

## Come+ON! 50 Years of the Club of Roma: Reflections and criticism.

Oleg N. Yanitsky

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Chief Researcher,  
The Federal Research and Development Sociological Center,  
Russian academy of sciences.

### ABSTRACT

The article presents the reflections and some critical remarks on the Report prepared for the Club of Rome's 50th Anniversary in 2018 (Von Weizsäcker and Wijkman, 2018). The Report is significant for many reasons; it shows the importance of long-term research project of a global scale; it confirms that such study has to be multidisciplinary one; it shows that any attempt to modernize capitalism in its recent form is useless; it points to the dangers of overpopulation of the planet and endless consumerism; Report demonstrates the importance of close interdependence between the planet evolution and reflections on it by the community of scientists and scholars; it sees our planet as diversified but an integrated wholeness; and it is a great merit of this project that being initially initiated by scientists from the global North, it gradually involved in its orbit the scientists and scholars from the global South. At the same time the Report 2018, to my mind, has some weak points. First, the Report has no all-embracing global model of the planet evolution. It means that there is no separate man and nature but there is a sociobiotechnical system (hereafter, the global SBT-system), and this wholeness is maintained by permanently switching system of networks. Second, this SBT-system is constructed under conditions of the Fourth technological revolution. Third, a sustainability of any system is maintained by its permanent development, it's a law of nature and society. Fourth, the interactions between a system's parts are not limited by exchange of information or resources, these interactions have a metabolic character. Fifth, the Report's authors speak only about the limits of growth but no word concerning all-embracing and all-penetrating risks. Sixth, the overpopulation is a danger but the phenomenon of the 'strength of the weakness' is much more serious. Seventh, today the club form for developing global ideas is insufficient. Global scientific community is needed in a permanent global research project backed by a movement of scientists and scholars aimed at reducing international tension and threat of global risks.

**Keywords:** capitalism, Enlightenment, globalization, interdisciplinary research, media, megacities, metabolism, movement, networks, report, sustainability, the SBT-system.

This report is significant for several reasons. First, it shows the importance of long-term collaboration of scientists, scholars and businessmen on a global scale. Second, it confirms that the study of modern globalization should be multidisciplinary and inter-sectorial one. Third, this Report allows us to trace the relationships between long-term and short-term dynamics of our overpopulated planet. Fourth, the Report demonstrates a very important tie between the planet evolution and reflections on it by the community of scientists and scholars. Fifth, in contrast to continued practice to study this evolution in the frames of 'man—nature' dichotomy, this Report following the ideas of its fathers (J. Forrester, D. Meadows and many others) sees our planet as diversified but an integrated wholeness. In other words it is a system. And by this fact it confirmed my concept of this wholeness as a sociobiotechnical system (Yanitsky, 2016). Sixth, this long-term study clearly shows that the limits of growth are still existed, in spite of any technological and geopolitical innovations. Seventh, it is a great

merit of this Report that being initially initiated by scientists from the global North, it gradually involved in its orbit the scientists and scholars from the global South. But to my mind, the most important feature of the Report 2018, it is an attempt to reconsider the philosophical and ethical foundations of capitalism as a driving force of future global development. I'd remind that in the run of a half-a-century 40 reports to the Club of Roma has been issued.

The Report is based on many theoretical developments and ideas as well as on many national and international sources of demographic, economic and social statistics. It will be too ambitious to embrace all of them in a short review. Therefore, I see my task to draw the attention of a reader to some key points of the Report 2018, accentuating the strong and weak sides of it.

The main themes of Report 2018 are named in the heading of it: 'The Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and the Destruction of the Planet.' As the Report's authors noted, the motto 'Come On!' means 'Come On, Join Us!' This optimistic call is rather indicative in the context of current global trend full of conflicts and hybrid wars of various scales. The following text is not a review. It's an attempt to reflect on the main ideas of the Report 2018 and to try to understand in which point of the global trend we are now.

