

Supranational Class Formation and Concept of Control in Global Economy



Efstratios Kyriotelis, Eirini Triarchi, and Konstantinos Karamanis

Abstract In classical theory, the relationship between state and capital is presented as an internal relationship, although there is an argument that it is external. If the relationship is external, that means that state and capital are two separate entities in a dialectical relationship. The relationship between state and management and control is independent of the relationship between capital and state, whether the latter is internal or external. Some commentators have gone as far as to suggest that we are witnessing the era of the post-national corporations. Doubters have predicted the demise of the nation-state, and globalization has brought changes in state sovereignty, capitalize on its exposure to global market. On the contrary the nation-state persists, especially in its control of fiscal and monetary policies, and international business, thus remaining the only political unit. Many combinations and variations can be designed; the state is in a more advantageous position in the global market. The expansion of the state sector in the economy marks the expansion of the recognition of the social nature of the productive forces. However, historical evolution does not end with State Monopoly Capitalism, which is replaced by the Supranational Monopoly Corporation (SNMCo)—for subjective and objective reasons. This movement creates new trends in the control sphere of global economy, leading to the birth of *external, supranational control*. The transition to the global market takes place through the passage of capital and labor force movement into the global economy. This article offers a theoretical framework to explain and present the process of developing supranational class and supranational capital and their effect in control of global economy. The countries of SE Europe (SEE), located on the edge of both sides of EU and Eurasia are affected from the supranational control and unipolar global

E. Kyriotelis (✉) · E. Triarchi · K. Karamanis
Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, Greece
e-mail: kyriot@teiep.gr

E. Triarchi
e-mail: etriarhi@uoi.gr

K. Karamanis
e-mail: kkaraman@teiep.gr

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

105

A. Horobet et al. (eds.), *Global, Regional and Local Perspectives on the Economies of Southeastern Europe*, Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57953-1_7

governance. Awareness of the closer reality rather than the wider unseen policy is the primary and necessary element towards the deeply divided Europe.

Keywords Supranational capitalist class · Supranational capital · Globalization · Enterprise · Transnational capitalist class

JEL Classification Codes F01 · F20 · F60

1 Introduction

The objective of the study is to contribute in the field of world political economy (WPE), enriching the discussion and the intellectual debates concerning the formation of supranational class and the control of global economy. This article argues that the most powerful route to globalization is the capitalist form, on the basis of which capitalist globalization takes place in the system of imperialist integration, which is a real event. The concentration of capital and the creation of supranational enterprises, which control capital and utilize the labor force independent of national economies, creates complex bonds, both between the various operations and between the various branches within the supranational company, which thus indirectly controls the labor force and the different national economies. This creates a system of contradictions between the perception that there is no substitute for the nation-state, the absorption of states in regional integrations and global integration, the contradiction between the supposed strengthening of states with the integrative processes and their dissolution in favor of supranational capital. This also marks the transition process of regional integrations, in which weak nation-states are absorbed and dissolved. At the same time, the national bourgeoisies are dissolved along with the nation-states, creating the supranational capitalist class.

The fluidity of the situation is what creates the corresponding fluidity in the economy, because smaller and larger powers will decide their futures in the globalized economy on the basis of the cost-benefit analysis. This fluidity leaves the outcome of globalization open, which not only reverses the terms of global governance but also disturbs the global balance.

Control of the economy passed to the supranational capitalist class intertwined with the supranational capital. Supranational Capitalist Class had evolved as a segment of the bourgeoisie, representing in the outset the transnational capital that control the means of production through transnational corporations. The objective of this work is to deepen the discussion on the transformation of the Transnational Capitalist Class into supranational and the establishment of worldwide supranational control of supranational capital.

2 Supranationality and Globalization

The literature concerning the transnational corporations and their transformation into supranational is very limited. Sklair delivered, by his work, the formation of transnational capitalist class (TCC) and the discourse of globalization. According to Sklair, while globalization means different things to many different people, there is a growing consensus that capitalist globalization is its most powerful form (Sklair 2002). A transnational capitalist class (TCC) has emerged as that segment of the world bourgeoisie that represents transnational capital, the owners of the leading worldwide means of production as embodied in the transnational corporations and private financial institutions (Robinson and Harris 2000).

