



Podliesna V.G., Doctor Habil. in Economics, Associate Professor, Leading Researcher at the Department of Economic Theory, SO “Institute for Economics and Forecasting of the NAS of Ukraine”, 26, Panasa Myrnoho Str., Kyiv, 01011, Ukraine, email: podlesnw2019@gmail.com, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8435-1013>

SUSTAINABLE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF MILITARY-ECONOMIC CYCLICALITY

This paper is devoted to the prospects for sustainable socio-economic development in the context of military-economic cyclicalities, first – in the context of the deployment of crisis-militaristic phases of global cycles. Logical and historical methods, dialectical ascent from the abstract to the concrete, including general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction applied in author’s research. Author substantiated that crisis-militaristic phases are the culminating ones in the development of military-economic cycles; their completion determines the nature of further development of the geopolitical system. In the process of crisis-militaristic phases, the aggravated inter-class, inter-country, inter-civilizational contradictions are partially resolved. After their end, there comes a period of relative stability in the development of the world-system, which is ensured by the fact that the winning social organism in the another large-scale war – a country or a military-political alliance of countries – temporarily establishes institutional practices of societal life at the local and global levels for other actors of the world-system. Periods of relative stability in the cyclical development of the world-system are the time of formation and accumulation of internal contradictions, which creates grounds for the deployment of crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles in the form of "global" wars that stop or slow down those constructive societal processes that bring sustainable socio-economic development closer. The article presents an original formulation of the problem of sustainability of socio-economic development in the conditions of military-economic cycles deployment. The key cycle-forming role of crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles and their impact on the sustainability of the world-system development were identified: it is cyclically disrupted by economic crises and wars, after the completion of which the global geopolitical system is reformatted, new institutional practices of international relations, economic activity, cultural and ideological guidelines are established for a long-term period, which ensures relatively sustainable development.

Keywords: military-economic cycles, crisis-militaristic phases, sustainable development, geopolitical contradictions, instability, military Keynesianism, demilitarization.

Подлесна В.Г., д-р екон. наук, доц., провідний науковий співробітник відділу економічної теорії, ДУ “Інститут економіки та прогнозування НАН України”, вул. Панаса Мирного, 26, Київ, 01011, Україна, email: podlesnw2019@gmail.com, ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8435-1013>

СТАЛІЙ СОЦІАЛЬНО-ЕКОНОМІЧНИЙ РОЗВИТОК В КОНТЕКСТІ ВОЄННО-ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ ЦИКЛІЧНОСТІ

Стаття присвячена дослідженню перспектив сталого соціально-економічного розвитку в контексті воєнно-економічної циклічності, насамперед, розгортання кризово-мілітаристичних фаз глобальних циклів. У статті застосовано поєднання історичного та логічного, діалектичне сходження від абстрактного до конкретного, що включає загальнонаукові

методи аналізу і синтезу, індукції та дедукції. За результатами дослідження, у розгортанні воєнно-економічних циклів кризово-мілітаристичні фази є кульмінаційними, їхнє завершення визначає характер подальшого розвитку геополітичної системи. У процесі кризово-мілітаристичних фаз частково вирішуються загострені міжкласові, міждержавні, міжцивілізаційні протиріччя; після їх закінчення настає період відносної стабільності у розвитку світ-системи, який забезпечується тим, що суспільний організм (країна або воєнно-політичний союз країн) – переможець у черговій широкомасштабній війні на певний час встановлює інституційні практики суспільного життя на локальному та глобальному рівнях для всіх інших акторів світової системи. Періоди відносної стабільності в циклічному розвитку світ-системи – це час формування та накопичення внутрішніх протиріч, що створює підґрунтя для розгортання кризово-мілітаристичних фаз воєнно-економічних циклів у формі “глобальних” воєн, які припиняють або гальмують ті конструктивні суспільні процеси, що наближають сталий соціально-економічний розвиток. Представлено оригінальну постановку проблеми сталості соціально-економічного розвитку в умовах розгортання воєнно-економічних циклів. Визначено головну циклоутворюючу роль кризово-мілітаристичних фаз воєнно-економічних циклів та їхній вплив на стійкість розвитку світ-системи: вона циклічно порушується економічними кризами та війнами, після завершення яких глобальна геополітична система переформатується, на тривалий період встановлюються нові інституційні практики міжнародних відносин, економічної діяльності та культурно-ідеологічні орієнтири, що забезпечує відносно сталий розвиток.

Ключові слова: воєнно-економічні цикли, кризово-мілітаристичні фази, сталий розвиток, геополітичні протиріччя, нестабільність, воєнне кейнсіанство, демілітаризація.

Socio-economic cycles are a form of self-development of socio-economic systems, in the course of which periodically arise, aggravate and are resolved the contradictions of reproductive dynamics, expressed in differences in the pace of technical and technological, institutional and socio-economic changes. For a process to be recognized as cyclical, a necessary condition is the renewal of certain phases of the system's self-development, while the number of phases and the form of their deployment may vary for different cycles. The main current forms of socio-economic cycles in the capitalist world-system are global in nature and coordinated with Kondratieff cycles, first. These are long cycles of world politics, cycles of hegemony, in the process of which the leading actors of geopolitics compete for the status of a world leader – a hegemon – capable of determining the development guidelines, including values, for the rest of the world.