### **What is about philosophical roots of current state of the world?**

In the Report preface the authors stated that 'The world is again in a critical situation. We see the need for a bold new beginning. This time, however, we believe it is particularly important to look at the philosophical roots of the current state of the world.' I fully agree that the world is in a critical situation. But why is to begin from the philosophical roots, and from which ones in particular? Why the authors reject all theoretical and empirical baggage that they are accumulated in the run of 50 years? Or the phrase 'the bold new beginning' means total negation of the works of the Club members and many other scientists and scholars across the world?

The authors listed the 'collection of opportunities that already exist: decentralized clean energy, sustainable jobs in every type of country, and massive decoupling of human well-being from the use of fossil fuels, basic materials and scarce minerals. Pragmatic policies including on (?) financial system are featured.' It seems to me that the authors of Report take a possible as already existing. What has been achieved in a particular place, community or even in the nation-state doesn't necessarily mean that it has been achieved everywhere! For example, 'jobs in every type of country' it is not a reality but a dream. 'Complementarity, balance and the wisdom of synergies between contrasts should be milestones on the way to the new Enlightenment.' It seems that the Report authors are not satisfied with the western (pragmatic-oriented) philosophy and looked for Eastern philosophical systems as a ring-buoy. If we look at rapidly growing China, we'll see quite another political philosophy with strict programming as its core.

It's surprising that the Report's authors didn't listed the collection of risks and threats that are obvious as well: continuing gap between the North and the South, millions of homeless, unemployment, permanent geopolitical conflicts and local wars, natural and man-made catastrophes, etc. More than that, the Report's authors didn't analyze structural-functional changes in global SBT-system generated by its network character.

To my mind, the core of modern world philosophy is a conflict and struggle. Our world is in the state of transition but nobody knows in what direction it will move and what will be the cost consequences of it. Analyzing current global geopolitical practice one can see that all

agreements and resolutions are based on a force, economic, political or military ones. Local conflicts are here and there are transforming into long-term political struggle and wars. The more our planet will be overpopulated, the more consumerism will spread over the world, and the more our planet will be deteriorated the stronger will be a struggle for living areas and safe spaces. Sometimes I think that the essence of modern global philosophy is the geopolitics.

### **Interdisciplinary and metabolic approaches: Where they are?**

As the biologist and specialist in system analysis B. Commoner pointed out, all interconnected with all, and all is going somewhere. This principle as well as the works of J. Forrester (1969, 1971) directly point at the necessity of the interdisciplinary and metabolic approaches in the analysis of global future. All modern disciplines practice these approaches in one way or another. The very existence of the biosphere means that its turnover presupposes various metabolic transformations. Nevertheless, there is no these approaches in the Report and even in its Index! The mimicry method is well but it requires next step: how these qualitatively different processes and substances are changing each other. Their 'interactions' is the first phase only. The essence of the problem is how and in which way these qualitatively different processes and substances transform each other. The tempo-rhythms of global transformation are another important indicator of it. Any economic process or technical construction is not able to simply mimicry natural processes, these processes and constructions have to be qualitatively transformed in accordance with the regularities of natural ecosystems. The coming of the 'Internet of things' is impossible without long and painful process of technical interpretation of regularities of functioning of the above ecosystems. It is not accidental that the two public committees of the UNESCO have decided to merge two years ago.

But it is not all. The more our world is becoming artificially constructed the more the wastes that it produces are accumulated in all spheres of the biosphere (cosmic space, air, water, soil and in the earth mantle) which are not absorbed by natural ecosystems. Only to bury them an energy and place are needed. It means that scientists and constructors thinking about the mimicry have to return to the very beginning of any production process and to decide how to minimize a poisoning of the earth by the wastes. In Russia the year 2017 had been announced as the 'Year of Ecology.' And the first task had been to remove numerous waste dumps. But as it appears it is not an easy task because there was no strict politics of separate waste collection by households and enterprises. This case points out that any 'mimicry', if any, has to embrace all production process from the very beginning to its end.