This notion was developed on the class-based approach, with the dismantling of the global economy, which interprets socioeconomic affairs narrowly and based on class. The class-based approach is historically legitimate and objective. If this is the case, however, then history came and imposed its own changes; just as no historical achievement is permanent, so too has the class-based approach proven historically limited. In fact, however, this is a political position that is consistent with the global dimension, arisen for the universalist view of global reality. It is a methodological and political process on a new level and with a new quality in approaching universal phenomena.

However, the earlier historical experience remains and is utilized during the course of global integration. This means that there are two integrations on the path to global integration: the capitalist and the socialist. This also conflicts with the modern reality of capitalist globalization, where supranational institutions dismantle the corresponding national ones, and external relations are transformed from secondary into primary ones. This is today's reality; it is also a new level of political practice within the determinist process of interdependence of all the countries in the world.

Examining the world as a whole and also in its parts, systems and subsystems, and globally assessing the movement of nation states, regional unions and international bonds, we can observe that a gradual, long-term rapprochement is taking place. In this process, the national and the supranational element move together in dialectical unity, in a constant movement of cooperation and confrontation.

In the global economy today, issues objectively matured on the ground of supranational capital and that of the nation-states arise, where the evident trends become dominant realities. The discussion of the dissolution of the nation-state is a frequent rhetoric in the scientific community, as though it were the dominant obsession of the two sides of the same coin, where on the one side, it is idealistically perceived that the dissolution of the nation-state will bring about the emancipation, and on the other, that political guarantees of the national and international order will be perished. Despite all its shortcomings, the nation-state has shown amazing resilience, and every country that emerged from the nineteenth-century colonial empires has established itself as a nation-state (Drucker 1997).

It is important at the outset to distinguish between three distinct approaches to the movement of capital from national to the global market:

The first is based on the state as the vehicle that transfers the capital into the global market that conveys the social and production relations from national to international and from international to globalizing. This is the subjective perception of globalization. This is the concept of capitalism disillusion denial, because it is based in the ideology conception of capitalism perpetuation.

The second is the supranational conception of globalization, where the globalization is realized under the supranational practices. This the actual process realized today, and the international institutions cover the deficit in global governance. This is the monopolar or unipolar globalization where the nation-state loses its sovereignty and the individual becomes superior to the collective, where each subject claims the individual interest. In the atomized world, the nation-state is violently led to the globalization crucible, with the visible danger of losing the vehicle of transferring sustainable elements, cultural, ethnical, national, political and so on, during the transition from national to global. The violent dissolution of the state alters the state itself and state's institutional status becomes synonymous with nationalism and de-nationalization.

The third perception of globalization is emerging from the multipolar globalization. On this basis, social development is stimulated by strengthening multipolarity against unipolarity, by the emergence of new powerful poles, entering and claiming to become subjects of global governance. Because it should not be expected that the trend towards globalization will be marked with a straight line and that the withdrawal of the nation-state will result from rules imposed by the powerful forces on all sides. Big powers will be appropriately adapting to changing circumstances in the pursuit of global governance through interventions in domestic politics of current states (McGrew and Held 2002). With the weakening of unipolarity, multipolarity is strengthened and vice versa. Traditional powers and new emerging ones, mainly economic powers, are consolidated, creating strong subjects of global governance mainly through new institutions; those powers are subject, of course, to the universal economic laws. The regulations of international institutions and their coherence is what will characterize the path to be taken by global governance, whether there will be a strengthening of multipolarity with the creation of new poles, resulting in a discussion of multipolar globalization.

The third way is connected with democratic globalization, the strengthening of nation-states, until their final and definitive withdrawal in the globalized economy through procedures analogous to those of their constitution. In this case, the nation-state becomes the vehicle of national diversity, culture and other sustainable national elements in the new global society. International or supranational institutions increase their prestige with the participation of most states in them, their democratic functioning is increased, and the rising course of the nation is strengthened while national sovereignty and independence is reinforced. However, the question remains open as well as whether arrangements in global politics will be the common field of public confrontation or cooperation.