The most important phase of these cycles is the crisis-militaristic phase, which unfolds in the form of a long-term large-scale military-political conflict between the leading actors of geopolitics, which involves other countries within the circle of their geopolitical interests. All historical forms of socio-economic cycles, the most important and cycle-forming phase of which is proto-global and global wars, should be classified as military-economic cycles.

During large-scale wars in historical retrospect, deep contradictions of social development were resolved, but the periods of intensification of military actions themselves are a time of turbulence and slowdown of those constructive social processes that bring sustainable socio-economic development closer. The development of crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles is a period of deviation from the guidelines of sustainable development in conditions of strong geopolitical instability, but it is at this time that economic, technical and technological, political and institutional foundations are created

for overcoming the crisis of the geopolitical system and its return to the trajectory of sustainable development.

In the course of cyclical societal development, the scale of societal production and population increased, and, accordingly, the scale of ecologically destructive impact on the environment, including during large-scale wars. Today, the nuclear weapons accumulated by nuclear powers pose a threat not only to the development but also to the existence of human civilization as a whole. The International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament assesses nuclear weapons as capable of completely destroying life on the planet, and their current arsenals as capable of doing so many times over. The addition of new members to the nuclear club of states, as well as growing systemic vulnerabilities, calls into question the possibility of avoiding the exchange of nuclear strikes indefinitely [1]. In such circumstances, especially given the fact that the development of the world-system is entering a crisis-militaristic stage, the concept of sustainable development, defined as development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability to meet the needs of future generations, is becoming more relevant. Sustainable development involves achieving three main goals: economic and social progress and environmental protection [2].

Today, the official goals of the sustainable development concept are 17 ones: no poverty, zero hunger, good health and well-being, quality education, gender equality, clean water and sanitation, affordable and clean energy, decent work and economic growth, industry, innovation and infrastructure, reduced inequalities, sustainable cities and communities, responsible consumption and production, climate action, life below water, life on land, peace, justice and strong institutions, and partnerships for the goals [3]. They are adopted by all UN member states in 2015 as part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which formulates a 15-year plan to achieve them.

In the next 30 years, the practical implementation of the concept of sustainable development will be hampered by the general destabilization of the capitalist world-system, due to the fact that in the 2020s – 2050s its cyclical development will experience a sharp increase in the amplitude of fluctuations. It is during this period that the upward wave of the 6th Kondratieff cycle, the material expansion phase of the new systemic cycle of capital accumulation, the "macro-decision" phase of the modern long cycle of world politics, and the "thirty-year war" phase of the hegemony cycle will unfold. As a result of unfolding such phases in historical retrospect, revolutionary transformations of the capitalist world-system took place, which made it possible to reach the level of socio-economic and institutional development at which the concept of sustainable development was formed and its practical implementation began.

Building an egalitarian society is the most consistent with the concept of sustainable development, but it is the least likely. The most likely scenarios for further civilizational development after the end of the crisis-militaristic phases of the most relevant forms of modern global military-economic cycles are: 1) overcoming the crisis of global capitalism and its further development in a new form based on the fourth industrial revolution and economic networking; 2) transition from capitalism to global neo-feudalism; 3) the formation of a hybrid form of global society consisting of elements of capitalism,

totalitarianism and feudalism. In the course of the crisis-militaristic stage of the cyclical development of the world-system (i.e., the waging of a thirty-year world war) in the 2020s – 2050s, the further form of its development will be determined, and thus the prospects for achieving the goals of sustainable development.

The study of the prospects for implementing the concept of sustainable development in conditions of military-economic cyclicity is carried out in this article through the prism of theories of the cyclical nature of global political-economic and military-economic processes. This study is based on the theory of long cycles of world politics G. Modelski and W. Thompson [4; 5]. The increasing role of the militarization of the economy and the economic policy of Keynesianism in the socio-economic development of the modern capitalist world-system is justified based on publications G. Arrighi [6; 7], P. Custers [8], J. Toporowski¹, S. Chary and N. Singh [9]. The study of the role of crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles in the cyclical dynamics of the world-system, and, consequently, in changing conditions for the realization of sustainable development goals, is based on the above-mentioned theory of long cycles of world politics by G. Modelski and W. Thompson [4; 5] and the world-system analysis by I. Wallerstein [10]. The impact of the US institutional cycles on the global military-economic cyclicity is presented in the article based on the concept developed by G. Friedman [11]. Nuclear threats to sustainable development and eco-destructive consequences of militarization (current and possible) are characterized on the basis of the publications of P. Hille², International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament (ICNND) [1], Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) [12], United Nations (UN)³ [3].

The methodological basis of the study consists mainly of general scientific methods. To study the impact of military-economic cyclicity on the sustainability of socio-economic development, firstly, logical and historical methods were used, as well as a dialectical ascent from the abstract to the concrete, including general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis, induction and deduction. Problem-chronological and statistical methods were also applied.

The **purpose of this paper** is to study the prospects for sustainable socio-economic development in the context of military-economic cyclicity, primarily in the context of the unfolding of crisis-militaristic phases of global cycles, which is actualized today by the aggravation of geopolitical contradictions, plunging the world-system into deep instability.