Finally, there is a *social metabolism* as such. Some sociologists tend to simplify a role of social interactions reducing them to exchange by messages and resources via social networks or see these interactions a mean of building of individual's career. But it is oversimplification. In essence, social metabolism is a mighty instrument of construction of a more just and ecologically-oriented society. After all, social metabolism (in the widest sense of the word) governs many forms of man-nature transformation processes.

### **There are no signs of sustainable development**

Modern global world is in crisis and this crisis not a cyclical but growing, the authors of the Report 2018 are stated. The authors of the Report cited the Report of their colleagues, the winners of the Blue Planet Prize (2012) who said that 'the human ability to do vastly outstripped the ability to understand. As a result, civilization is faced with a perfect storm of problems, driven by the overpopulation, overconsumption by the rich, by the use of environmentally malign technologies and gross inequalities, ...and a global society is infected by the irrational belief that physical economy can grow forever.'

These points are rather important for several reasons. First, one shouldn't understand the first thesis concerning the 'outstripping' literally. It's going on about the basic thesis of Marxist theory of capital accumulation which excludes any form of its 'optimization' from the global viewpoint. Such accumulation is impossible without new resources including intellectual ones. Second, the population growth is a normal biological reaction on worsening living conditions. Look at China where an economic growth is accompanied with the decrees aimed at reducing of population growth. Third, the overconsumption is another instrument of extra accumulation of a capital. Fourth, the reverse side of the same coin is an accumulation of solid wastes in all sphered (in cosmic space, air, water, soil, etc.) which in turn poisons all forms of living environment. Fifth and the most important, the unlimited growth of 'physical economy' (in the widest sense of the term) means the elimination of human culture or its transformation into a service mechanism for the growth of such economy (any form of advertisement).

The global crisis is not cyclical but growing, and its symptoms are found everywhere, in the degrading, developing and developed countries. 'The response of the governments has been concentrated, at worst, on managing their own political image, and at best to treat the symptoms of the crisis, not the causes.' The world political class is strongly influenced by the investors and by private economic companies. Consequently, the current right-wing populism depends on the long-term decline of global developed middle-class. The Report's authors stress the emergence of multidimensional character of poverty in the modern world. Besides, the 'financialization' of economy is a cause of social inequality. In the European Union the strongest trigger for populism has been a mass migrants' influx from the Near East and the Northern Africa. In turn, the refugee crisis triggered the identity crisis in the EU. The authors of the Report 2018 stress that these and other risks put aside such basic principles of the EU establishment as unity, peace, the rule of law, environmental and cultural diversity protection, etc.

I agree with the Report 2018 statement that consistent decay of such parameters of democracy as individual's freedom of opinion and press, free and fair elections, freedom of assembly and separation of powers are more and more restricted. But some questions arise. First, may be the existing social order doesn't fit to very mobile and diversifies world? Second, maybe there is no unified social order at all? On the other hand, may be the abovementioned features of democracy are not unified? And the Report 2018 authors simply impose the western model of democracy on the whole world? Third, in any case the people should struggle for the establishment and maintenance of the democracy model rooted in the history of their country. Fourth, in the run of decade global social order permanently oscillates from unity to diversity, from global to local and vice versa. But in any case, it seems a bit strange that criticizing right-wing populism the authors of the Report 2018 forgot such important feature of democracy as the grassroots, social, human rights and environmental movements. As it had been shown many years ago the emergence of virtual world makes these forms of democratic activity even stronger. If the ruling elite meet their demands a society has become more sustainable.

### **Who is guilty?**

The authors of the Report 2018 state that 'real bang for the buck is to change the habits of the reach, not the poor...This means that the developing countries are right in saying that the biggest burden of changing course should be on affluent nations.'

It's a wrong position, to my mind. If our world is true global it means that all its actors are involved, be it global stake holders, nation-states or civil organizations, and therefore they are 'guilty' in the critical state of our planet. One may name endless number of actors and reasons and in the final analysis one will lapse into perpetual (bad) infinity. The main difficulty of any

system analysis is the interdependence of all with all. It's more than right in modern conditions in which its distinguishing feature is the strength of a weakness. The authors of the Report see our world as more or less stable and still developing evolutionary. Thus, the authors neglect the works of their European and the US colleagues who argue that the modern world is highly risky, or more exactly it is capable to produce all-embracing and all-penetrating risk at any moment (Beck, 1999, 2007). To my mind, all are guilty because they are all short-term oriented. Even those who are poor and uneducated must feel that their living environment rapidly transforming into a desert. In this respect the mass migrants' flow from the Middle East and the North Africa is a painful lesson for all that the environment is needed in defense in every moment. In other words, *living environment is a form of capital* which should be permanently protected and reproduced.

### **To redesign everything**

The authors of the Report 2018 offer the principles of 'Natural Capitalism'. The first one is seems clear: to use all resources more productively. The second one is to redesign how we deliver energy. This principle is based on the biomimicry and circular economy approaches. The third principle is to manage all social institutions to be regenerative of human and natural capital. It has been developed by J. Fullerton in his paper the Regenerative Capitalism (Fullerton, 2012) in which he laid down a set of principles that nature uses to build stable, healthy, and sustainable systems throughout the world:

1. *Right relationships*: Holding the continuation of life sacred and recognizing that human economy is embedded in human culture, which is itself embedded in the Biosphere;
2. *Innovative, adaptive and responsive*: Drawing on innate ability of human beings to innovate and 'create anew' across all sectors of society;
3. *Views wealth holistically*: True wealth is defined in terms of the well-being of the 'whole', achieved through the harmonization of the multiple forms of capital;
4. *Empowered participation*: Financial wealth is equitably (although not necessarily) distributed in the context of an expanded view of true wealth;
5. *Robust circulating flow*: A continuous striving for minimizing energy, material and resource throughput at all phases of production cycle, reusing, remanufacturing and recycling materials;
6. *'Edge Effect' abundance*: Creative collaborations increase the possibility of value-adding wealth creating through relationship, exchanges and resiliency;
7. *Seeks balance*: Balances resilience, the long run ability to learn and grow stronger from shocks, which, while more dynamic, can create more brittle concentrations of power;
8. *Honours community and place*: Operating to nurture stable communities and regions, both real and virtual, in a connected mosaic of place-centered economies.

The above points are needed in some comments. First, it is well-known that an economy is embedded in culture and in the biosphere. But they are not embedded into each other but represent the inseparable whole, named the global SBT-system. The second, who will be a designer? Recently the designer is a world market and its leading force, a 'short-seeing capitalism', using the main idea of the Report 2018. Is it will be replaced by global government or by 'creative collaborations' of competing market stakeholders? Anyhow, the term the 'designer' returns us to the question of global ruler. Third, who said that human beings are permanently creating something new? They are restructuring, renewing and built-in new territories and simultaneously are destroying natural ecosystems. Then, what about how to maintain sustainable world that is full of conflicts, clashes and wars? Fourth, I agree that we should view a wealth holistically. But who will 'harmonize' the multiple forms of capital? Is it again unknown global designer? Fifth, the same question: who will be a distributor of expanded 'true wealth'? Besides, the very amount of 'true wealth' strongly depends on global,

national and local conditions. Sixth, the idea of equitable distribution of financial capital is absolutely unrealistic. Seventh, the very idea of circular economy seems me very attractive but any kind of circular economy needs additional energy and resources. The need of new resources forces global stakeholders to compete each other. As a result, the knots of international conflicts have emerged. Eighth, let's be the realists: recently a 'creative collaborations' are possible within corporations and other closed organizations only. In a foreseeable future 'creative collaborations' is no more than a kind of utopian thinking because the struggle for new resources will be more and more cruel. Ninth, the 'seeks balance' thesis is not clear. In any case any balance presupposes struggle for it, which in turn, needs new energy and resources input. And how this struggle leads to 'more brittle concentration of power' is unclear. Tenth, the term 'honour(s)' has a lot of meanings. If it's going on about the protection of cultural diversity of localities, I fully agree. Then, recently the term 'region' is uncertain and can embrace territory of several nation-states (see, for example, the China's New Silky Road project or of already existed system of the EU gas supply from Russia). Eleventh, in the Report in question there is no one word about the Fourth industrial Revolution and its information-communication networks as structural-functional basement (Global Risk Report, 2016; Schwab, 2017). Why? Is the prospect of transformation of our world from the 'Internet of people' into the 'Internet of things' real? If the second statement do real the Gandhi's idea about humanization of technologies become useless. This statement relates to any ideas of humanization of globalization process.

### **Developmental Alternatives**

The authors of the Report 2018 said 'that in line of the philosophy of Gandhi, technologies have to be more human in scale, less waste-full in terms of resources, and directly responsive to the basic needs of the people doing them....The possibility for such sustainable development is undermined if the economic and social disparities in a society are large.' Therefore, 'Increasing social equity as well as eradicating poverty thus becomes a primary instrument for environmental conservation.'

It is rather important that in contrast to the previous section of the Report 2018, the Developmental Alternative have its own think tank and R&D division, as the authors reported. These divisions develop specific technological designs and instruments that meet both criteria of environmental soundness and relevance to poverty eradication (machines and tools for cooking, electricity production, green affordable construction materials, weaving, handmade recycled paper, etc.). It should be mentioned that in Russia with its giant territory such technological designs and tools are already produced by the population in remote provinces. Indian experience in the development of small credit organizations is very useful as well. It is significant that Developmental Alternatives has become one of the first major international headquarters NGOs in India. Its core idea is the 'redefinition of the economy as a *subsystem* of a society and nature.' This Alternative stresses a necessity to India to develop its own path towards sustainability.

Nevertheless, a set of questions related to the Developmental Alternative idea has emerged. First, is how to diminish disparities in global society at large? Once again we encounter with the problem of humanization of capitalism and of the transnationals as its major driving force. Second, this very promising idea has to be applied to the diversity of climate, economic, social and other conditions in situ. For example, in Russian Tundra there are no resources to produce handmade recycled paper. In that climatic zone a reindeer is a main source of food and building material. Third, the development of an Alternative Society questioned the existing mode of production. What is rational in modern one is not necessarily will be rational or even fit at all to alternative one which is often a regeneration of traditional modes of production and

life. Besides, it's not clear how the modern and alternative mode of productions will co-exist peacefully? To my mind, there is a danger that modern information-communication systems simply destroyed the alternative settlements and their mode of existence. Fourth, it is surprising that the authors missed such unavoidable actor as mass-media. The media is not only a mean of communication but a mighty force of shaping the present and the future. Fifth in particular, a possibility to live in two worlds, a material and virtual, has to be carefully studied. Finally, the development of the spots (areas, zones) of alternative mode of production means the conservation their traditional way of life. That is why I see this idea as a palliative and not as radical turn to sustainable future. In some respects this idea reminds me the cities of tomorrow designed by E. Howard. In modern world a local is inseparable from global structures and processes.

### **Urbanization: How to manage it?**

'Cities our primary habitat, but urbanization in its present form is causing a rapidly increasing of human ecological impacts,' the Report 2018 stated. To my mind, it's a traditional (and outdated) worldview separating natural and built environment. As it has been shown before, recently natural and built environment are inseparable because all end-products of industrialization and urbanization directly or indirectly affect the nature. Recently there are no separate natural and built (technical) milieus, we are now dealing with very complex whole which I've called *the global SBT-system* (Yanitsky, 2016). It's the utopia to transform hundreds megacities of the world into endless number of small towns with little gardens as E. Howard offered (Howard, 1902). Humanity chooses more rational way out: to build vast periphery, i.e. to create a suburban areas, and simultaneously to reconstruct the old cities in two ways. The former is to rehabilitate them with the help of their own residents, grassroots and charity organizations, while the latter is to luxurious estates for the reach within megacities, with artificial climate and energetically autonomous and safe made by means of modern technologies. It's a reality but not a full story. First, urbanization is tended to transform into a global process by means of informational, resource, human and other networks. Second, humanity is now living in two social spaces, material and virtual. That is urbanization is double-level process in its essence. Third and the most important, current urbanization is the most obvious form of the global SBT-system. In other words, modern megacities and their suburbs are one of the forms of global SBT-system existence.

### **On ecological enlightenment**

The Report 2018 is rightly draws our attention to a growing gap between social reality and the state of affairs in science and education. Fragmentation of both is continued, and it is the evidence that the fragmentation of education and knowledge production is profitable to the capital accumulation.

Let me to refer to one of early works of U. Beck. He saw the ecological enlightenment first of all as a political process. 'The key question is how can a policy of ecological self-limitation...gain power and enforceability?' Beck underscored the notion of a conflict. At 'the stake in the old industrial conflict of labor against capital had been positives: profits, prosperity, consumer goods.' In the new ecological conflicts at stake are 'negatives: losses, devastation, threats' (Beck, 1995: 3). 'Like "social question" in the nineteenth century, the "ecological question" today must be related to social that is, to the institutional opportunities for action that fit the context in which the question arises' (Beck, 1995: 7).

Beck concluded that 'the ecological issue, considered politically and sociologically, focuses at heart on a systematic, legalized violation of fundamental civil rights – the citizen's right to life and freedom,' and to the right to resist, insisted Beck referring to Thomas Hobbs (Beck, 1995:

8). Such conflicts in turn produce an ecological reflection on overall state of the matters, initially locally, then nationally and in the end globally. I agree with Beck that the struggle for ecological safety and justice is one of the important mechanisms of ecological enlightenment. No one idea, social norm or 'calculated safety' could be realized without mass enlightenment by means of mass struggle.

Finally, the evolution of the Enlightenment is rather indicative. Initially it had been Homo Faber, then Homo Ludens, and now is Homo Gamer. Recently, the Enlightenment left classrooms and university labs and lecture-rooms and shifted into virtual space. I define the Homo Gamer as a person alienated from social and political reality and deeply involved in the space of virtual events and games. Of course, I don't reject the use of the game as an instrument of modelling of permanently changing reality. But the emergence of game industry means that teenagers are fully subjected to the rules of behavior constructed somewhere outside the gamer's consciousness. In more general terms, a media capitalist shapes and directs the gamer's behavior by two keys only, by redirection and reprogramming of information flows (Arsenault and Castells, 2008). These so called 'button children' are not self-contained, capable to produce innovation or to participate in environmental movements. Here is only one example from recent Russian history of environmental movement. The most active participants of it had been recruited from two socially polarized strata. One group came from the university's students and their academic tutors. And another group had been composed from young people from the remote province of the country. It's rather indicative that both are now involved in the struggle for environmental protection on the sub-continental level. I mean their involvement in the New Silky Road mega-project and its environmental consequences.

### CONCLUSION

The above analysis leads us to a more general conclusion: any sustainability may be reached by permanent developments and transformations only. These developments cannot be partial (one-dimensional) but only complex, i.e. multidisciplinary and simultaneously only. The 'courageous individuals or companies or states' are important but insufficient. Recently we, civil society members should not only to think but to act globally. And such alliance of actors has to be composed from various civil activists including scientists and businessmen-turned-activists. The Gamson's scheme (1990) in which dominating power structures which either adapt civil initiatives proposals to their own needs or negate them is not sufficient. We are needed not only the dialogue in the form of a narrative between adversaries but the dialogue resulted in a joint activity for global wellbeing.

The authors of the Report 2018 concluded: One condition should be respected everywhere: 'Leaving the trajectory of unsustainable growth.' They address this message, first of all to the poorest who not only permanently 'mining' the environment but much more than others depend on climate and other local conditions. But as for me, a fragile stability of the global SBT-system is first of all violated by the transnationals that are interested in geopolitical domination and in new resources only. In the run of his long history the capital had never been interested in nature protection including those areas which are crucial for the maintenance of the earth climate and the biosphere (first of all the rainforests). Therefore, not the poorest but the richest, i.e. the owners of transnationals are responsible for ongoing global warming.

It seems unavoidable, the Report 2018 continued, that 'what is urgently required is a development of a new kind of human goals and, if possible, a new kind of social Enlightenment. One of the main characteristics of that enlightenment is *balance*. The goal is a balanced world, with a realistic harmony between the current list of economic and ecological sustainable development goals.' Congratulations! The authors began from the statement that our world is



needed in new philosophy which is a basement of any system of values, and concluded the Report with the same appeal without any description what kind of philosophy the world is needed. Only on this basement sociologists and social psychologists could develop a model of such values which is necessarily needed an empirical testing. Then it must be adapted to a diversity of global cultures, after then this diversified model should be structured congruently with global dynamics, and so on and so forth. If not, it is simply wishful thinking.

The authors of Report 2018 appealed: 'We invite engineers, inventors, practitioners and financial investors to work on decoupling economic success and human satisfaction from the consumption of natural resources.' It's strange that they don't invite philosophers, a wide range of scientists and scholars including sociologists as well as civil activists. Does it mean that they trust to the engineers, inventors, practitioners and financial investors only? And they are not needed in multidisciplinary specialists and experienced civil activists? Does it mean that 'New Enlightenment', as it had been stated at the Report beginning, will be created without participation of philosophers and other scholars? What is about a 'critical situation' and a 'bold new beginning'? And what is about the Pope Francis's initiative to overcome a deepening crisis of goals? Is it has been only a slogan without any explanations and developments? Unfortunately, I couldn't find more or less developed idea related to the 'New Enlightenment.' But in any case, such Enlightenment is not a classroom work but a combination of permanent learning and struggle for environmental protection and rehabilitation.

There are many other ideas or statements without any further substantiation in the Report. For example, 'The human dominated world can still have a prosperous future for all.' First, our world is no more human dominated, or the authors totally negate global warming? Second, is prosperous future real when the world is balancing on the edge of nuclear or of any other hybrid war? Third, the 'prosperous future for all' when in the following text the authors of the Report signify such urgent global issues as a poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, refugees' and migrants' flows, and so on and so forth. How these two adversarial processes interrelated?

### **CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Global capitalism is not only short-sighted and one-dimensional. Marx based his theory of capital accumulation mainly on the experience of the most developed European countries of the midst of XIX century. It is not accidental that he didn't analyze so-called Asian mode of production. But today there is no unified 'Asian mode of production', look at China, India, Pakistan, Russia and many other Asian countries. Therefore, the starting point of analysis of global capitalism must be a diversity of its phases and forms. Unfortunately, I don't know any researchers and research projects aimed at building a global model of modern diversified capitalism. But it's only a half the issue in question. The other side of it is a conjunction of forms of market and capitalist accumulation with diversity of cultural forms and ideologies. Therefore, we should analyze a bunch of a particular model of capitalist production and ideology, sometimes in a very surprising form like one can see in China, Russia or Vietnam.

But again it's not the end of the story. There are two interrelated sides of modern capitalism evolution. The former is a negation of its own history. Individuals, groups, organizations and nation-states have and maintain their history, and capitalism is not, but why? The reverse side of any dynamic of it is a certain static form, that is, an ideology and culture. The latter is a struggle of the powers with inside and outside opponents, adherents of a particular form of ideology, as one can see looking at China, the EU or in the US. It seems to me that the bunch between a particular history, ideology and concrete form of capitalist accumulation should be at the center of analysis of recent stage of globalization. It seems to me as well, that the

unifying trend of capitalism transnationalization has already encounters the opposite movement towards national autonomy and protection of cultural specificity. What the authors of Report offer as a medicine against short-term profit maximization of world capitalism remains still unclear.

More than that, I suggest a hypothesis that a kind of new global reason is already shaping beyond the confines of existing international social order. An alternative is rather simple: either to find a certain consensus between competing powers or to annihilate each other. But *the modern capitalism is one-dimensional*, that is, still all-restructuring and all-destroying. More than that, the bunch of modern capitalism and media as a fourth power has far-reaching consequences for humans. It is media that mobilizes the people for endless consumption growth and demobilize their reflective potential and critical capacities. Therefore, the primary task of scientific community is to assist in the developing of antidote for these destructive processes. It's an urgent task of global scientific community members and their backers irrespectively of their personal worldviews.

Any ideas of sustainability, mimicry or of a circular economy have to be based on a solid base of interdisciplinary and metabolic approaches which, in turn, are needed in a development of the instruments of interdisciplinary communication including the languages and techniques of inter-disciplinary transition and monitoring, etc.

Therefore, we are now needed not only in the club for discussions on global affairs. Two other scientific-and-public instruments are of a paramount importance. The former is a long-term interdisciplinary project embracing a whole world, and the latter is the international movement of public-oriented scientists and scholars. The Pugwash movement is a best example of it, and it must be revitalized in a new, interdisciplinary form. Let me remind that in July 9, 1955 Lord D. Russel announced the Russel-Einstein Manifesto which stated that we have to learn to think in a new way (Butcher, 2005). This appeal is still acute.

And now is the final remark. Being involved in some international research projects, I realize how difficult to reconcile the ideas and suggestions of the Report 2018 participants. Nevertheless, the world is entering into new phase of its development, i.e. in the Fourth Industrial Revolution. It seems to me that a transition to it has to be the red line throughout the total text of this kind.

### FUNDING

This article is written with the support of the Russian Fundamental Research Fund under grant 'Russian megacities in the context of new Social and Environmental Challenges: Building Complex Interdisciplinary Model of an Assessment of 'Green' cities and Strategies for their Development in Russia', project no 17-78-20106.

### References

- Arsenault A. and Castells M. (2008). Switching Power: Rupert Murdoch and the Global Business of Media Politics. *International Sociology* 23(4): 488-513.
- Beck U (1995). *Ecological Enlightenment. Essays on the Politics of the Risk Society*. New Jersey: Humanities Press. 159 pp.
- Beck U. (1999). *World Risk Society*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Beck U. (2007). *Cosmopolitan Version*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Butcher S.I. (2005). The Origins of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto. Available at: [http://pugwashconferences.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/2005\\_history\\_origins\\_of\\_manifesto3.pdf](http://pugwashconferences.files.wordpress.com/2014/02/2005_history_origins_of_manifesto3.pdf)

De Donk W., B. Loader, P. Nixon, D. Rucht., eds. (2004). *Cyberprotest. New Media, Citizens and Social Movements*. London: Routledge.

Forrester J.W. (1969). *Urban Dynamics*. London: The M.I.T. Press.

Forrester J.W. (1971). *World Dynamics*. Cambridge: Wright-Allen Press.

Fullerton J. (2015). Regenerative Capitalism, Capital Institute. Available at: <http://capitalinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/2015-Regenerative-Capitalism-4-20-15-final.pdf>

Gamson W. (1990). *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

The Global Risks Report (2016). Geneva: World Economic Forum. Available at: [www.weforum.org/risks](http://www.weforum.org/risks)

Howard E. (1902). *The Garden Cities of Tomorrow*. London.

Schwab K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Von Weizsäcker E.U. and Wijkman A. (2018). *Come On! Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and the Destruction of the Planet*. New York: Springer. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-7419-1

Yanitsky O. (2016). Sotsiobiotechnical systems: A new Approach to Man-Nature Interactions, in: On Globalization and its Environmental Consequences. The Yanitsky Reader II Available at: [http://www.isras.ru/index.php?page\\_id=1198&id=4603](http://www.isras.ru/index.php?page_id=1198&id=4603) pp. 123-135.