3 Supranational Capitalist Class

Transnational Capitalist Class (TCC), according to Sklair, can be analytically divided into four main fractions and the people and institutions from which they derive their power in the system can differ over time and locality (Sklair 2002). These fractions are:

1. owners and controllers of TNCs and their local affiliates;
2. globalizing bureaucrats and politicians;
3. globalizing professionals;
4. consumerist elites (merchants and media).

The leading personnel in these groups constitute a global power elite, dominant class or inner circle in the sense that these terms have been used to characterize the dominant class structures of specific countries (Sklair 2016).

We argue in this essay that a Supranational Capitalist Class (henceforth SCC) has emerged, and that it is now a ruling class since it controls the global decision - making and in this extent the global economy. SCC has constructed a new axis consisting of economic forces that have become the dominant “authority”, imposing economic control through economic and political predominance. The SCC uses the global structure to unfold the vast accumulation of capital in the global market. The capital is becoming supranational and consists of internationalized (globalized) national capital. The difference between the TCC and SCC is that the latter stands above nation-states and it uses the supranational formations to impose its power and achieve its aims but also uses the state itself, imposing economic control over the state through supranational institutions such as EU, IMF, World Bank, G4, G7 etc. In its formation contributed the weakening of the state and state’s sovereignty and the subordination of the state into supranational entities.

The state is at the core of the system and is the agent of political-cultural and other special features. Thus, the survival of all these elements is directly linked to the state’s position in the world. However, the attacks against the nation-state and the attempts by supranational organizations to absorb it, are a direct attack on political-cultural values, which are borne by the nation-state as a political-cultural value itself. The state is connected with bourgeois society and the capitalist system in such a way that the withdrawal of the nation-state also means the change of society and the socio-economic system, while any other attempt to dissolve the nation-state is reactive and unlawful historically. As a consequence of this, the bourgeoisie is weakening within states, which can be compared with the fall of the landowner’s aristocracy in France in the mid-19th century, with the rise of industry as the most important source of wealth.

The result is the creation of the supranational capitalist class, bearing new entrepreneurial practices (Nikolopoulou 2016). The SCC emerged as a dominant class, so that the pursuit of the strengthening of the bourgeoisie in the classical sense is utopian. In contrast to the collapse of the landowners’ aristocracy, followed by the collapse of conservatism, which was replaced by the radicalism and the progressive

character of the bourgeois class of commercial capitalism, what may not have been perceived by the current national bourgeoisie is the fact that, in its utopian pursuit of the recovery of political and economic control, it has entered into alliances with the class created in its place and by its degradation. The new and different element that the SCC introduced as a political practice and ideology, is the neo-conservatism that turns the society back, an entire historical era. The partnership of the old and the new at the global level has resulted in a confusing and deteriorating situation and, eventually, in the further weakening and fragmentation of the national bourgeoisie. A characteristic of this confusion is the strengthening of nationalisms of all kinds, even in the heart of “progressive” Europe, not only in the economically weak states but also in the stronger European countries. It has not been realized that the national bourgeoisie has become unnecessary in the globalized economy, and no ideological affinity is capable of putting into operation forces to save it, because saving the national bourgeoisie also means saving the basis on which it relies, that is, the national economy.

In contrast, unipolarity is based precisely on the weakening of national economies, which in turn presupposes the weakening of the bases that support them, starting with bourgeois civilization and science. *Certain issues are introduced here, which are related to the law of continuity and the line of rescue of the diachronic and sustainable elements of the nation-state’s historical community, national cultures and, of course, political civilization, its political system and its core, democracy* (Ntouskos 2000).

The Supranational Capitalist Class should be considered as a whole and not divided into fractions, including the following subdivisions:

1. Owners and controllers of SNCs
2. Controllers of Supranational Institutions
3. Globalizing Politicians
4. Upper ex-bourgeois class elite
5. Controllers of NGOs

These subdivisions derive their power from the great powers and uses the substructure of the great powers, to impose the economic and political model formed upon their geo-strategic goals. The channels through which their power is spread in the complex globalized system, are the same channels used by the great powers to spread their political power. So it could be said that the expression of the SCC, the Supranational Monopolistic Corporation is also in dialectical unity with the powerful states, and this is happening in both socioeconomic systems, capitalism and socialism.

