

Political Evolution of the Washington and Beijing Consensus: Models of Globalization

Ruslan Bortnik

Director of the Ukrainian Institute of Politics (Kyiv, Ukraine)

E-mail: rbrtnk@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5356-4972>

Bortnik, Ruslan (2024) Political Evolution of the Washington and Beijing Consensus: Models of Globalization. *Ukrainian Policymaker*, Volume 14, 4-15.

The purpose of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the «American» and «Chinese» models of globalization in the context of the growing competition between the United States and China for global leadership; and to improve understanding of the differences between these models of globalization, which will allow for more accurate forecasting of further development of international relations and development of effective strategies for different countries. The study also attempts to consider the prospects and future of these models and to point out their shortcomings. The article is based on a comparative analysis of theoretical concepts and empirical data, including official documents, scientific publications, and statistical data.

Keywords: models of globalization, American globalization, Washington Consensus, Chinese globalization, Beijing Consensus, Rule-based world, Community of the Common Destiny for Mankind, Belt and Road Initiative

Received: 10 June 2024 / Accepted: 25 June 2024 / Published: 15 July 2024

Introduction

One of the most popular words in the media and in politics today is the word «globalization.» This concept is used today not only to describe processes and events in international politics, but also for domestic use by politicians, journalists, scholars, and ordinary citizens. At the same time, it causes not only debate among scholars, but is also an instrument of constant information and political struggle, a source of social hope or fear.

However, «globalization» has become another «political» concept, with controversies around it often provoked not only by fundamental political contradictions, but also by a lack of

understanding of the essence and forms of the definition itself, and important differences between different models.

At the same time, globalization is a process that affects all aspects of modern society: economy, politics, culture, and ecology. At its center are two powerful models of globalization: «American», based on the principles of the «Washington Consensus», and «Chinese», based on the «Beijing Consensus». These models determine not only the economic policies of individual countries, but also global trends in international political relations, the world economic order, and overall civilizational development.

Therefore, this article attempts to examine the origin and definition of the concept of «globalization», and, on the example of a comparative analysis of its two key models, the «Northwest» or «American» or «Washington» («Rule-based world» for politics, realized in the «Washington Consensus» model for economics) and the «Southeast» or «Chinese» or «Beijing» («Community of the Common Destiny for Mankind» for politics), for the Washington Consensus model for the economy) and the Southeast or Chinese or Beijing model («Community of One Destiny for the Humanity» for the Beijing Consensus model for the economy), to better understand the essence of this process.

In general, in the broadest sense, «globalization» is the growing worldwide integration of economic, cultural, political, religious, and social systems (Black et al., 2017: 165). However, there are hundreds, if not thousands, of definitions of this concept through the prism of different spheres of human activity and different models of subject-object relations.

At the same time, for a long time in public discourse, the concept of «globalization» (the very definition of which appeared in the 1930s (James & Steger, 2014: 418) was associated primarily with liberal globalization, a model developed mainly by the countries of North America and Western and Central Europe. This trend in the public discourse intensified especially after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the USSR, which significantly reduced ideological competition in the international arena and became a marker of the final defeat of the communist model of globalization – the concept of the «world proletarian revolution» (Bukharin, 1933).

The Washington Consensus for Economics and Politics

The conditional conceptual platform of liberal globalization was the formation of a set of political principles and rules known as the Rules-Based Order model, and in the field of international trade and finance, the so-called Washington Consensus.

The «Washington Consensus» was developed in the late 1980s and included ten basic recommendations for developing countries facing economic crises. These recommendations include fiscal discipline, reallocation of public expenditures, tax reform, financial liberalization, exchange rate unification, trade liberalization, privatization, deregulation, and protection of property rights.

According to the World Bank, countries that have implemented the principles of the Washington Consensus, such as Chile and Mexico, have been able to achieve significant economic growth. In Chile, for example, real GDP per capita grew from \$4,500 in 1990 to \$15,000 in 2020 (World Bank, 2023).

From a scientific and theoretical point of view, this model of globalization is a concept of international relations in which formally and publicly established international norms and the rule of law are of primary importance. It aims to ensure stability, predictability, and fairness on a global scale through compliance with international laws and multilateral cooperation.

The conceptual structure of this model consists of:

1. International law and norms that govern interactions between states. These include treaties, conventions and customs of international law covering a wide range of issues, from international trade to human rights (United Nations, 2020: 12).
2. Multilateral institutions, such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank, which facilitate cooperation and dispute resolution (World Trade Organization, 2021: 45).