The cyclical nature of capitalist reproduction, the rhythm of which is determined by periodic crises and wars, makes it impossible to achieve absolutely sustainable societal development. That is, realistic goals are the maximum smoothing of its cyclical fluctuations, smoothing out all forms of social inequality, which will lead to a decrease in the acuteness of inter-class contradictions, and therefore stabilize the capitalist world-system.

¹ Toporowski, J. (2023). The War in Ukraine and the Revival of Military Keynesianism. URL: <https://www.ineteconomics.org/perspectives/blog/the-war-in-ukraine-and-the-revival-of-military-keynesianism>

² Hille, P. (2022). SIPRI Report: The nuclear arms race begins again. *Deutsche Welle*. URL: <https://www.dw.com/ru/doklad-sipri-gonka-jadernyh-vooruzhenij-nachinaetsjavnov/a-62083829>

³ Wars cause severe damage to nature. (2022). UN. URL: <https://news.un.org/ru/story/2022/11/1434362>

The stability of the capitalist world-system as a whole and its components – core, semi-periphery and periphery – depend primarily on the stability of geopolitical processes. The formation of the world geopolitical system occurs in the process of unfolding global cycles, with military-economic cycles playing the leading role. The greatest influence on the development of the global geopolitical system is exerted by the Kondratieff cycles, long cycles of world politics by G. Modelski and W. Thompson, cycles of hegemony by I. Wallerstein, long military cycles by J. Goldstein, and systemic cycles of capital accumulation by G. Arrighi.

The theory of long cycles of world politics by G. Modelski and W. Thompson conceptualizes the cyclical process of certain states acquiring the status of a world leader. In particular, according to the model of long cycles of “accumulation of experience”, which explains the process of “rise” of a world power, each such 120-year cycle consists of four phases: 1 – “agenda setting”, 2 – “coalition building”, 3 – “macro-decision”, and 4 – “execution”. The “macro-decision” phase is characterized by a global confrontation, at the end of which a global leader emerges; it lasts approximately 30 years [4].

According to I. Wallerstein, in the historical process of development of capitalism, three independent cases of hegemony were formed. In the historical retrospective of capitalism development, these were the United Provinces (Holland), the United Kingdom (Great Britain) and the United States of America. In each case, hegemony was achieved through the Thirty Years of world war, a land war that involved (not necessarily constantly) almost all the major military powers of the era in large-scale conflicts that were extremely devastating to the land and population. These were the Thirty Years' War of 1618–1648; cycle of the Napoleonic wars 1792–1815; Euro-Asian Wars 1914–1945 [10].

In the works of G. Arrighi, the historical process of the origin and evolution of capitalism is presented as a cyclical process formed by systemic cycles of capital accumulation, consisting of two phases (epochs): 1) the phase of material expansion, when money capital “sets in motion” a growing mass of commodities, including commodified labour and natural resources; 2) the phase of financial expansion, when the growing mass of money capital is “freed” from its commodity form and accumulation is carried out through financial transactions. In historical retrospect, three systemic cycles of accumulation were fully unfolded: the Genoese cycle of the XV – early XVII centuries; the Dutch cycle of the late XVI – third quarter of the XVIII centuries; the British cycle of the second half of the XVIII – early XX centuries. Today, the financial expansion phase of the American cycle, which began in the late XIX century, is still unfolding. It is clear from the works of G. Arrighi that wars and military economy played one of the key roles in the cyclical process of gaining hegemony. In particular, the commercialization of warfare was a major factor in the extraordinary concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the oligarchies that ruled the Italian city-states. The Dutch were leaders not only in the accumulation of capital but also in the rationalization of military methods, which affected the outcome of the Thirty Years' War, as the United Provinces supported the adoption of new military methods by their allies. The British victory in the Seven Years' War (1756–1763) and the cycle of Napoleonic Wars, which ended with the defeat of France, were key stages in the establishment of Great Britain as the new hegemon. Great Britain possessed unprecedented hegemonic capabilities;

in particular, its coercive apparatus – above all its navy and colonial armies – and its island position were an unassailable advantage in the global power struggle [7].

Without considering the cyclical nature of the processes of gaining world leadership, Z. Brzezinski acknowledged that in historical retrospect the Roman, Chinese and Mongolian empires were regional predecessors of the later pretenders to world domination, who belonged to the Western European civilisation. After the fall of the Mongol Empire, “...Europe became the center of world power and the scene of major battles for power over the world”. Until the middle of the XVII century, the paramount European power was Spain, which ceded its leading role to France, which was the dominant European power until 1815, after which Britain held world domination until the First World War. However, Z. Brzezinski did not consider any of these dominant empires to be a truly world power, recognizing such a status only for the USA. He considered this state to be the last world superpower: “In the end, world politics will certainly become increasingly uncongenial of the concentration of power in the hands of a single state. Consequently, the United States is not only the first and only superpower on a truly global scale, but most likely the last” [13].

The rhythm of the global political process is set by periodic large-scale wars, upon completion of which regional geopolitical systems and the global geopolitical system as a whole are reformatted, regional and global hegemony of the victorious countries in the military-political confrontation is established. During the crisis-militaristic phases of global military-economic cycles, the geopolitical system of global capitalism is plunged into the strongest instability, at the same time it is tested for strength. After the completion of each crisis-militaristic stage in the cyclical development of the capitalist world-system, it temporarily stabilizes. This is due to the fact that the new leader of the global geopolitical system, or the old leader, who has retained his dominance due to the transformation of the geopolitical strategy, sets technical, technological, socio-economic, military-political, environmental and cultural development guidelines for the whole world. In the global capitalist system, it is the sustainability of the development of the hegemonic state, its values that determines the sustainability of all other states, national economies, and thus the economic basis for achieving the goals of sustainable development. In historical retrospect, it was the countries that achieved hegemonic status that, during the period of their dominance, determined the institutional practices of public life for the long term. This ensured relative stability of societal development on a global scale, although conditions were unequal for different countries and were determined by their geopolitical status. Since the second half of the 20th century, the aggravation of geopolitical contradictions has led to the unleashing of local-global conflicts. The local-global conflicts taking place today initiate a new self-evolving cycle of militarization on a global scale.

It is during the unfolding of crisis-military phases that the ways of resolving the contradictions of the world-system are determined, which lays the foundation for upward trends in the economy. In addition, the military-industrial complex becomes a growth driver, and military Keynesianism is applied to overcome the socio-economic crisis.

According to Keynesian theory, military expenditures, being a component of the state budget, can have a multiplier effect on the economy. Keynesians advocate the role of military spending in stimulating aggregate demand in periods of economic downturn [9]. The

implementation of military Keynesianism in practice allows to create conditions for the growth of income of citizens, tax revenues and resources to finance new military expenditures at the expense of military expenditures of the state [6].

Critics of military Keynesianism believe that it demonstrated serious flaws during the Cold War and may be useful in the short run, but in the long run, the ability of military Keynesianism to support economic prosperity is questionable. Also, institutionalists point out that military spending may be in line with the interests of powerful groups such as the military-industrial complex [9].

However, it was military Keynesianism and social Keynesianism, indicative planning, and the implementation of the theory of a socially oriented market economy after World War II that allowed the postwar crisis to be avoided and provided the developed Western countries with a “glorious thirty years” (1946–1975) – a period of high economic growth and a significant increase in social standards of living. Military Keynesianism was already applied during World War II and is still actively used by the leading countries of the world system to overcome deep cyclical economic crises. The commercialization and industrialization of war is an integral component of the development of the capitalist economy. The militarization of the economy, societal life, and societal consciousness are quite effective tools for implementing the mobilization scenario of overcoming deep cyclical crises of the capitalist economy, but they also form the basis for contradictions and imbalances in societal reproduction, the destruction of societal consciousness, which in the long run lead to even deeper crises, in other words, militarization destabilizes society in the long run and is a factor that generates cyclical crises.

Military Keynesianism became an integral component of the economic policy of the U.S. state institution, which has been manifested with particular force since the 1940s. Overcoming the Great Depression in the U.S. became possible precisely due to military Keynesianism, which forms the state incentives of economic behavior of economic entities at the macro- and global levels. Even in times when Keynesian theory was subjected to public and scientific obstruction, in other words, from the 1970s to the beginning of the global economic crisis in 2008, its recommendations in the part of military Keynesianism were quite actively applied [14].

The application of military Keynesianism in the Cold War era has deep geopolitical foundations – the rivalry between the leading world powers that organized and led the opposing military-political blocs. It was the rivalry between the USSR and the US during the Cold War that caused a significant increase in military spending: between 1949 and 1951, the US quadrupled its annual military budget. After the end of the Cold War, the global geopolitical system developed in line with globalization, but the legacy of militarization has not only survived [9], but is becoming increasingly relevant in the current conditions of transition to the crisis-militarist stage of the cyclical development of the world-system.

In the cyclical development of global military-economic processes, according to the theory of long cycles of world politics, in 2026 will come the phase of “macro-decision”, which in the previous few cycles unfolded as a 30-year period of global confrontation that led to world wars [4]. The local-global conflict in the European region, which is currently unfolding in the form of a large-scale Russian-Ukrainian military-political conflict and has

the potential to initiate a military confrontation between military-political blocs, as well as the renewed Israeli-Palestinian conflict, have paved the way for the crisis-militaristic phases of global military-economic cycles. Namely:

- "intermediate war", stimulating the economy at the beginning of the upswing phase of the 6th Kondratieff cycle;
- "macro-decision" phase of the modern long cycle of world politics;
- "thirty-year world war" phase of the modern hegemony cycle;
- territorialism (material expansion) phase of the systemic cycles of capital accumulation.

The start of the fourth institutional cycle of the leader of the modern capitalist world-system – the USA – will stimulate the deployment of the mentioned crisis-militaristic phases. The existence of such cycles was substantiated by G. Friedman; each institutional cycle of the USA lasted 80 years. According to G. Friedman's forecasts, approximately in 2025, the fourth institutional cycle should begin in the United States; in historical retrospect, the beginning of each such cycle was a war [11].

The unfolding of global military-economic cycles in the near future largely depends on the domestic political, foreign policy, and institutional cycles of the hegemon of the modern capitalist world-system – the United States. The leader of the modern capitalist world-system, as in all previous years of the post-Western European era in the deployment of long cycles of world politics (since 1850), remains the United States [4], although its political-economic system is increasingly destabilized.

G. Friedman reasoned that the development of the USA "...is governed by two extremely regular cycles – institutional and socio-economic. The institutional one controls the relationship between the federal government and the rest of American society: it changes about every 80 years. The socioeconomic one is every 50 years, and it pulses the dynamics of the American economy and society... Historically, institutional cycles have been driven by wars: the War of Independence, the Civil War, and World War II". The first institutional cycle began when the Constitution was drafted in 1787, was triggered by the War of Independence and its aftermath, and lasted 78 years – until the end of the Civil War and the amendment of the Constitution in 1865, which created a federal government whose relationship with the states was not fully clarified. The second institutional cycle began in 1865 as a result of the Civil War, lasted until the end of World War II, and resulted in the consolidation of the federal government's authority over the states. The third institutional cycle began in 1945, arising out of World War II; in the process of its unfolding, the power of the federal government expanded significantly and extended not only to the states, but also to the economy and society as a whole. The fourth institutional cycle, according to G. Friedman's predictions, will begin around 2025. It should be taken into account that "the pressure of American cycles from within inevitably affects the rest of the world in the form of the same pressure" [11], so the deployment of cyclical geopolitical processes in the near future largely depends on whether this form of cycles will continue to exist in the United States. The current societal-political crisis in the United States is so large and permeates all spheres of socio-political life that it is quite capable of leading to an internal societal

catastrophe with a military component, or to a world war in hybrid form, which will be the starting point for the deployment of the next 80-year institutional cycle in the United States.

The socio-economic and political cycles of this superpower, in particular the foreign policy cycles of F. Klingberg, as well as the institutional and socio-economic cycles identified by G. Friedman, influence the unfolding of global geopolitical processes. Klingberg cycles consist of an "extraversion" phase – the willingness to use direct diplomatic, military, or economic pressure on other nations to achieve American goals – and an "introversion" phase – a focus on the internal problems of American society. The average duration of the introverted phase of such a foreign policy cycle is 21 years, while the extroverted phase lasts 27 years. U.S. foreign policy develops in a spiral, with the degree of involvement in affairs abroad increasing at the end of each extroverted phase. Since 1776, three Klingberg cycles have unfolded: 1) 1776–1824; 2) 1824–1871; 3) 1871–1918; during 1918–1940 – the extraverted phase of the fourth cycle. U.S. involvement in world affairs should have been declining in the 1960s, and the first signs of extraversion in foreign policy should have appeared in the U.S. in 1983 [15].

The unfolding of Klingberg's foreign policy cycles is coordinated with the unfolding of Kondratieff cycles. The coordination of the chronology of the deployment of phases of Klingberg's foreign policy cycles with the chronology of the deployment of waves of Kondratieff cycles indicates that there is a connection between changes in the economic environment and changes in the nature of U.S. foreign policy (Table 1).

Table 1

Kondratieff cycles and cyclicity of U.S. foreign policy

Kondratieff cycle	The nature of the Kondratieff cycle wave	Time period of the Kondratieff cycle wave	The nature of the phase of the U.S. foreign policy cycle	Time period of the phase of the U.S. foreign policy cycle
I	Upward	From the late 1780 until 1810 to 1817	Introverted	1776–1798
	Downward	From 1810–1817 until 1844–1851	Extroverted	1798–1824
II	Upward	From 1844–1855 until 1870–1875	Introverted	1824–1844
	Downward	From 1870–1875 until 1890–1896	Extroverted	1844–1871
III	Upward	From 1891–1896 until 1914–1920	Introverted	1871–1891
	Downward	From 1914–1920 until the mid-1940s	Extroverted	1891–1918
IV	Upward	From the mid-1940s to the late 1960s	Introverted	1918–1940
	Downward	From the late 1960s to the early 1980s	Extroverted	1940–1960s
V	Upward	From the early 1980s to the early 2000s	Introverted	1960s–1983
	Downward	From the early 2000s to the late 2010s	Extroverted	1983 – early 2010s

Source: compiled on the basis of: [15; 16].

Quite strict chronological correspondence of the extroverted phases of the U.S. foreign policy cycles to the upward waves of the Kondratieff cycles, and of the introverted phases to the downward waves was observed from the 1840s to the early 2010s. This historical period saw the unfolding of the second, third, fourth Kondratieff cycles and the completion of the transition from the upward wave to the downward wave of the fifth Kondratieff cycle. The rising wave of the first Kondratieff cycle contains a part of the introverted period and a part of the extroverted period of the American foreign policy cycle (Table 1). The introverted character of the U.S. foreign policy in 1776–1798 is explained by the fact that during this historical period the most important institutional foundations of the USA existence were being formed (adoption of the Declaration of Independence, adoption of the Articles of Confederation – the first U.S. Constitution, signing of the peace treaty between the United States and England, adoption of the U.S. Constitution, which is still in force today, election of the first U.S. president, formation of the first U.S. government), which explains the concentration on domestic problems.

Apparently, in the early 2010s there was a failure in the unfolding of the U.S. foreign policy cycle – the Klingberg cycle. According to the logic and chronology of the deployment of Klingberg cycles, in the early 2010s the extroverted phase of the foreign policy cycle should have been replaced by an introverted one, lasting about 21 years, but already in the early 2020s the U.S. foreign policy became more active in the context of using not only ‘soft power’ but also participation in hybrid wars and influence on the unleashing of local-global conflicts. This transformation of the Klingberg cycle corresponds to the rhythm of unfolding of the current long cycle of world politics, namely the approaching phase of ‘macro decision’.

The extroverted nature of the US foreign policy during the period of deployment of the rising waves of the Kondratieff cycles is largely because the rising waves are the period of active implementation of basic innovations, primarily in the military sphere. In general, the coordination of crisis-militaristic phases of global military-economic cycles with the Kondratieff cycles is explained by the dynamics of innovation processes.

W. Thompson links the innovation processes with global warfare. The analysis of empirical data and theoretical argumentation allowed him to conclude that systematic warfare is a product of economic innovation and the desire for leadership. In this case, innovation and systematic warfare are interdependent processes. That is, the long waves of economic and technological change, the long cycle of military and political leadership, and war are closely interrelated. Five global wars have been identified by long cycle researchers: the Dutch-Spanish War of 1580–1608, the Great Alliance Wars of 1688–1713, the French Revolution and Napoleonic Wars of 1792–1815, World War I and World War II 1914–1945 [5].

In the current conditions of aggravation of confrontation between the leading actors of geopolitics and their allies, the capitalist world-system has taken the path of militarization. That is, a new cycle of militarization of the global economy is open, which means the intensification of the application of the economic policy of military Keynesianism. This is evidenced primarily by the growth in global military spending. The unleashing of military conflicts contributed to a 6,8 percent increase in global military spending in 2023, the

sharpest year-on-year increase since 2009 and bringing global military spending to the highest level ever recorded by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). In 2023, global military spending increased for the ninth consecutive year, reaching a total of \$2443 billion. The global military burden, defined as military spending as a percentage of global gross domestic product (GDP), increased to 2,3 percent in 2023. Average military spending as a share of government spending increased by 0,4 percentage points to 6,9 percent in 2023. In 2023, global military spending per person was the highest since 1990 at \$306 [12].

The growth of global military expenditures in 2023 can be explained primarily by the ongoing war in Ukraine and the escalation of geopolitical tensions in Asia, Oceania and the Middle East. Military expenditures increased in all five geographic regions, with significant growth in Europe, Asia, Oceania and the Middle East.

Military spending as a share of government expenditure, which can be seen as a measure of government priorities, increased in 9 of the top 10 spenders in 2023. Among the top 10, the share of military expenditures in public spending was highest in Ukraine (58 percent), followed by Saudi Arabia (24 percent) and Russia (16 percent). The most notable increases in 2023 were in Ukraine (+19 percentage points) and Russia (+3,2 percentage points). A clear indication of Ukraine's militarized socio-economic development is that its military expenditures accounted for 58 percent of government spending in 2023 [12]. And according to forecasts of the Institute for the Study of War⁴, the Russian government plans to spend 17 trillion rubles (\$183 billion) on national security and defense in 2025 – about 41 percent of its annual expenditures.

After the outbreak of hostilities in 2022, Ukraine found itself able to sustain its annual budget only through a combination of tax increases, debt, and international financial assistance, with the non-military funding gap reaching approximately \$40 billion in 2023. The EU and U.S. financial aid packages provided to Ukraine in 2022 and 2023 were critical to freeing up resources that Ukraine could allocate to its armed forces [12].

According to the State Web Portal “Budget for Citizens”⁵, which provides data from the Ministry of Finance of Ukraine, defense expenditure in the Ukrainian state budget in 2023 amounted to 52,3 percent; compared to the same indicator for 2021 (8,6 percent), the share of defense expenditure increased by 6,1 times.

After World War II, the bloodiest local wars that served as a way to resolve global contradictions were: Korean War (1950–1953), the Vietnam War (1955–1975), the war in Laos (1960–1973), the war in Cambodia (1967–1975), war in Afghanistan (1979–1989), the Gulf War against Iraq, Desert Storm (1991), the war in Somalia, the Battle of Mogadishu (1993), NATO's war against Yugoslavia, which began with Operation Allied Force (1999), the war in Afghanistan, which began in 2001 with U.S. Operation Enduring Freedom

⁴ Harward, C., Stepanenko, K., Hird, K., Barros, G., Kagan, F.W. (2024). Russian Offensive Campaign Assessment. ISW. URL: <https://www.understandingwar.org/backgrounder/russian-offensive-campaign-assessment-september-30-2024>

⁵ State budget web portal for citizens. The Ministry of Finance of Ukraine. 2024. URL: <https://openbudget.gov.ua>

(2001–2021), the military operation “Shock and Awe” (‘Iraqi Freedom’) by the combined forces of the U.S. and anti-Iraq coalition (2003), the armed conflict in South Ossetia (2008), the war in Libya (2011), the war in Syria – a multilateral, multilevel armed conflict that began in 2011 and continues today.

The localization of global contradictions in the civilizational space of Ukraine, with the subsequent deployment of military conflict is due to the fact that in Eurasia, which, according to Z. Brzezinski, occupies an axial position in geopolitical terms, and "represents a chessboard on which the struggle for global domination continues", Ukraine is the geopolitical center without control over which Russia is unable to recreate a Eurasian empire [13]. Ukraine's local-global conflict has not only collapsed its economy, but also created deep societal and environmental destructions that will impede its sustainable socio-economic development for a long time to come.

The localization of military forms of resolving global contradictions in the XX century saved humanity from a catastrophe of planetary proportions, but the continuation of such geopolitical practice in the XXI century is extremely dangerous.

As a result of the war, Ukraine continues to experience significant structural, demographic, socio-economic, institutional and other social changes of a destructive nature. In particular, the long-standing trends of accelerated depopulation, large-scale migration of Ukrainians abroad and the actual cessation of basic reproduction of the population in general and the labor force in particular have been exacerbated. The war had a profound shock effect on the socio-economic situation in Ukraine. Overcoming these consequences and further recovery requires significant investment funds and efforts, the estimated total need for reconstruction and rehabilitation funds for 2023–2026 is \$128 billion, and for 2023–2033 – almost \$411 billion [17].

The authors of a preliminary study on the environmental impact of the war in Ukraine conducted under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Program, report on air, water and soil pollution, forest fires, hazardous military waste, and conclude that the next generation of Ukrainians and their neighbors will live with the “toxic legacy” of the current war⁶. The war in Ukraine in 2022 has become a space for localizing the processes of resolving deep civilizational and geopolitical contradictions that periodically escalate in the course of cyclical societal development; the ecologically destructive consequences of this war already pose a threat to the health of the population and future generations, and to full human development in general.

Further aggravation of geopolitical contradictions can lead to an increase in the scale of modern military-political conflicts, increasing the threat of a nuclear conflict, so the prospects for human development today are determined by the effectiveness of societal institutions formed in the process of civilizational development.

The main conclusion of the report prepared by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) published in June 2022 is that a new round of nuclear arms race awaits the world in the next decade. All nine nuclear-weapon states – Russia, the United States, China, France, Great Britain, Pakistan, India, Israel and North Korea – are actively

⁶ Wars cause severe damage to nature. (2022). UN. URL: <https://news.un.org/ru/story/2022/11/1434362>

beginning to modernize their arsenal. According to D. Smith, head of SIPRI, "...the risk of nuclear weapons use is higher now than at any time since the end of the Cold War"⁷.

Today's deep crisis of capitalism, primarily institutional, with economic and military-political derivatives, indicates that: 1) the world system is now in the midst of a transition to the sixth Kondratieff cycle, which begins with an upward wave, which means the large-scale introduction of innovations, including military ones; 2) impend deployment of the 'macro-decision' phase of the modern long cycle of world politics; the technical and technological basis of these cyclical processes is the fourth industrial revolution, which significantly increases the destructive power of military technologies and gives rise to new forms of warfare. The formation of a global political and economic system based on the principles of humanism and environmental protection, in other words, sustainable development, is possible only if the institutional practices of international relations provide non-military ways to resolve inter-civilizational and geopolitical contradictions, primarily to curb the use of weapons of mass destruction.

The transformation of the global geopolitical system into a system in which the antagonism between social classes, antagonism between the actors of geopolitics is smoothed, will significantly increase its sustainability, which will ensure sustainable development of individuals, organizations, business units and the entire global civilization.

To mitigate antagonism at the global, national and micro levels, it is necessary to consolidate the efforts of the social class that possesses economic and political power sufficient to set the guidelines of socio-economic development, political life, ideology and manage social development, not allowing it to deviate significantly from these guidelines.

In the capitalist world-system such social class has an international character, its basis is formed by representatives of big business. Today, the contradictions between big business, oriented to use the opportunities provided by military Keynesianism, and big business in civilian sectors of the economy have become more acute. For the former, the period of turbulence generated by the crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles provides growth opportunities, while for the latter, it disrupts the established global and local value chains and threatens ruin. Therefore, consensus within the backbone of the ruling class – big business – is inevitable, the only question is its form [18].

The sustainability of socio-economic development can ensure the observance by all actors of geopolitics of the law of techno-humanitarian balance – "the higher the power of production and combat technologies, the more advanced means of cultural regulation are necessary for the preservation of society" [19].

Today, it is necessary to consolidate the actors of geopolitics to achieve the goals of sustainable development, which will stabilize the global political-economic system, resolve its most antagonistic contradictions, and smooth out cyclical fluctuations, primarily the crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles. In modern conditions, in order to avoid large-scale human casualties, economic and environmental damage from warfare,

⁷ Hille, P. (2022). SIPRI Report: The nuclear arms race begins again. *Deutsche Welle*. URL: <https://www.dw.com/ru/doklad-sipri-gonka-jadernyh-vooruzhenij-nachinaetsjavnov/a-62083829>

threateningly increasing with scientific and technological progress, one of the guidelines for sustainable development should be the transformation of crisis-militaristic phases of global military-economic cycles into non-militaristic phases of cyclical geopolitical processes. Successful achievement of sustainable development goals is possible only if the capitalist economy and public consciousness are demilitarized.

Conclusion. In the XX century, overcoming the Great Depression was possible not only due to economic reforms, but also under the influence of the Second World War. The global economic crisis that began in 2008 is comparable to the Great Depression of the last century and has not been fully overcome to this day. In the XX century, the technical capability and ideological basis for nuclear warfare were formed, which became and continues to be a threat to the existence of global civilization. Under such conditions, military-economic cycles should be replaced by peaceful forms of resolving political and economic contradictions of social development. Political-economic contradictions are the grounds for unleashing wars, but the imperfection of social institutions makes it possible to resolve these contradictions through war. Therefore, it is necessary to increase the effectiveness of international institutions designed to ensure compliance with the norms of international law by all participants in geopolitical processes and to prevent the unleashing of armed conflicts and wars.

The way out of the current global economic and geopolitical crisis due to the militarization of the economy, in particular – the application of the tools of military Keynesianism by the leading actors of geopolitics creates serious threats to the existence of human civilization at the current level of development of military technologies. To implement such a way of overcoming the crisis of the world-system, modern international institutions are not efficient enough, and global elites are not responsible enough to fulfill their institutional role.

Today, a new cycle of militarization of the economy has begun in the cyclical development of the world-system, which entails the militarization of societal consciousness and societal institutions. Under such conditions, the achievement of sustainable development goals is not only hindered, but also set back. That is, the deployment of crisis-militaristic phases of global military-economic cycles is a period of stagnation in the progress towards sustainable development in the conditions of geopolitical turbulence.

If in the course of the next crisis-militarist stage of cyclical development of the capitalist world-system (according to the leading theories of global cyclicity, in 2020–2050s) in the process of militarization of the economy and society it will be possible to observe the law of techno-humanitarian balance, then the transition to an upward wave of socio-economic dynamics will create prerequisites for the implementation of sustainable development goals in the future. If there is a transition from capitalism to global neo-feudalism or to a hybrid form of global society, consisting of elements of capitalism, totalitarianism and feudalism, then inter-class, inter-country and inter-civilizational inequality will increase, which will negate the intermediate goals already achieved today for the implementation of the concept of sustainable development.

In general, sustainable development does not exclude cyclicity. Sustainable development can be cyclical societal development, in which cyclical fluctuations in the

economy, the severity of cyclical crises and all forms of social inequality are smoothed out as much as possible, and the crisis-militaristic phases of military-economic cycles are transformed into non-militaristic phases of resolving geopolitical and geo-economic contradictions, which will avoid human casualties, economic and environmental damage caused by hostilities. That is, today it is imperative to implement a set of socio-economic and institutional transformations on a global scale aimed at stabilizing the geopolitical environment, reducing inter- and intra-country inequality, and ensuring environmentally balanced societal development. Such transformations can be realized only if a consensus is reached between the leading actors of geopolitics and between elite circles of society.

References

1. ICNND. (2009). Eliminating nuclear threats a Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers. URL: <https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/publications/documents/infcircs/2009/infcirc780.pdf>
2. Sustainable development. (2024). European Commission. URL: <https://policy.trade.ec.europa.eu/development-and-sustainability/sustainable-development>
3. Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. (2015). UN. URL: <https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/publications/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>
4. Modelski, G. (1995). The Evolution of Global Politics. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 1 (7), 424-467. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.1995.38>
5. Thompson, W. (2000). K-waves, leadership cycles, and global war: a non-hyphenated approach to World-systems analysis. In Thomas D. Hall (Ed.), *A world-systems reader: new perspectives on gender, urbanism, cultures, indigenous peoples, and ecology*. Rowman & Littlefield.
6. Arrighi, G. (2007). Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century. London, New York: Verso. URL: <http://digamo.free.fr/adambeijing.pdf>
7. Arrighi, G. (2010). The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times. London, New York: Verso.
8. Custers, P. (2010). Military Keynesianism today: an innovative discourse. *Race & Class*, 51 (4), 79-94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396810363049>
9. Chary, S., Singh, N. (2024). On the role of military spending: an economic thought perspective. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2350837>
10. Wallerstein, I. (1983). The Three Instances of Hegemony in the History of the Capitalist World-Economy. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 24 (1-2), 100-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002071528302400107>
11. Friedman, G. (2021). The Storm Before the Calm: America's Discord, the Coming Crisis of the 2020s, and the Triumph Beyond. Anchor.
12. Tian, N., Lopes da Silva, D., Liang, X., Scarazzato, L. (2024). Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2023. SIPRI Fact Sheet. URL: https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2024-04/2404_fs_milex_2023.pdf
13. Brzezinski, Z. (1998). The Grand Chessboard. Basic Books.
14. Podliesna, V. (2024). The Actualization of Military-Economic Cycles in the Process of Societal Development. LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
15. Schlesinger, A. (1986). The Cycles of American History. Houghton Mifflin.
16. Kondratieff, N. (1926). Die langen Wellen der Konjunktur. *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 56 (3), 573-609 [in German]
17. Burlay, T., Grytsenko, A., Borsenko, O. (2023). Societal consequences of modern hybrid war: key dimensions in the context of Ukraine. *Journal of European Economy*, 22 (2), 158-183. <https://doi.org/10.35774/jee2023.02.158>

18. Podliesna, V. (2024). Cyclicity influence on the global trend of turbulence for business. In J. Belak, Z. Nedelko (Eds.), *8th International Scientific Conference Challenges in the Turbulent Economic Environment and Organizations' Sustainable Development* (pp. 247-255). Maribor. <https://doi.org/10.18690/um.epf.5.2024>

19. Nazaretyan, A. (2006). Technology and Psychology: the Hypothesis of Techno-Humanitarian Balance. URL: <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=152422ed50fbf5ece4406da6039eab22c650daf8>

Received on September 20, 2024

Reviewed on October 3, 2024

Revised on October 4, 2024

Signed for printing on October 25, 2024