The issue that arises here is who exercises control on whom, the SNCs on the state or vice versa. This is a very serious issue because if the control is exercised by the SNCs on the states, even on the great powers, the institutional expression of this control also means control over the international institutions. This is true on the side of capitalism, where national governance is replaced by a system independent of nation-states and tends to become a global governance system through international institutions (McGrew and Held 2002), as a mechanism of control and management of the economy. The bourgeois class and the bourgeois states passed into the control of

the SCC and the SNCs. The bourgeoisie, which had exercised economic and political control on certain conditions, became useless and parasitical, and was replaced by the SCC in which economic and political control were merged. *Unaware of these huge changes, the bourgeoisie is transformed into wage laborers, who are unable to pass to the new class, like the feudal nobility, from feudalism into capitalism and be absorbed by the upper social classes of the then dominant urban class, as the nobles had the power to do* (Kondylis 2015).

4 From the State to Globalization and Supranational Formations

The new element of the globalized economy is the attitude of supranational capital, which partly subverts the global correction to global governance and control. In fact, international economic interdependencies have grown so much that crises and institutions are in a dialectical unity, with the former being distorted by linear growth, and institutions are the alignment of distortions.

The historically growing course of the nation-state is curtailed, while capital is shown to be superior to that of the state and continues to grow out of it, having broken the internal state-capital bond. The gap created by breaking the internal capital-state bond covers the supranational capital in the sphere of control and governance, and geostrategy covers the gap in the sphere of the economy's regulation. International institutions are becoming regulating mechanisms, depending on the international weight and their acceptance by individual states, as well as on the ability of states to impose their views, shaping global politics from their own perspective and thus influencing the control of global economy.

Globalization is not independent of the national and international dimension, which will also determine its content. Internationalization as a manifestation of the nation-state contact points and socio-economic systems, is the step before the formation of global politics and consequently of global governance. The international element is also what will transfer the national to the global. The question is how the transition to the world economy will be and what is the way of global governance, since capital, labor and scientific and technical progress are organically bound together in the global sphere. But this process is not automatic and that it is unsustainable, it is an obstacle to growth and the flight of mankind to the front. A contradictory term in global development is the geostrategy of supranational capital, unipolar globalization, the neoconservative one-way street and the New World Order as the only direction to globalization.

The accounting base is divided into roles between states, based on the pursuit of unipolar globalization. However, the realization of this division is in contradiction, first with each subject involved in it, because each participating subject has its own pursuit of power. Secondly, with the laws of world development that are inconsistent with the pursuit of unipolar globalization (Huntington 1999), but requires everyone's

participation. This latter is a prerequisite for globalization, otherwise globalization is partial, e.g. technological globalization, economic globalization, and so on. Moreover, each state has the potential to seek its own place in the international division of labor, based on its own power. Thus, the global pursuit of power forces states to demand their own alliances or to rally among themselves or become subordinate to one of the great powers.

Problems in the global economy are universal and therefore require global solutions. Individual solutions at the level of nation-states and regional unions (Hirst and Thompson 1996) take the overall picture out of the global picture and hinder globalization. At the time of the big one, the solution will be at this level and any other will be just short and partial. The overwhelming obstacles in the sphere of leadership are evident in the indifference of supranational capital for this sphere, which they deliver to the hands of the managers (upper ex-bourgeoisie elite), and the mismatch in their remuneration and performance.

One might say that supranational capital draws national production relations with it and transfers them to the destination countries. In this sense, supranational capital creates or affects production relations in the different countries to which it is exported, modelled on the relations in the country of origin. In other words, capital creates the production relations which serve its development and movement, and of course the two elements of monopoly capital (which also apply to supranational capital): monopoly superprofit and monopoly control. This is not true of the productive forces, which develop objectively, according to the economic laws (Thornhill 2017) to which capital is also subject.

5 Supranational Capital and Control of Global Economy

The dynamics of movement from the national to the global element is linked to the development of productive forces trapped within the nation-state boundaries and seeking to flee forward. This does not automatically mean the abolition of nation-states, but they are called upon to play a new role in a globalized society.