Nominally, this model is intended:

- to respect the sovereignty and equality of states, equalizing their natural differences in resources and capabilities, applying the same rules to all countries, ensuring that all countries have a voice in global governance (Keohane & Nye, 2020: 104);
- to create a stable and predictable environment between states and peoples that reduces the likelihood of conflict and promotes stability in international relations (United Nations, 2020: 22);
- to promote conflict resolution through multilateral institutions and international law that create mechanisms for peaceful dispute resolution, which in turn reduces the need for unilateral action and military intervention (International Monetary Fund, 2019: 15);
- to ensure the economic integration of countries and markets by standardizing rules, reducing barriers, and increasing transparency, leading to economic growth and development (World Bank, 2020: 32).

This model of globalization has been dominant in the world for the past 30 years, although it has been constantly undergoing internal changes.

Under its influence, in the first decades, geopolitical stability and adherence to international rules and norms increased, which somewhat reduced geopolitical tensions and contributed to a more stable and cooperative international environment; international economic development intensified (global GDP growth by 347%) and the socio-economic development of countries began to level off (the gap between countries' incomes decreased by 37% from 1990 to 2019) (World Bank, 2023); the situation with human rights has improved due to a significant emphasis on international norms; global governance systems have emerged.

However, despite its significant achievements and conceptual development, the Rules-Based Order has faced a number of internal contradictions and imbalances, and mixed results and even abuses in the implementation process, especially in developing countries.

Among them there are the following:

1. Expansion and formation of globalist models of economic and political cooperation.
2. The destruction of traditional societies and the unification of political, social and economic systems based on the models of North America or Western Europe. Removal of national elites and «chewing up» of traditional/conservative societies in order to transform them into parts of the global market.
3. Spontaneous nature of implementation and focus on the realization of short-term interests of industrialized countries, whose overall gain from the high level of openness of national economies so far exceeds their losses. By pushing less developed countries to eliminate trade barriers and maintaining their own through a policy of double standards, preserving the economic backwardness of third world countries and strengthening their technological dependence, developed countries

- secure disproportionate benefits from globalization, deepening the division of the world into a developed center and a backward and dependent periphery.
4. Deepening uneven development and growing imbalances in the global economy, expanding the expansion of transnational capital, and increasing the monopolistic position of developed countries in global markets for goods, services, and capital.
 5. Ignoring the socio-economic, cultural, and historical specifics of the development of national economies, their systemic westernization, forced homogenization of their economic regulation mechanisms on a strict monetary basis, and imposing on less developed countries a model of unified catch-up development focused on the use of funds, experience, and technologies coming from abroad.
 6. Restriction of national sovereignty and strengthening of the dictates of influential international financial institutions, weakening of the role of the state in regulating national economies and social protection, degradation of the environment for the sake of market profit, and aggravation of global problems.
 7. Priority of the ideology of market radicalism, which poses a threat of spiritual impoverishment of humanity, loss of national identity, standardization and unification of national cultures, traditions, customs, spread of mass culture, consumerism, national and religious intolerance, etc.

At a certain point, the model of «Rules-Based Order» or «liberal globalization», having lost its main ideological competitor in the form of the theory of communist globalization, in its main features, especially in matters of political and cultural unification with a focus on the models of North America and Western and Central Europe, began to go beyond its own classical definition and approach the concept of «Mondialization», which is most often used to describe the very tasks and goals of global political unification (Berry, 2013: 14; Sorinel, 2012).

In addition, numerous armed and political conflicts between the countries of the «liberal world» and others, the phenomenon of the so-called «color revolutions» may indicate that liberal (or Western) globalization has lost its flexibility and adaptability to the changing global geopolitical and geo-economic environment over the course of history, which is a critical sign of the necessary evolution. After all, it began to establish a model of dominance of the winner (leader) or, more often, a group of winners in their zones of influence. At the same time, this power was mostly anonymous or disguised.

And it is this loss of the ability to evolve and the desire to preserve and protect the established profitable world order at any cost that has become the reason and ground for the formation of alternative concepts to globalization, international political and economic cooperation.

Beijing Consensus for Economics and Politics

The most famous of them is the concept of the «Community of a Common Destiny of Humanity,» which, instead of actual unification and even subjugation (in some cases), offers a model of connectivity and preservation of the unique characteristics and identities of peoples and countries in politics, economics, and social systems. Another specificity of this model is that it is the official state concept of the People's Republic of China, which both gives it strength and causes skepticism and sharp criticism from opponents. In fact, the concept of a

community of a single destiny for mankind is a product of Chinese modernization based on the principles of Chinese culture (Xinhua News, 2023).

This model is also known in other formats: the Belt and Road Initiative (introduced in 2013), the Global Development Initiative (introduced in 2021), and the Global Security Initiative (introduced in 2022), etc. However, it is the doctrine of the «Community of a Common Destiny for Humanity» that serves as their general overarching framework.

The «Beijing Consensus» on economics, proposed in the early 2000s, is an alternative set of principles that emphasizes the importance of government regulation, innovation, gradual reforms, and social welfare. This model has been successfully implemented in China, where GDP per capita grew from \$155 to \$10,500 between 1978 and 2020 (World Bank, 2023).

The main principles of this model were proclaimed by Chinese President Xi Jinping in November 2012 at the 18th National Congress of the CPC and in 2015 during his speech at the 70th UN General Assembly. But it was in his speech at the UN that Xi Jinping said: «We must reaffirm our commitment to the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, create a new type of international relations based on cooperation and mutual benefit, and build a community of one destiny for mankind» (Embassy of PRC, 2015). At that time, Xi Jinping also emphasized five main areas of joint international activity: politics, security, economy, culture, and ecology, aimed at improving the world order.

The White Book «A Global Community of One Future: China's Proposals and Actions» released by the Chinese government in September 2023 details global challenges that require a global response that should be formed within this model of globalization (State Council Information Office, 2023: 5-6).

The authors of the book include these challenges:

Growing peace deficit: «Although human society has largely maintained peace since the end of World War II, threats to world peace continue to accumulate. War has returned to the Eurasian continent, tensions are rising, and a number of hot spots are emerging. The shadow of the arms race remains, and the threat of nuclear war – the sword of Damocles hanging over humanity – remains. Our world risks plunging into confrontation and even war.»

Growing development deficit: «The global economic recovery is sluggish, and unilateralism and protectionism are rampant. Some countries are turning to a 'small yard, high fence' approach to fence themselves off; they are pushing for disconnection, disruption and 'de-risking' of supply chains. All this has led to obstacles to globalization.»

A glaring security deficit: «Due to more intense global strategic competition and a lack of mutual trust between the great powers, the Cold War mentality has re-emerged and calls for ideological confrontation have reappeared. The hegemonic, abusive and aggressive actions of some countries against others in the form of fraud, robbery, oppression and zero-sum games are causing great harm. Non-traditional security challenges are on the rise, including terrorism, cyberattacks, transnational crime and biological threats.»

A more serious governance deficit: «The world is facing multiple crises of governance. The energy crisis, the food crisis, the debt crisis are getting worse.»

To overcome these challenges, China proposes to implement three interrelated initiatives – global development, global security, and global civilization. Each of the initiatives is further specified in the proposals: the first two in six, and the third in four. The opportunities that the Belt and Road Initiative can provide for solving global problems are postulated separately.

«The White Paper calls for the creation of a «global community of a single future» despite the «harsh reality.»

In fact, a new model of globalization is being proposed to replace the orthodox neoliberal model. Awareness of the complex structure of the modern world and the long-term strategic interests of mankind related to the revival of the leading role of the socio-cultural factor of world economic development provoked the development of the concept of «synergistic», «moral», «social and market», «managed» globalization, «globalization with a human face», in which the interests of the majority of the world's population, both present and future generations, become a priority. Characteristic features of the new model of globalization are:

1. Restoring the balance between market and non-market (e.g., government) regulators on a global scale.
2. Rejection of universalism and unification.
3. Humanization and focus on human values, respect for civil rights and freedoms, while recognizing the political and cultural identity of all peoples of the world.
4. Development of dialogue and partnership between civilizations, proclamation of interaction and cooperation as universal forms of human relations, and the superiority of economics over politics.
5. Ensuring a balance of interests and equality of opportunities for all countries, recognizing specific development needs.
6. Democratization of international organizations, formation of an effective mechanism for coordinating the actions of national states.
7. Eliminating the practice of double standards in relations between countries, eliminating artificial barriers to the dissemination of titles and information, expanding access to new ideas, scientific and technological achievements in order to increase the welfare and quality of life of the population of all countries.
8. Ensuring greater public awareness of globalization issues, involvement of independent public and academic organizations in the development and adoption of economic decisions at all levels of government.
9. Environmental and social orientation of economic development, harmonious reproduction of human beings, social relations, and a healthy environment.
10. Formation of a multipolar world, cooperation of national states and international organizations in solving global problems.

It is worth noting that Chinese globalization was preceded by economic success. China's economic transformation, initiated by Deng Xiaoping's reforms in the late 1970s, laid the foundation for its integration into the global economy. Market-oriented policies, trade and investment liberalization, and the creation of special economic zones (SEZs) have contributed to China's economic growth and facilitated its participation in global markets. China's export-oriented growth strategy has facilitated its integration into global supply chains, turning it into a «world factory» of manufactured goods. Cheap labor, a large domestic market, and government support for export-oriented industries have contributed to China's competitiveness in international trade. Launched in 2013, the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) is China's flagship foreign policy initiative to promote connectivity, infrastructure and economic cooperation in Asia, Africa, Europe and beyond. By investing in transportation networks, energy projects, and trade corridors, China seeks to increase its geopolitical influence and strengthen economic ties with partner countries, as well as to promote a multipolar model of the world order and develop various centers of power to counter the United States (Williamson, 2023).

This approach is based on the principle of state-led development. The Chinese government has played a crucial role in guiding the economy, investing in strategic sectors and ensuring that economic growth is in line with national development goals. The model also values gradual, experimental reforms as opposed to sudden changes, allowing China to adapt and refine policies to meet evolving challenges and opportunities.

The peculiarity is that the Chinese model of globalization tries to optimize the advantages and minimize the disadvantages of the policy of reform and openness. Due to this third feature, China, while engaging in globalization, carefully protects its sovereignty. An important part of this globalization is also the opposition to the «orthodox capitalist» neoliberal model of the United States and China's appeal to the idea of multipolarity, which is inextricably linked to their idea of globalization.

The peculiarities of Chinese globalization are widely discussed in the countries. In this context, it is worth paying attention to J. Ramo's book «The Beijing Consensus» (Ramo, 2004), as opposed to the concept of the «Washington Consensus» that appeared in the early 90s of the 20th century. Joshua Cooper Ramo discusses how the Beijing Consensus stands in contrast to the Washington Consensus. He emphasizes that the Beijing Consensus provides an alternative development model, particularly for developing countries, emphasizing innovation, sovereignty, and multilateralism, in opposition to the prescriptive, one-size-fits-all approach of the Washington Consensus.

The competitiveness of the «Washington» and «Beijing» models of globalization is largely based not only on current geopolitical realities but also on classical models of geopolitical thought.

Thus, British researcher, scientist and successful political practitioner, directly involved in the creation of a «national Europe» after the First World War, Halford John Mackinder divided the world into two main powers: Sea Power (dominated by maritime powers), in this case the United States, and Land Power (centered on the vast Eurasian continent), in this case China. Mackinder identified the Heartland – the vast expanse of Eurasia – as a key region (Mackinder, 2020). If one state could control the Heartland, it would gain an unprecedented geopolitical advantage. The ambitious Chinese initiative «One Belt, One Road» is in line with Mackinder's theory. The initiative aims to connect China with Europe by land and sea, expanding its access to the Heartland. By investing in infrastructure projects in Asia, Africa, and Europe, China seeks to secure trade routes, resources, and influence.

It is impossible not to mention Brzezinski's theory presented in his work «The Grand Chessboard» (Brzezinski, 2019). Zbigniew Brzezinski developed the concept of the Grand Chessboard to clarify the geopolitical dynamics of Eurasia in the post-Cold War era. Brzezinski argues that Eurasia is a chessboard on which the struggle for global supremacy is unfolding. He emphasizes the importance of preventing the emergence of a dominant power in Eurasia that could challenge U.S. hegemony. From Brzezinski's point of view, the confrontation between the United States and China can be seen as a strategic maneuvering for control and influence in Eurasia. The United States, perceiving the rise of China as a potential threat to its global dominance, seeks to maintain its position as the dominant player on the grand chessboard. This has led to the development of policies such as the Indo-Pacific Strategy and the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue (Quad) aimed at curbing Chinese expansionism and preserving US strategic interests in the region.

Comparing these two economic models, it can be noted that the Washington Consensus formulated 10 neoliberal rules for transforming the economies of Latin America (Ramo,

2004). They included: 1) removal of tariff barriers; 2) unregulated economy, etc. The Beijing Consensus has the opposite rules: 1) the pursuit of innovation in the economic, political, and social spheres, but with due regard for Chinese specifics; 2) the social sphere should develop in parallel with the economy; 3) asymmetry in development is necessary.

State intervention versus a market-based view of the economy. The Beijing Consensus advocates a more prominent role for the state in managing economic development, while the Washington Consensus favors market forces and minimal state intervention.

Also, the Chinese approach emphasizes social stability and gradual reforms, while the American model prioritizes efficiency and rapid liberalization.

Infrastructure investment versus financialization. China's focus on infrastructure investment contrasts with the US emphasis on financialization and capital mobility.

Global influence. China's «One Belt, One Road» and infrastructure projects reflect its desire to expand global influence through economic cooperation and interconnectivity, while the United States promotes its values and interests through initiatives such as democracy promotion and free trade agreements.

Features of economic models

The Beijing Consensus and the Washington Consensus represent competing (but not antagonistic) models of globalization that reflect the different economic strategies and priorities of China and the United States. While both approaches are aimed at promoting economic growth and development, they differ significantly in terms of their emphasis on government intervention, market forces, social stability and global influence, and issues of sovereignty and identity. Understanding these differences is crucial for analyzing the dynamics of modern globalization and the evolving role of China and the United States in the world economy.

«The Washington Consensus emerged in the context of the Latin American debt crisis and the economic problems of developing countries. The main idea was to integrate these countries into the global economy through liberalization and market reforms.

The Beijing Consensus, on the other hand, emerged in the context of China's rapid economic growth and its desire to offer the world an alternative model of development. This model is based on the experience of China's economic reforms, which began in 1978 under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping and included the gradual introduction of market mechanisms into the planned economy.

The world is currently facing growing economic and political competition between the United States and China. Both countries are seeking to expand their influence through various economic and political initiatives.

The «Washington Consensus» reflects the American approach to economic reform based on the successes of liberal economies. These reforms implemented in Latin America have had mixed results, with some countries achieving sustained growth while others have faced economic difficulties and social problems.

The Beijing Consensus, on the other hand, was developed as a response to criticism of the neoliberal model and offers an alternative for developing countries seeking sustainable development. China has used this approach to strengthen its influence in Africa and Asia through the Belt and Road Initiative and investments in infrastructure projects.

The United States and China are the main political actors in the globalization process. The United States promotes its model through international organizations such as the International

Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, offering loans and assistance to countries that agree to market reforms. China, in turn, uses platforms such as the BRICS and the Belt and Road Initiative to promote its development model and strengthen economic ties with developing countries.

The «Washington Consensus» led to significant reforms in Latin America, but the results were mixed. For example, in Chile, economic reforms have led to sustained economic growth and poverty reduction. On the other hand, in Argentina, reforms based on the Washington Consensus led to an economic crisis in the early 2000s, which was accompanied by mass protests and political instability.

The Beijing Consensus has been successfully applied in China and in a number of African countries. For example, Ethiopia was able to attract significant investment from China, which contributed to infrastructure development and economic growth. Between 2000 and 2018, Ethiopia's GDP grew by an average of 9.5% per year, one of the highest rates in the world (World Bank, 2023).

«The Washington Consensus has contributed to a significant increase in exports and foreign investment in countries that have adopted its principles. For example, exports of goods and services in Latin America increased from 16.5% of GDP in 1990 to 23.4% of GDP in 2010 (World Bank, 2023).

At the same time, the Beijing Consensus has contributed to significant GDP growth and poverty reduction in China. Between 1981 and 2015, the number of people living below the poverty line in China decreased from 88% to 1% of the population (Poverty of China, 2024). This achievement was made possible by the active role of the state in economic development and strategic investments in infrastructure and social programmes.

Countries in Southeast Asia, such as South Korea and Singapore, have used mixed models of economic development that incorporate elements of both the Washington and Beijing Consensus. These countries have achieved significant success by combining market reforms with an active role of the state in strategic sectors of the economy. South Korea, for example, increased its GDP per capita from \$2,300 in 1980 to \$31,000 in 2020 (World Bank, 2023).

«The «Washington Consensus» has promoted the development of market economies, but its critics point out that it has not paid enough attention to social aspects. In some countries, liberalization and privatization have led to increased social inequality and economic instability. For example, in Mexico, the poverty rate decreased from 53% in 1992 to 41% in 2018 (World Bank, 2022), but social inequality remained high.

The Beijing Consensus, by contrast, emphasizes social welfare and sustainable development. China has seen a significant improvement in the quality of life in recent decades. Life expectancy has increased from 67 years in 1980 to 77 years in 2020, and the adult literacy rate has reached (World Bank, 2024).

«The «Washington Consensus» has played a fundamental role in shaping economic policies in developing countries over the past several decades. While it has contributed to significant economic reforms and the integration of countries into the global economy, its legacy is complex and multifaceted. The Consensus launched an important global dialogue on economic development, emphasizing the need for policies that are not only growth-oriented but also inclusive and sustainable. At the same time, as the global economic landscape evolves, the approach to economic policy must also evolve, which is something that is missing from this model.

Conclusions

Humanity has been following the path of globalization for almost its entire history, seeking political, social and economic benefits in global cooperation with other social and economic systems. Although sometimes this road was interrupted by global cataclysms, world wars, epidemics, and periods of self-isolation. That is why globalization is necessary – in order to solve global problems of security, ecology, and inequality – the world needs to be globalized, and it is inevitable.

At the same time, depending on which model of globalization we choose, we will build a global political and socio-economic system. The global political or economic system will reflect the norms or rules that are currently being formed within the framework of different models of globalization, especially the «American» and «Chinese» models. After all, if we choose the models of unification and universalization, the world may be more unified and monolithic, more responsive to global crises, but at the same time, it may be more fragile and less free. In such a world, there may be risks for a person seeking freedom. At the same time, if we choose models of globalization that will allow us to fully unleash the civilizational, social, economic, and spiritual potential of different peoples and civilizations; to connect and share all the resources that this rich planet has to offer, this progress may be slower, but at the same time more sustainable, productive, and less conflictual.

The «Beijing Model» represents a paradigm shift in economic development strategies, contrasting sharply with the neoliberal «Washington Approach» and acting as a critique and alternative, rejecting its one-size-fits-all approach to economic development. It emphasizes China's unique path, focusing on state-driven growth, gradual reforms, and innovation. This model has attracted interest due to its role in China's transformation into a global economic power, offering an alternative framework for developing countries. The notion of the «Beijing Model» itself summarizes the distinctive strategies and policies that fueled China's rapid economic growth and emergence as a global power. In contrast to the Washington Model, which advocates broad economic liberalization and privatization, the Beijing Approach is characterized by its pragmatic, flexible approach to economic development, emphasizing the role of the state in guiding growth and prioritizing social stability alongside economic expansion.

At the same time, the Washington Model has considerable experience in implementation, detailed elaboration at all levels and planes, successful results in different parts of the world, and the example of the United States, the most powerful country today in terms of military, political, social and economic development.

Critics of the Washington model argue that it has often led to economic instability and increased inequality in many developing countries. In contrast, the Beijing model offers a more individualized, country-specific approach to development that has underpinned China's remarkable economic success and significant poverty reduction over the past four decades.

China's economic model has attracted attention around the world, especially among developing countries seeking alternatives to Western economic policies. The «Beijing Model» emphasizes that effective development strategies must be tailored to each country's unique conditions, using state capacity and strategic planning to promote growth and innovation. This approach has inspired several countries to explore similar development paths, reflecting China's ability to combine economic liberalization with strong governance.

Despite its achievements, the Beijing Model is not without its weaknesses. There are serious concerns about the environmental sustainability of China's rapid industrialization, the social costs of economic transformation, and the challenges of sustaining high growth rates. In addition, the possibility of replicating China's model in other contexts is discussed, given the unique political, social, and economic conditions that have shaped China's development trajectory. Critics also highlight the potential problems with development models based on state intervention, including the risks of corruption, inefficiency, and stifling private sector innovation.

The «Beijing Model» introduced a new framework for understanding social and economic development, questioning the dominance of the neoliberal «Washington Model». Indeed, the «Chinese approach» emphasizes the importance of state involvement in guiding economic growth, the benefits of gradual and adaptive reforms, and the need to design development strategies that are tailored to the specific conditions of each country. While China's model has contributed to outstanding economic success and lifted millions of people out of poverty, it also raises questions about sustainability, inequality, and the possibility for other nations to adopt similar approaches. As the global community continues to search for effective development paradigms, the debate between the proponents of these two models underscores the complexity of economic growth and the variety of paths that nations can take to prosperity.

Both the «Washington» and «Beijing» models are in fact the consequences of different approaches to modernization of these countries and their followers, each of which has created a successful example to follow. Although other countries and peoples have not yet succeeded in fully replicating the success of the national modernization of the United States and China.

Both models began as economic concepts, but over time they have acquired a significant political (UN, G7, G20, EU, IMF, WB, SCO, BRICS, etc.) or even military (NATO, other military blocs) infrastructure, which turned them into full-fledged models of human globalization with geopolitical rewards and punishments

At the same time, the common problem of both models is that their task is to create a comfortable international environment for the countries of their initiators – they are instruments of foreign policy, not to extend the internal successful models of the United States and China (with their goals, architecture and standards) to the international environment, which, to varying degrees, may preserve comprehensive inequality between regions, countries and societies for a long time. The humanistic globalization, whose time will come sooner or later, will likely face slightly broader tasks to ensure sustainable high standards of living in the world while preserving the freedom and diversity of political and social manifestations of humanity.

References

- Bell, D. (2015) *The China Model: Political Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy*. Princeton University Press. Available online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1q1xrbj>.
- Berry, M. (2013) Neoliberalism and the City: Or the Failure of Market Fundamentalism. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 31(1), 1–18. doi:10.1080/14036096.2013.839365
- Black, J., Hashimzade, N., and Myles, G. (2017) *A dictionary of economics*. Oxford University.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2019) The Grand Chessboard. Fabula. Available online: https://archive.org/details/grandchessboarda00brze_0/page/n1/mode/2up

- Bukharin, Nikolai (1933) *Chapter 4: The Theory of Proletarian Dictatorship and Scientific Communism*. Available online: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/works/1933/teaching/4.html>
- Embassy of PRC (2015) Available online: http://ru.china-embassy.gov.cn/rus/ztbd/QQ13/201512/t20151202_3113377.htm
- International Monetary Fund (2019) *The IMF at a Glance*. Available online: <https://www.imf.org/en/About/Factsheets/IMF-at-a-Glance>
- James, Paul, and Steger, Manfred B. (2014) A Genealogy of globalization: The career of a concept. *Globalizations*, 11(4): 417–434. Available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14747731.2014.951186>
- Keohane, R. O., and Nye, J. S. (2000) Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And So What?). *Foreign Policy*, volume 118, Pages 104-119. Available online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1149673>
- Mackinder, H. (2020) *The Geographical Pivot of History*. *Cosimo Classics*. Available online: https://archive.org/stream/the-geographical-pivot-of-history-by-halford-john-mackinder/The%20Geographical%20Journal%20by%20Geographical%20Journal_djvu.txt
- Poverty in China (2024) Available online: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poverty_in_China
- Ramo, J.C. (2004) *The Beijing consensus*. London: *Foreign Policy Centre*. Available online: <https://fpc.org.uk/publications/the-beijing-consensus/>
- Sorinel, C. (2012) Economic Sciences Series. *Ovidius University Annals*, 12(2). Available online: <https://stec.univ-ovidius.ro/html/anale/ENG/cuprins%20rezumate/volum2012p2v2.pdf>
- State Council Information Office (2023) Available online: https://english.www.gov.cn/news/202309/26/content_WS6512de8fc6d0868f4e8dfc7b.html
- United Nations (2020) Charter of the United Nations. Available online: <https://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>
- Williamson, J. (s.a.) *The Ten Commandments of the Washington Consensus*. *The Washington Consensus and Beyond*. Available online: <https://www.gsid.nagoya-u.ac.jp/sotsubo/Washington%20Consensus.pdf>
- World Bank (2020) Annual Report 2020. Available online: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/about/annual-report>
- World Bank Group. Data (2023) Available online: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD?locations=CL>
- World Bank Group. Data. Life expectancy at birth, total (years) – China (2022) Available online: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.LE00.IN?locations=CN>
- World Bank Group. Poverty and Shared Prosperity, 2022 (2024) Available online: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/poverty-and-shared-prosperity>
- World Trade Organization (2021) Understanding the WTO. Available online: https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/understanding_e.pdf
- Xinhua News (2023) *White Book: The concept of a community of the common destiny of mankind goes back to the soil of deep Chinese culture*. Available online: <https://russian.news.cn/20230926/3fc094e337274ebfb14fe3cb60a03eaf/c.html>