate new spaces (not necessarily geographical ones). Capitalism, closed within the framework of one society or region, is doomed to a series of inevitable crises, including a crisis of overproduction. Since the inception of capitalist relations, capitalism and technology have been in a dialectical relationship: technologies have supported the expansion of capitalism, creating an ever more perfect infrastructure for it, and capitalism, in turn, has provided more and more resources for technological development. Thus, capitalist relations received a practical opportunity to cover almost the entire world space.

According to Ulrich Beck, based on technological development, globalization makes possible what was apparently always latent in capitalism, but at the stage of its taming by a social democratic state remained hidden: enterprises, especially those operating on a global scale, play a key role not only in organizing the economy, but also in organizing society as a whole – at least because they are able to take material resources (capital, taxes, jobs) away from a society (Beck, 2001). Globalization, which itself accelerated with technological development, accelerated the expansion of capitalism and strengthened its hegemony in turn. The penetration of the values of the Western world into spaces to which they were previously unfamiliar has cemented capitalism as a natural norm. According to Beck, it was globalization that strengthened the influence of TNCs and provided them with a chance to usurp power outside the political system (Beck, 2001). A similar opinion is shared by Maliuk, who considers globalization not as an independent process, but as an organic trend in the development of capitalism, subjected to its laws (Maliuk, 2015, p. 177).

Arrighi calls capitalism the only social system in history that has become truly global. By the end of the 20th century, capitalism can no longer remain only a special form of relations of production, as Karl Marx saw it. Now it has taken shape as a global social order, penetrating all spheres of human life and determining them.

In our paper we propose to consider capitalism as a global social order, which means to understand it as a way of organizing social reality on a global scale. Capitalism, just like any other form of social order, is characterized by several things: 1) non-randomness of social interaction and its probability (Golikov, 2018, p. 158); 2) non-spontaneity of its emergence, which means the presence of certain social institutions and organizations that perform the functions of social control (Shmatko, 2001, p.14); 3) certain stability and steadiness (Sobolevskaya, 2013, p. 794); 4) interdependence with individual actions (Sobolevskaya, 2013, p. 794); 5) the possibility of objectification of the social, and, consequently, its conceptualization (Sobolevskaya, 2013, p. 796).

Subordinating social reality to the logic of capital, capitalism puts in the basis of social interaction the values, principles, schemes of market relations, and therefore — the maximization of profit. This does not exclude the emergence and parallel existence of other effects and consequences, but the commercialization of social relations occurs within the framework of all social institutions: family, education, science, health care, religion, friendship and others.

The capitalist order is anchored in formal and informal social institutions and organizations (for example, the IMF, WTO, UN, NATO). A distinctive feature of this order is the emergence of new entities – transnational corporations. Capital has always been globally oriented, but only by the end of the 20th century TNCs become full-fledged subjects of international relations and participate in them on an equal basis with states and international organizations, structuring the global geographic and social space

(Hardt, Negri, 2000, pp. 31–32). Acting as instruments for the development and maintenance of the current capitalist social order, TNCs obey the logic of its existence: they also have an expansionist nature (grow in size, create and cover new spaces), concentrate power in the hands of a few and adapt to changing conditions (Hardt, Negri, 2000, pp. 183–205). TNCs are not only subjects of global social, economic and political relations, they produce new subjectivity: needs, social relations, bodies and minds – «in other words, they produce producers» (Hardt, Negri, 2000, p.32).

Capitalism can hardly be called a stable order, but in terms of permanence, it is ahead of any other. Capitalism is an unprecedentedly adaptive system (Magdoff, 2003, pp. 97–98). Unlike the feudalism that preceded it, or the even earlier slave owning system, since its establishment in Western societies, capitalism has gone through many crises that have been constantly questioning its viability. However, every time capitalism seemed to demonstrate its limits, it survived and adapted to the new conditions of each era. To take a recent example, many researchers said (Saad-Filho, 2020) that the 2020 COVID-crisis will kill capitalism, but despite all the challenges, the global order has only slightly shaken and is already recovering from shocks.

Despite the global nature of capitalism and its ability to shape social reality, it is being transformed under the influence of local phenomena and processes. Some provide it with an impetus for further growth (for example, the collapse of the USSR and the Socialist Bloc opened new spaces for its development), while others, on the contrary, challenge it (for example, success of leftist movements in Latin America). Locality and globality are in a dialectical relationship, and this cannot be excluded from the field of analysis. This is also confirmed by the studies of Roland Robertson, during which he formulated the concept of glocality as a response to the myth of a unifying globalization, supposedly equalizing all world communities and states. Robertson points out the non-identity of interconnectedness and homogenization and emphasizes the importance of local contribution to the globality (Robertson, 2012, p.197).

For all its totality, capitalism manifests itself in many different ways. «Pluralization of the social order is possible due to such organization of social reality, when one area of a certainly ordered phenomena reproduces itself, interacting with others» (Sobolevskaya, 2013, p.794). Accordingly, the same social order at different levels, for different societies, takes different forms. Natalia Shmatko notes that the global order manifests itself in different ways within a scope of local orders or topoi (Shmatko, 2001, p. 15). Therefore, it is easy to see that the capitalist social order manifests itself in different ways and is experienced differently, for example, by the Ukrainian and American societies. It has multiple effects on society and individuals, and also leads to various consequences. At this level, there are no universal manifestations of capitalism, although the logic of its functioning is the same.

Turning into a global social order, capitalism transfers its characteristics, which previously could be observed in a local context, to the global system: constant expansion, inequality and exploitation (Arrighi, 2004). Accordingly, the question arises «Why does such an unfair global order have no viable alternatives? What makes its actors accept this system?». The answer is in the hegemony of capitalism, which is realized through imperialism.

For imperialism, capitalism is a global context, within which the former develops as an instrument for maintaining the world domination of capitalism. At the same time, imperialism can be viewed as one of capitalism's many manifestations. No less global, but taking on a different form.

According to Arrighi, modern imperialism is a model of political power closely related to capitalism as a special type of economic power. Following Harvey, Arrighi notes that imperialism of the capitalist type is a fusion of two components: «policy of the state and empire» and «molecular processes of capital accumulation in space and time» (Arrighi, 2005, p.27). Thus, capitalist imperialism is produced in the course of the dialectical interaction of economic and political power. In the modern world, it is difficult to imagine the functioning of capitalist logic without imperialist support and vice versa. These two vectors, which determine the development of interstate and supranational relations for several centuries, ensure the existence of each other (Arrighi, 2005, pp. 34–35).

For the purposes of this paper, imperialism will be seen as a way of shaping the capitalist social order in relations between dominant capitalistically developed states and dependent states or territories without statehood. Relying on neoliberal ideology, imperialism is based on implicit exploitation and helps maintain the continued existence and power of capitalism.

Since imperialism within the framework of this work is seen as a way to maintain the capitalist social order and at the same time as a way to form it locally, it is a phenomenon of no less global scale than capitalism. In the 21st century, imperialism enters a new phase associated with the globalization of production and finance (Bellamy Foster, 2015), which creates the need to redefine its main characteristics.

Like capitalism, imperialism penetrates all spheres of social life. According to Samir Amin, world imperialism unfolds within the framework of five spheres of monopoly, which determine the place of the country in the hierarchy of interstate relations and ensure their position in the imperialist system of relations. These include: 1) technological monopoly, which paves the way for medical, military and industrial domination; 2) financial monopoly to control financial markets. The stability of the local currency, the dollar as an international currency, and the power of the banking capital over the rest – all this ensures the financial monopoly of the Western world. 3) monopoly access to the planet's resources, which, on the one hand, is provided by previous monopolies, and on the other, leads to an unequal distribution of resources and their depletion; 4) communication monopoly, which is based on inequality of access to the media market; 5) a monopoly on weapons of mass destruction, which forms the international distribution of forces. «The result is a new hierarchy, more unequal than ever before, in the distribution of income on a world scale, subordinating the industries of the peripheries and reducing them to the role of subcontracting. This is a new foundation of polarization, presaging its future forms» (Amin, 1997, p. 5).

The economic dominance of capitalism needs political reinforcement, which will prove that dominant states are able to create stable and uncontested social order. Within modern imperialism, since the late 1970s, this role has been played by neoliberalism, a political economic theory, the findings of which have begun to be widely applied in practice. In an ideological sense, the conviction, which stays behind neoliberalism, is that society as a whole and the individual actor in particular can get maximum well-being in a free market and minimal government intervention.

To maintain the capitalist global social order in balance and to legitimize it, it must be perceived by the majority (both representatives of dominant groups and dependent ones) as the only true and having no alternative system. This maintenance is based on a hegemony – additional power that is accumulated by the dominant group due to its ability to lead society in a direction that not only meets the interests of the dominant group, but is also perceived by subordinate groups as meeting broader interests (Arrighi, 2005, p. 13). Arrighi notes the shift from the class level of hegemony's power to the global one and asks the question «What makes the actors of the world order agree with such an unjust process of capital accumulation and the division of labor?». He sees hegemony as an additional power inherent in states or supranational structures and organizations. The main difference from the Gramscian definition of hegemony is that when we talk about unconditional leadership in a state context, the idea that is convenient to exploit as beneficial for all citizens and residents is the idea of leadership on the world-scale in order to be able to defend state interests and national prosperity. When it comes to leadership in an international context, it becomes impossible to exploit the same idea as beneficial for the inhabitants of all countries. «Thus, while the general interest of a system of states cannot be defined in terms of changes in the distribution of power among them, it can be defined in terms of an increase in the collective power of the entire system's dominant groups over third parties or nature» (Arrighi, 2005, p. 33). That is, to establish world hegemony, the leading states are forced to construct an image of the Other, who will become an enemy and an obstacle to the struggle for «universal success».

Thus, using the above-mentioned tools, imperialism acts, on the one hand, as a product of capitalism, as a way of shaping it at a more local level, and on the other hand, as a mechanism that supports the existence of a global capitalist social order. Capitalism, despite its global nature, still needs a system of legitimation and political and ideological support. Imperialism as a kind of political and ideological framework that determines the order of practical actions aimed at maintaining the status quo of modern capitalism makes it possible. In turn, the totality of these actions can be called neocolonialism.

Ghanaian philosopher and politician Kwame Nkruma is considered to be the author of the concept «neocolonialism» within political and scientific discourse. Following V. Lenin¹, he defines neocolonialism

¹ Lenin, V. I. (1978). *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Moscow: Publishing House of Political Literature, 135.

as the «last stage of imperialism» (Nkrumah, 1965). According to Nkrumah, the formal elimination of colonialism didn't cancel the dependency of former colonies from metropolises. In fact, it has only grown, although becoming less visible. Boris Kagarlitsky supports the same opinion noting that the decolonization process had been initially guided not by national liberation movements, but by imperialist scenario, which increased the dependency from the Center (Kagarlitsky, 2010, p. 633–635). To adapt to a new world, when the costs of maintaining colonies became higher than the benefits, developed capitalist states agreed to lose their political sovereignty, but to keep the economic status quo. «National independence and decolonization not only did not weaken the position of imperialism as a system, but, on the contrary, breathed new life into the peripheral capitalism, which had been in crisis» (Kagarlitsky, 2010, p. 638).

The main feature that distinguishes traditional colonialism from neocolonialism, according to Nkrumah, is the absence of direct dependence in the form of formal subordination and the presence of an indirect influence of dominant states on dependent countries. Exploitation under the guise of aid, the formation of credit dependence, the creation of a system of international supranational organizations, the creation of conditions for the dominance of Western culture – all these things Nkrumah considers as the mechanisms of neocolonialism, the purpose of which is to preserve dependence under the guise of freedom (Nkrumah, 1965).

In addition, modern neocolonial studies, in contrast to postcolonial ones, note, on the one hand, the emergence of new «metropolitan» countries (for example, China), and on the other hand, new «colonial» dependent countries that did not previously have colonial experience (for example, countries of the post-Soviet bloc). Thus, neocolonial studies not only analyze the transformation of traditional colonial relations into neocolonial ones, but also indicate the emergence of new subjects of these relations and practices.

Traditional colonialism is often reduced to economic exploitation and cultural domination. However, neither traditional colonialism, nor its modern forms can be reduced only to these manifestations. Neocolonialism, as a set of practices resulting from pluralism in the formation of imperialism, unfolds in various directions: in economics, politics, culture, education and science, in the mental, bodily, as well as military, information and socio-demographic spheres.

Anatoly Gorelov and Ivan Bronnikov understand neocolonialism as «a system of unequal (economic and political) relations imposed by Western countries on the rest of the world, based on their military power and the activities of monopoly capital, international financial organizations and TNCs» (Gorelov, Bronnikov, 2015, pp. 21–22), and add that «global neocolonialism is a modern direction of globalization and the practice of global imperialism» (Gorelov, Bronnikov, 2015, p. 22). It is precisely the set of practices of global imperialism which is defined as neocolonialism in this paper. Together with the phenomena of a higher order, imperialism and capitalism, neocolonialism is a key characteristic of the modern global system.

Thus, the global social order as a special subject of sociological research is conceptualized through three basic concepts:

- **capitalism** as a global social order that organizes the world according to the principles of market economy, domination of finance capital and monopoly on the power of capital;
- **imperialism** as a special way of shaping the global order at the local level, as a political and ideological reinforcement of capital and a mechanism for supporting its functioning;
- **neocolonialism** as a set of practices of global imperialism, which unfold in all spheres of personal and social life.

These three phenomena of the global social order determine both the state of the global order and its character, and the local experience that its components experience. At the same time, the global social order as a special way of organizing social reality produces those phenomena, processes and actors that operate at the international, local, regional and group levels. Thus, global social order and its components organize the relations of dialectical dependence. Capitalism, imperialism and neo-colonialism are becoming, not exhaustive, but solid, framework, in which phenomena of a more local order are included. Naturally, social science also develops within this setting and under its influence. Therefore, the recognition of this fact is a step towards overcoming the limitations imposed by this global social order.

CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH PROSPECTS

Despite the challenges sociology faces when studying large scale subjects, it is necessary to face the fact that globality has become an important form of social reality long ago. Therefore, it is impossible to ignore it as a relevant subject of social research. Globality in its various manifestations needs to be analyzed both as a separate subject and as a context for any other subjects of social research. Several attempts to do so are already undertaken: sociology tries to comprehend globality through the notion of global system, world system, empire, North-South and East-West relations, etc. For now, these are only a bunch of scattered theories which require systematization and deeper analysis. Sociology needs to develop relevant methods to be able to grasp such a subject.

In this paper we made an attempt to analyze globality in a global social order perspective, which means to consider the social world on a global scale not as a united system but rather as organized by certain rules and principles. The decisive role in it plays global capitalism which is supported by imperialist thought and neocolonial practices. All three elements are connected with each other dialectically, so are their relations to the global social order: these elements simultaneously affect the shape the order takes and are themselves shaped under its influence. These findings can be considered on the one hand as a minor contribution to the theories of globality, and on the other, as a starting point for further research within the framework of global social order perspective.

REFERENCES

- Amin, S. (1997). *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization: The Management of Contemporary Society*. Zed Books Ltd, 192. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350218888>
- Arrighi, G. (2004). Spatial and Other 'Fixes' of Historical Capitalism. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, X, 2, 527–539. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2004.289>
- Arrighi, G. (2005). *Hegemony Unraveling I*, New Left Review II/32, 23–80.
- Beck, U. (2001). *What is globalization?* Translated from German by A. Grigoreva, V. Sedelnik; Edited by A. Filippova. Moscow: Progress-Tradition, 304.
- Bellamy Foster, J. (2015). The New Imperialism of Globalized Monopoly - Finance Capital. *Monthly Review*, 67, 3. Retrieved October 16, 2021 from https://monthlyreviewarchives.org/index.php/mr/article/view/MR-067-03-2015-07_1
- Bentley, J. H. (2004). Globalizing history and historicizing globalization. *Globalizations*, 1(1), 69-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1474773042000252165>
- Bronner, S. E. (2011) *Critical Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 130. <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780199730070.001.0001>
- Fomichev, P. N. (2000). *Global Sociology: The Formation of New Science: Scientific Analytic Review / RAN.INION*. Center for Academic Research and Informational Studies on Social Sciences. Department of Sociology and Social Psychology. Edited by Girko L. V., Moscow, (Section. «Sociology»).
- Golikov, O. S. (2018). *Fabrication of order. Knowledge in the constitution of social*. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 592.
- Gorelov, A. A., Bronnikov, I. A. (2015). Global neocolonialism and the problem of sovereignty. *Power*, 2, 19–25.
- Hardt, M., Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjnrw54>
- Kagarlitsky, B. (2010). *From Empire to Imperialism: The State and The Rise of Bourgeois Civilization*. National Research University Higher School of Economics. Moscow.: Publishing House of National University, 374.
- Kleimenova, E. G. (2014). Social order as a basis for the stability of the social system. *Bulletin of Udmurt University. Series Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy*, 1, 23–30.
- Magdoff, H. (2003). *Imperialism without colonies*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 160.
- Maliuk, A. (2015). The Concept of Globalization through the Lence of the World-System Approach. *Social Dimensions of Society*, 7 (18), 171–190.
- Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2018). *Multipolar Globalization: Emerging Economies and Development*. Routledge, 264. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315312859>
- Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2019). *Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange*. Fourth Edition. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 250.
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*. Retrieved October 16, 2021 from <https://www.marxists.org/subject/africa/nkrumah/neo-colonialism/introduction.htm>
- Polyakova, N. L. (2019). Global sociology. Basic research strategies. Part I. Universalist approach. *Journal of Moscow University. Sociology and Political Science*, 25 (4), 154–174. <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2019-25-4-154-174>

-
- Polyakova, N. L. (2020). Global sociology: basic research strategies. Part II. Civilization approach. *Journal of Moscow University. Sociology and Political Science*, 26 (1), 7–28. <https://doi.org/10.24290/1029-3736-2020-26-1-7-28>
- Robertson, R. (2012). Globalisation or glocalization? *Journal of International Communication*, 18:2, 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.2012.709925>
- Saad-Filho, A. (2020). From COVID-19 to the End of Neoliberalism. *Critical Sociology*, 46 (4–5), 477–485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920520929966>
- Shmatko, N. A. (2001). Pluralization of social order and social topology. *Sociological Studies*, 9, 14–19.
- Sklair, L. (1995). *Sociology of the Global System*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2nd edition, 352.
- Sobolevskaya, M. A. (2013). The notion of social order in the modern social theory: from the discourse of order to the order of discourse. *Young Scholar*, 12 (59), 794–798.
- Tsymbal, T. V. (2013). Scientific and methodological aspects of the typology of the modern globalization theories. *Actual Problems of Sociology, Psychology, Pedagogy*, 18, 35–42.