The bond between state and capital from internal is transformed into an external one, and capital is transformed into a supranational capital and becomes an entity wider than the state. The transition is first from the national level to the international one, and at this level capital is transformed into a transnational capital, while at the next level, the world, capital is transformed into supranational. These changes are not only linear, but through setbacks and barriers they have followed the dynamics of capital that could not remain locked in the narrow limits of the state.

Competitions from the late 19th and the 20th century were in the national context. Since 1989, the conflicts are clearly emerging as the pursuit of global subjects to assert global governance and control. In this perspective two issues, of equal importance, are raised. The first issue concerns global governance and control and the second the management of the economy. Hence, recourse was made to international institutions, and at the same time as the need to resolve these issues, this also became a priority

within the changes that took place at the end of the 20th century. International institutions are taken as a mechanism where the goals are in response to the demand, control and regulation of a divided economy so as to bridge the gap between the subjective pursuits and the objective course of events. The global, international and national viewpoints can cooperate through the institutions, and the internal democratic, or social structure of each institution, pulls out their communicative, democratic or social view in the direction of the economy and the corresponding form of governance and control.

Performance in the sphere of control is not simply a matter of geostrategy, nor a question of supranational capital that has the power to seek the governance and control of the global economy. Irrespective of the privatization of the economy, which offers the material interpretation of the principle of equality, it is widely understood that neither is it free nor open to anybody to claim the share that would be attributable to it, depending on its “capabilities”. As long as the state takes over the control of the economy, if it has the power to do so, the above issues are solved within policy boundaries and the state acts as a stabilizing mechanism. Thus, the government was taken over by the state, as well as the control of capital through the government policies and of the labor force, through the control of the trade unions. This mechanism worked as long as capital could develop within the narrow limits of the nation-state. But capital needs to be expanded globally, and this contradicts Keynesianism and the free market economy that cannot function globally, as mechanisms for regulating supranational capital. SCC and its expression supranational capital overthrows these economic methods, sets its course on the basis of geostrategy, and nation-states cannot understand why their efforts to harmonize in the new world order fail.

While a new global configuration emerged out of these changes, there are two issues concerning the control of global economy and consequently the national economies:

- The first of these issues concerns the scientific deficit that distinguishes the approach of the system of Directorate and Control in the modern economy, through the International Institutions that play a role in shaping the international and consequently the political economy. When control comes out of the possibilities of the state, through the relative contradictions and the risk of losing control of the economic process, then the control passes at a superior level to the *supranational control* exercised through the international institutions. This control is subject to the law of anomalous development.
- The second issue concerns the creation of a multipolar opposition, the global control system, which tends to be created by states and ethnic groups that accept the pressures of capitalist globalization. The various poles that are created tend to create unified structures and forms of organization, with new institutions either that had been institutionally recognized or unrecognized. Science is called upon to examine the creation of new institutions, their dynamics, their resilience to the pressure of economic outcomes and the strength of their structures. The debate concerns the retreat of the national element and the impact on nations-states

as autonomous social entities. The functions of the nation-state are no longer dominant and a new role is assigned to it.

6 Supranational Capital and Dissolution of State

The current situation is a strong obstacle to global economic integration, mainly because the inconsistency between objectives and instruments is quite far from being manageable. Therefore, the distance between the powerful and the weak economically, states is further complicated by the geostrategy of supranational capital, which is oriented towards the interest of capital. The movement of capital is slow at the level of the small enterprise. The global market was scattered in small segments exploited by nation states, limiting circulation and the development of the productive forces. Large industrial production transforms competition into international and global competition.

Capitalism is based on the nation-state and on national enterprises and under this perspective it hinders the internationalization and growth of productive forces, due to individual capitalist ownership. In this respect, supranational capital is more progressive than individual capitalist ownership and facilitates the globalization of productive forces. The internationalization of the productive forces is incompatible with the tightness of the nation-state, which hinders the development of capitalism and globalization. On the other hand, though, the viable features of the nation-state are essential (Boyer 1996) to the historical continuity of mankind towards globalization. For these reasons, we must find the international institutions and mechanisms that will address these issues and provide the prerequisites for global integration.

The system of contradictions is expressed in the consolidation and the simultaneous dissolution of the nation-state, at the political level (Keohane and Nye 1977), and the convergence of the economies and the dissolution of production in the same countries, at the corresponding economic and social level. While the contradiction arises from the dissolution of the small enterprise, increasing the percentage of wage labour, which is inside a capitalistic formation, a socialistic characteristic, which is excluded from the first. The governance using quantitative economics alters, correspondingly, qualitative characteristics, by alleviating the strong local coherence, false historical truth configuration, dissolution of the state's economic structure (which dissolves the productive potential of economies), and altering states' identity to consumers, rather than producers. States are weakening and the international institutions become stronger than the states, which abolish national identity and lose control. Thus, the transnational cooperation is performed on the basis of politico-economic inequality. The structure of the system is unstable and its construction is based on economically powerful states for convergence but on the other hand assumes weak states, so that supranational administration can be applied by the supranational element. As a result, such structure cannot stand and will collapse from within. It becomes clear that the substance of the previous process is the dialectics of productive

forces and production relations, the dialectics of nation-state and international institutions, and those of management of the economy and the lack of an international economic mechanism to exercise management at the global sphere. The productive forces are now over-developed, with global range, and require corresponding ecumenical management.

Economic effects also extend to the sphere of politics, with the depreciation of the political system, dependence on downgraded credit rating due to the unreliability of the political system, the need to increase debt, the deterioration of the welfare state, and eventually the dissolution of the welfare state. In such a situation it is easy to say that the state is parasitic for the economy as the state is an obstacle to the development of the business sector (Fulmer 2010). This unscientific position is linked to the de-scientification of the political economy and serves only the supranational capital that comes to fill the gap with the aim of gaining the monopoly superprofit in undervalued economies. The above mechanism is part of the geostrategy of supranational capital, whereby a country is first de-industrialized, national capital is depreciated, and then supranational capital is exported to the country whose economy has been depreciated and passes under supranational control.

The dismantling of the nation-state (Strange 1996) and national businesses, subject to the geostrategy of supranational capital, signifies a weakening of the capitalist system, weakening of the state, and, generally, dissolution of the core of the system, the small enterprise. The creation of supranational capital is however a transfer of national production relations from the national to global level. This transfer means overcoming local tightness, and is a superior form of production relations, which implies a superior order of interests. This movement of the transfer of production relations from the national to global framework is a movement that is historically progressive and contains economic and social magnitudes. Behind economic one finds the social magnitudes, which collide with each other and determine both economic and social development. When economic and social magnitudes grow unevenly and ambiguously, both the economic and the social structure are affected.

The supranational capital in the process of economic sovereignty and global economic control conflicts with the rules of social production, affects the structure of the system, raises the productive forces to a higher level, and production relations fall under the control and governance of the new SCC (Sklair 2000). This economic-theoretical stance, of course, also has an ideological background and a sociopolitical point of view, because of the position that the economic element cannot be regarded only from the aspect of economic criteria but from a superior social and economic point of view. Those who acknowledge only the economic point of view, and only profit as a source of economic development, have overlooked basic rules of political economy.

Supranational capital affects the structure of the financial system, in particular the financial capital, banks and industry, that is, the real economy, material production and the financial services associated with it. In their stead, it puts forward services and directs financial capital to the virtual economy. Financial capital, in the short term, is making profits from the “new” virtual economy, which is based on usurer lending. This is a source of development that geostrategy has inherited from imperialism. The

profits made by the virtual economy are short-term, so the supranational capital is turning towards sovereign debt crisis to maintain profitability.

Debt crisis, however, is a crisis of geo-economics and is borne by the developed productive forces; it is a version of the virtual economy, whereby the real economy is deprived of the funds which are borrowed in order to be collected, without being used in production. Debt concerns the national bourgeoisie, which is deprived of its sources of income, industrial production; debt is unsustainable and results in rendering the national bourgeoisie unviable. The intervention of the general economic crisis of capitalism in 2008 wiped out historical profit margins from the virtual economy, and the high profitability of supranational capital was shifted to the sovereign debt crisis. The only thing that is still feasible, is to improve the economic position of states or regions and then only occasionally and cyclically as long as this economic dimension is also directly dependent on this geostrategy of neo-conservatism; and this because regional associations are included in the international division of labour, having taken the place of nation states. There remains the last cell of capitalist development, that of private ownership and the individual capitalist enterprise has been put aside (absorbed) by supranational capital. Whereas these are things that happen in theory, in practice the Euro-Atlantic structures dissolve the nation states, in an unregulated and rushed way and at the same time undermining the EU the most durable and strongest regional union. EU can be used as a guide to global integration, even if this may be an imperfect experiment.

7 Conclusion

In a theoretical framework this paper identifies the process of the development of the supranational class and supranational capital and their effect in control of global economy. A mechanism of transition is established, starting from the nation state and moving on through the heart of the economic life, the enterprise and the investment at the global market. The type of entrepreneurship and the type of enterprise are key issues in the evolution of the economy.

In this transition process, this paper stands on the realm of reality, not of course what it seems, but what is created by the unity of objective conditions and the action of socio-economic subjects. It is evident that the facts are compiled with the laws of global development. Collusion of heterogeneous factors inevitably leads to conflicts, leading to sharpening in the sphere of directorate and control of global economy.

The developments that are historically legitimate and scientifically substantiated, obey the universal economic laws and are the products of the capitalist system, in which property and labor can be sold as commodities, meaning that ownership tends to become a unified global ownership, and the same applies to the labor force.

According to the literature, the movement of capital in the global sphere is subject to the geopolitical antagonism of the powerful forces that have the power to impose geopolitical arrangements. However, this is a geostrategy with geopolitical and geo-economic elements, imposed by supranational capital through its influence on states

that are subjectively capable of planning and implementing that geostrategy. This subjective capability does not necessarily mean that the geostrategic aims will be achieved, since geostrategy, too, is subject to the influences and reactions of all the forces of the global economy. The dependency between the productive forces and production relations forms a dialectical unit with their socialization, and both together characterize social production.

Concerning the control of the global economy this is related to the superprofit of the supranational capital, its appropriation of world value and surplus value, intensifying the system of unequal exchange by means of the dollar, the networks of institutional economies of scale, European agreements, the European energy map, and so on.

In the substance of globalization and the decline of national forms and other subjects of historical legitimacy and hence the retreat of other hypertexts with regional and federal character, for the benefit of the SNCs, with its corresponding geostrategic, the resulting situation will be deteriorated.

Finally, the supranational capital shakes the structure of the economic system, raises the productive forces to a higher level, and production relations move under the control and governance of the new Supranational Capitalist Class.

References

- Boyer, R. (1996). The convergence hypothesis revisited: Globalization but still the century of nations. In S. Berger & R. Dore (Eds.), *National diversity and global capitalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Drucker, F. P. (September–October 1997). The global economy and the nation state. *Foreign Affairs*, 76(5), 159–171. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20048206>.
- Fulmer, W. R. (2010). The paradox of the welfare state. *Foundation of Economic Education*. [Online]. Available at: <https://fee.org/articles/the-paradox-of-the-welfare-state/>.
- Huntington, S. P. (1999). The lonely superpower. *Foreign Affairs*, 78(March/April).
- Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1996). *Globalization in question: The international economy and the possibilities of governance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kondylis, P. (2015). *Konservativismus. Geschichtlicher Gehalt und Untergang. Klett-Cotta, 1986*. [Conservatism. Historical Content and Decline]. Crete: Editions Crete University Press.
- McGrew, A., & Held, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Governing globalization: power, authority and global governance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Nicolopoulou, K. et al. (2016). Cosmopolitanism and transnational elite entrepreneurial practices: Manifesting the cosmopolitan disposition in a cosmopolitan city. *Society and Business Review*, 11(3), 257–275. [Online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/SBR-01-2016-0001>.
- Ntouskos, P. (2000). *The Great Transition "Η Μεγάλη Μετάβαση"*. Athens: Editions Gutenberg-Giorgos and Kostas Dardanos.
- Robinson, I. W., & Harris, J. (2000). