

***AGAINST GLOBALISED COLONISATION, FOR A  
GLOBALISATION OF CIVILISATION***

## **AGAINST GLOBALISED COLONISATION, FOR A GLOBALISATION OF CIVILISATION**

In the aftermath of the Second World War and with the political assertion of the blocs, on the one hand the communist world with its articulations (USSR (Stalin, Khrushchev and later) - Maoism - Titoism - Hoxhaism - Castroism - Guevarism - and the Asian variants of North Korea, Laos, Vietnam and the African variants) and on the other hand the Western bloc, with the inclusion of Japan and the focus on India as 'the world's largest democracy' after independence and, after 1960, and the inclusion of many African countries, the confrontation was measured not only on politics or economics or scientific research or military power, but also on the culture of democracy or the two cultures of democracy, which in any case exerted a mutual influence in a regime of perennial competition.

On the level of reciprocal cultural influence, the focus was certainly on the exercise of freedoms and democratic participation, with the aim of uplifting the social and economic conditions of the peoples, who had all suffered from the world war.

This attention was manifested - mainly in Western Europe and other countries with democratic systems - in emphasising the commitment to the principle of solidarity with the less well-off classes, to show that the social and economic, as well as civil, condition of these classes was better than that of the popular classes in states with communist regimes.

The progress of peoples governed by democratic systems was evident and the succession of five-year plans of communist states would fail to reach the social and economic levels of the former.

The ideological motivation of communism was shattered by the lack of results with respect to the welfare levels of the citizens (welfare that was not only economic, but social, civil, scientific, and cultural due to an obvious lack of comparison because of the imposition of a monoculture) and thus 1989 is the historic date of the failure of communism with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent liquidation of the Soviet Union, thanks to one of the greatest politicians in history, Mikhail Gorbachev.

Mikhail Gorbachev was, together with Ronald Reagan, the one who held the world bloc system in balance, and at that stage the great responsibility of the two and their respective governments prevented an imbalance, which would have seriously endangered the peace

and existence of millions of citizens in the world, from being triggered in the event of an atomic war.

The ideological defeat of real communism, despite remaining in the ascendancy in China and a few other countries, but in different ways, leaves the world with the other ideology, which had shown it could achieve better results, and uncritically makes it a totem, from which started the globalisation of markets (according to the economic definition) but in fact the globalisation of information, culture, technology, research, 'official science', effectively affirming a monoculture, triumphalistically accepted at first, but which in the light of facts reveals all its economic, social, civil, and human limitations.

## **THE LIBERALIST CULTURE**

Thirty years after the end of communism and the beginning of globalisation, the damage of the liberalist monoculture is evident, and even the greatest economists are unable to find a clear direction to correct all the imbalance created and desired.

Satisfying the needs (before) and desires of citizens becomes the objective of every manifestation and every intellectual, economic, civil, and social activity, and the dimension gradually changes from social to individual, encouraging the enhancement of the individual's capabilities, offering models that incite the conquest of ever more evident positions in the social context of reference.

The Christian logic that the last will be first is inverted; in the earthly context it is always better to be first, because 'the first is first, the second is nobody', goes a common adage.

It is precisely in this logic that a social path is constructed in which competition, which in itself is not negative, is practised at all levels and at all costs, without taking into account contextual conditions and thus the relativisation of various situations.

In effect, the physiocratic and liberalist logic of 'laissez faire, laissez passer' is borrowed, even in society, and thus individuality prevails over sociality, annihilating interpersonal relationships and bending them to the achievement of personal goals in priority and sometimes exclusive terms.

In this context, what are termed 'moral superstructures' decay, and thus the logic is affirmed that anything that can satisfy the desires of the individual is permitted, with the sole exception of respect for 'human rights' (and not always), enshrined in UN charters.

The reference model for constructing the society of men is identical to the liberalist economic model, whereby the strongest companies assert themselves over the weakest; In society, the less affluent classes, people with congenital or chronic diseases and reduced working capacity, the elderly, generate social costs, which the logic in vogue suffers and tries in every way to reduce - an example is the repeated request at different times for the reduction of the 'tax wedge', or the concentration of a category of citizens in the RSAs to avoid home care, which would have psychologically better effects - to affirm the principle that everyone must live off their work according to their capacities; and if these capacities are insufficient, what to do?

The principle of solidarity and the social dimension are almost completely ousted from the logic of living, without this exclusion creating a scandal (Obamacare, which ensured care for the indigent, for a not inconsiderable part of the US population caused a scandal and an attempt was made to repeal it).

Wilhelm Ropke's social market economy, embraced by Christian-inspired parties in Europe, advocated in Germany during the Weimar Republic, was applied in Europe and other countries until the 1990s and was supplanted by capitalist practice after the fall of the Berlin Wall, creating the current world situation.

In the USA, Keynesian theories were applied and John Kenneth Galbraith, from Kennedy's presidency and subsequently for several decades, was one of the most listened to economists.

When the social protections of the weakest in society fall, one of the fundamental principles of civil and democratic coexistence is compromised, because constitutional principles are infringed not only in Italy, but also in other countries, in the European Union, and the UN Charters are violated, which provide that in every country discrimination against citizens, deprived of the autonomous capacity to provide for themselves, is not allowed.

Therefore, it should be noted that applying the liberalist economic model in the world's democratic societies has created intolerable inequalities and has blocked societies in evolution, undermining the well-established 'social lift', which led children to create better conditions than their fathers.

The blockage of social dynamics has generated huge pockets of unemployment and also a major impediment to the overall adaptation of society to contemporaneity, because it has

left unsupported those who would and could have wanted to contextualise their existence with the goals that are constantly being achieved.

The pandemic has highlighted the world situation, and even the strongest economies or those that believe they have the resources to deal with any problem find themselves in difficulty, as an effect of the liberalist policy that states have allowed to take place, expand and proliferate without any limits or conditions.

The current situation of society in every part of the world records the crushing of the middle and upper middle classes downwards, effectively widening the band of the poor and increasing, beyond the physiological threshold, the class of the marginalised.

Tax systems are also conditioned by the liberalist policy of leaving large multinational companies out of the national tax system, allowing them to locate their tax offices in countries with favourable taxation or negotiating the percentage of the tax contribution to be paid from time to time.

## **THE SITUATION OF THE STATES**

The financial situation of states would have to be analysed, as the situation of public debts generally increases with the increase in social policies to be expected; in such a situation, with the almost total disappearance of the middle class, with the centralisation of wealth in the coffers of a small number of financial groups, with the contraction of the retail sector, operated by individual and small and medium-sized companies, because it is concentrated in the large distribution chains, entrepreneurship is drastically reduced and proportionally the resilience in times of crisis of citizens with variable income according to the volume of business is reduced; ultimately, crises are mainly borne by citizens on fixed incomes, because their salaries lose purchasing power as prices rise.

All the great economic powers have huge public and private debts, and some of these multinationals are at risk of bankruptcy because their customers, represented by the impoverished middle class, no longer have the capacity to pay their exposures (just two examples, representing almost the entire phenomenon: Lehman Brothers and Evergrande Real Estate Group, which were considered 'too big to fail').

If we do not take action to correct a globalisation without rules, precisely by introducing rules that do not limit the accumulation of wealth, but regulate its use, distinguishing the financial

sector from the production sector, the commercial sector, the services sector, and allocating market shares that prevent the creation of oligopolies, with the motivation of affirming the need for competition, we would find ourselves at the beginning of an era of 'financial cretaceous-tertiary' for the multinationals (economic dinosaurs) and of a new post-war (financial) era, due to the generalised impoverishment of the world's population, which would no longer be able to fulfil its commitments, consequently leading states to the collapse of their budgets due to the social costs to be faced.

## **PROSPECTS OF MANKIND UNDER THE LIBERALIST SYSTEM**

The current financial liberalist system will have as its epilogue the creation of a society where wealth is concentrated in the coffers of a few global groups, the industrial sector will tend to standardise production in order to reduce differences to zero (also in the cultural field such as fashion, design, tools, habits, food, organisation of daily time, etc.); the commercial sector will be organised in enormous megastores, cities will be deprived of shops, because small-scale trade (retail) will no longer have room to survive; the part of the population recognised as able to work will be directed to wage labour, to control labour systems, to standardise wages and wage guarantees, to reduce individual capacity and submit it to corporate strategy; leisure time will be organised globally to force people into certain practices, functional to productive efficiency.

Ultimately, the goal is to create a global society of 'robotic humans', responding to the demand for efficiency for the production of wealth of the few financial groups, which will govern the world economy.

Hence the need to rediscover the social market economy, along with the 'Economy of Community', the economy of communion, and any other form of solidarity to be applied in a society deprived of means.

The great structures that regulate the world economy (financial, production, trade, services) should be reformed and subjected to the government of the states that adhere to them, with objective general rules and phasing-in periods, so that each adhering state is guaranteed uniform treatment among all, without exception.

It has happened in the past that some states have been admitted, despite not having the conditions for entry, into major international organisations (China in the WTO, despite the major problem of human rights and the democratic deficit).

It would also be important to verify the necessity or advisability of financial superstructures, which regulate the commodity markets, which far from benefiting the primary producers, on whom a production and price regime is imposed, serve private speculation to accumulate wealth, through a series of financial instruments that are based on the assessment of a future and hypothetical risk (see the TTF- TITLE TRANSFER FACILITY in Amsterdam).

The reference is not to producer associations (such as Opec and the like, even in the food sector), but to general and specific financial structures, for which a total limitation would not be necessary, but only that of influencing the current account when hypothesising a future trend.

In this reality, even the organisation of stock exchanges would need a regulatory structural review, especially in the evaluation of the admission of securities and the management of specifically financial securities, which accumulate the greatest capitalisation, and which currently have the possibility of intervening in every area and sector, determining their increase or decrease.

It is not a good thing that the 'financialisation of the economy' has taken place at all, as unscrupulous raiders can create huge financial movements in the public and private spheres, undermining the natural course of life of states and private companies.

The institution of the instrument of 'golden power' to block hostile takeovers, provided for by national and European legislation, is probably only a defensive tool, whereas it would be necessary for takeovers or acquisitions to take place after a prior check to verify the company's future, production levels and the preservation of jobs or, alternatively, the creation of new jobs to replace those that may have been lost.

It has happened that in our country, some large companies for the extraction of minerals, for the production of steel and for the production of electrical appliances have been taken over, and at the end of the timeframe envisaged for company restructuring, they have been abandoned (I am referring to Indian, US, and Algerian companies, which evidently had an interest in reducing or eliminating Italian competition).

Particular thought must be given to the organisation of the Brics, which came into being in 2009 without South Africa, which joined in 2010, and which set up an alternative and competing organisation to the Monetary Fund and the World Bank, no longer recognising themselves in those international organisations.

The creation of the New Development Bank (New Development Bank), the Contingent Reserves Arrangement (CRA), the Global Development Initiative GDI, and the Global Security Initiative GSI, manifest the will to oppose the economic and financial policies adopted by the existing organisations established under Bretton Woods.

The Brics represent more than 45 % of the world's population and 25 % of the global economy and have attracted the membership of other countries (Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, Argentina, Egypt, Indonesia, Nigeria, Senegal, United Arab Emirates, Thailand), with the prospect of more to come.

The reasons lie in the obvious aspiration of these countries to acquire more space in self-determination and also in not being subjected to American economic and financial policies, the result of the prevailing monoculture.

The risks of an economic clash that is no longer mediated by international bodies is very high, and therefore it would be necessary to set up an inclusive political turn, where each state can recognise and negotiate its own space for growth.

The principle of 'exporting democracy' has not worked and can never work, because the sense of democracy must first be a widespread culture and then it can be institutionalised in state organisation.

A typical case occurred when the Western world favoured and nurtured the so-called 'Arab springs', which were born through popular uprisings inspired by fundamentalist currents.

In Egypt the 'Muslim brothers' were defenestrated by Al Sisi, in Tunisia there is a situation of precarious stability, in Libya civil war has broken out and the situation has still not been normalised, not to mention Afghanistan.

Ultimately, I do not think that the results of exporting democracy have borne serious fruit, also because democracy cannot be exported, but must mature in popular culture and become a heritage in the everyday behaviour of citizens, evolving civil and religious culture, as is currently happening in Iran with the popular uprisings to protest against the persecution

of girls for religious reasons, violating the principle of the intangibility of the person, established by all the Charters of Rights.

## **THE ANTHROPOCENE**

For some time thick intellectuals have been discussing with their book production about the prospect that society may have in the near future.

The reflection on the transformation of nature, a consequence of the impact with man, dates back to the late nineteenth century by the geologist Antonio Stoppani, who used the term “anthropozoic era”; later the Russian Vernadsky called the era “noosphera”; the same term was used by the Catholic thinker Teilhard de Chardin; the definition continued to change to “Holocene” to get to the current term of “anthropocene”, also adopted by the Nobel Crutzen.

Among the first to accurately analyse the social trend at the beginning of the years of the economic boom was Romano Guardini, who glimpsed the transformation of the anthropological culture that would build a “non-human man”, inserted in a “non-natural nature”, intuitively anticipating today’s era, in which we think of “human, post-human and trans-human”.

Francis Fukuyama speaks of the “end of history and the last man,” as the conclusion of the evolutionary process. but if the evolutionary process is over, what can the activity of the surviving man be at the end of history?

Moreover, what evolutionary process, that of civilisation?

Is the process of civilisation really concluded or do we have to wait for all communities to reach the same level of economic, social, civil, cultural evolution?

Is there anyone who has defined the beginning and end of the civilisation process?

Does not the process of civilisation follow that relating to the evolution of the human intellect and consequently to that of interpersonal and social relations?

Undoubtedly Fukuyama’s thought makes us think a lot, because we do not have to resign ourselves to the “end of history”, but we must move forward until the brain capacity of man manages to control all the research processes in every field, in order to be able to use them according to his own judgment, to achieve ever greater levels of well-being.

Christianly the “end of history” is conceived only when the Apocalypse manifests itself by regenerating men in the image of God, without space and time and therefore without end.

Secularly cannot be conceived “the end of history” until human intelligence governs the world, even with macroscopic errors of assessment and with the presence of will stubbornly prevaricating and violent. The instinct for survival can do justice even the most subtle forms of self-destruction, motivated by the perversive desire to acquire unlimited power.

Samuel Philips Huntington’s prediction of the historical events of the end of the last century now appears verified by the events and therefore it can be said that the unipolar world, imagined with globalisation, with unique thought, with democracy exported, with the “politically correct”, with the uniformisation of behaviors also through digital systems, with the “culture cancel”, with the attempt to erase the roots of communities, did not work and indeed was rejected, because it was unnatural with respect to the originality of every man.

I would point out, however, that “sovereignism” must also be judged negatively, because it calls into question centuries of civilising activities of Humanity and its numerous communities, which have not closed themselves, but have maintained relations with the whole surrounding world and gradually with an ever wider range, in relation to times and systems of connection.

From the Phoenicians to the Greeks, to the Romans, to the Indo-European peoples, to the Vikings, to the Saracens, to the Mongols, there have always been migrations and therefore cultural exchanges, which have promoted research and guaranteed the cultural evolution of thought and all that descends in cascade.

It will be necessary to revise all the theories that believe that they can govern the world with “unique thinking”, because it would be unnatural: individual originality is the greatest wealth humanity has and has enabled us to achieve our current goals.

During the Global Social Business Summit in Turin, Muhammad Yunus said: Human beings are proud of their local identity, as well as being part of a global community, but the word “globalisation” comes from another direction. It comes from political colonisation or economic colonisation. Uneven relationships should not be called globalisation. Globalisation should be based on friendship, sharing and solidarity. The economy that maximises profit cannot achieve this goal. Its purpose is to take advantage of the weaknesses of others, not to help overcome weaknesses. This is the business of social business. The future world should be a world of social business.

It is not conceivable a “unipolar” world, not even multipolar, but multilateral, where each community finds its own space and competes on the same level as the others to imagine and build the future.

A question to ask ourselves is the question whether “globalisation without rules” is against the culture in general and the cultures of the peoples.

Probably yes, “globalisation without rules” is against culture because it is the bearer and nourisher of a “unique thought”, which initially responded only to the economic principle of rationalisation of production phases with the uniformisation of behaviors; then this “unique thought” extended to every manifestation of life, also instrumentalising collective behaviors, which had only the need to determine a turning point in the direction of well-being.

Can we say that “globalisation without rules” is against civilisation? Probably yes, because in society without rules (laws) the force prevails over reason, while in society with rules (laws) the reason of civil coexistence prevails through respect for the values of freedom, justice, equality, solidarity in the social dimension.

Ultimately, it must be noted that in nature always force wins and to prevent this from happening, the element that believes it is weak or has its own natural defenses or adopts survival tactics that allow it to survive.

Man has lived this experience and in order to survive he thought to regulate coexistence with the laws, as the fruit of the intelligence of philosophers of all time, conquering the degree of modern civilisation.

In contemporary times it is not conceivable that we return to barbarism without the rules with the globalisation experienced in the last thirty years; instead, we must commit ourselves to a globalisation that has rules respected by all, where everyone legitimately has its role and its social, civil and economic space, without prevarications, for the growth of all.

## **RELIGIONS**

Incidentally, it must be said that religions have had and continue to have the objective of freeing man from the condition of finiteness of life, to which he is subjected for death; finiteness that could result in the assumption of the futility of every effort for life, preventing the process of evolution; even more serious would be the belief that any behavior can be adopted in order to live according to one’s own desires, regardless of the ethics of respecting

others; such a conviction would have resulted in the extinction of mankind from the very beginning.

Religions in the past have also accepted or even promoted behaviors based on the acquisition of “temporal power”, witnessing the history of two thousand years; but in the modern era such facts have been widely stigmatised by all, although they still remain the last epigons of a religion that denies the value of peace and civil coexistence and still practices war (the Taliban, the Shiites of Iran, the Salafis, etc.).

Even Eastern religious culture, which is more than transcendent is exquisitely intellectual and teaches the overcoming of the human dimension through the exaltation of thought as the fruit of the intellect, is predominantly a culture of peace, excluding some interpretations of Shintoism.

Imam Ahmad Muhammad Ahmad al Tayyib, 44th Grand Imam of Al-Azhar University Mosque, in many messages recalled the Value of Peace and invited all Islam to work towards it.

Likewise, Pope Francis, who met the Imam, calls daily for Peace, Forgiveness, Brotherhood, Love for Creation, of which “we are guardians” (Laudato Si) for the whole world, including Ukraine and Europe, Yemen, Central Africa, the Horn of Africa and all the territories where outbreaks of war persist.

## **FOOD AND MINERAL RESOURCES**

There is the problem of resources, which become increasingly insufficient, as indicated by the trend of Hearts Overshoot Day, which constantly anticipates the date of the resources consumed in the year, which for 2022 was set to 28 July.

In the face of resource consumption among eight billion people, 820 million people suffer from hunger in the world (UN 2021 report), while a third (1.3 billion tons) of food production becomes rubbish.

If 7.2 billion human beings are met with two-thirds of 2.6 billion tonnes of food resources, 1.3 billion food resources could feed another 3.6 billion people; the reality instead gives us 820 million people who suffer from hunger.

It does not seem to me that this aspect of globalisation can also be approved, unless it is noted that 1.3 billion of wasted food resources were first traded and therefore financially exchanged, while the 820 million people in need live in poverty and therefore have to suffer their fate, without solidarity being able to replace inhumanity.

Moreover, the case of Ukrainian wheat is eloquent; it should not even have been put forward, fortunately it resolved positively; the problem of fossil energy sources remains.

No one calls into question the membership of the energy sources of the States that hold it, making it legitimate trade, but it would be necessary to share internationally the social nature of a source and therefore define by consensus a particular regime, possibly also in economic terms, which excludes energy sources such as food from the general practice and rules for trade in other productions.

Probably these should be the first rules for globalisation of the third millennium, in which scenarios and perspectives are already open to be examined with extreme scrupulousness, because they relate to the future of humanity and of every single person.

A different question poses the so-called “rare earths”, which would be found in some limited territories of the planet and therefore are the subject of tension between states and in some African realities have triggered bloody wars.

I do not think that in the third millennium we can act as in the past for noble metals, triggering struggles and wars in states and between them to grab the greatest amount.

The evolution of the science we are experiencing will certainly be able to identify and indicate alternatives of materials, without the need to open up further conflicts; from this perspective, “rare land” can be exchanged like any other product, without prejudice to the rule of evaluation in the comparison of supply and demand.

Economic history has always taught us that the rarefaction of a product compared to a growing need, in the first phase increases the value of the product, but later, when the cost becomes too expensive, the market searches for alternatives and surrogates and, in some cases as in the current period, asks science to research new products, to improve production and marginalise exhausted sources (see coal as an energy source, or nuclear in Italy, or hydroelectric for the scarcity of precipitation, etc.).

## **SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND THE PROTECTION OF LIFE**

The pandemic has set in motion all the world scientific research to find an antidote to Sars-Co.Vi.D — 19-2, determining two positive aspects: the first is attributed to competition between States for those who should find the most effective antidote; the second is attributed to the comparison of the results achieved and, subsequently, to the exchange of information, albeit partial, on the drugs produced.

For the trials, different systems have been adopted, as well as for the attainment of “herd immunity”, which probably has not been reached anywhere in the world (in China it has been subjected to lockdown throughout the Shanghai area).

Scientific research, however, presents some fundamental criticalities that should be removed for the good of humanity, but that no one has done so far, because the precariousness of the world balance, not at all guaranteed and guaranteed by the globalisation achieved, is always incumbent and therefore states impose on some critical dossiers the state secret to their own protection.

One imagines and may even suspect that some research concerns the NBC industry for war purposes.

Although most of the products have been banned, in some war zones, depleted uranium bullets have been used and in the current war in Ukraine the use of phosphorus bombs has been reported.

The search for war use in the past has sometimes been driving the use in civil use of the found with so many advantages for progress, currently there is no need for a search for war uses, which could then be transformed to civilian use, because the destructive power that the product could have poses an enormous risk to humanity.

The nuclear weapons agreements were a milestone towards the disarmament of the world.

In recent decades, despite the control of nuclear weapons, the ideas of weapons of mass destruction have multiplied; for this reason it is absolutely essential that we continue to treat a disarmament not only nuclear, but of all weapons of mass destruction in the field of NBC, electronic, electromagnetic, psychotronic, geophysical, direct energy weapons, weapons controlled by AI, many of which aim to hack the control systems of the government systems of pointing and launch, causing “incidents”, even in anonymity, between States, directly or indirectly.

It will be necessary to acquire the awareness that the vulnerability of computer systems is proven and there are no inviolable security systems, even those with periodic updating, therefore, the weapons of digital generation risk being a serious problem for humanity, beyond the will of those who design, build and hold them.

Another critical issue of scientific research concerns ethics both on research itself and on experimentation; in fact, some experiments could encroach on eugenics, which must be banned worldwide, because contemporary Menghele are found in all parts of the world.

EFSA — the European Food Safety Authority — has its own protocol, but its scope is limited to the food sector, while it would be necessary to establish a global authority to monitor all the research to govern it with a general protocol and addenda for each sector of investigation.

European populations, through the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and the Dignity of the Human Being against the Application of Biology and Medicine: The Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine" — Oviedo 4 April 1997, signed by the countries of the Council of Europe and the European Union, have a legal basis, which protects them from the application of eugenic practices.

It would be important to promote a worldwide institutional confrontation, in order to prevent independent research centres or even state structures from engaging in research and application of the results contrary to the general rules, consensually approved, for the sole purpose of prosecuting illicit gains or the control of entire communities subjecting them.

The risks are very high and cannot be underestimated, to prevent humanity from finding itself victim to dynamics of genetic manipulation out of control.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

In the light of the succinct considerations made, all those worthy of deepening, one cannot fail to conclude that the "globalisation" achieved is completely inadequate to respond to the challenge of the twenty-first century and to overcome discrimination, marginalisation, colonisation, homologation, standardisation and robotisation of man.

Starting from the WTO and involving all international agencies, through the UN, it will be necessary to establish rules that apply to all States of the world (196 recognised and 11 not recognised or partially recognised), aiming at the well-being of populations, in every area

and in respect of the reference cultures, according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Life, dignity, nutrition, health, protection of the environment, freedom, justice, equality, education and training throughout life, are the fundamental principles that will have to govern the communities of the third millennium in order to achieve and guarantee a lasting peace for all human beings, where each can find its space and its dimension in a continuous confrontation, aimed at improving the conditions of well-being for all.

Rome, 30 November 2022

*On. Vitaliano Gemini*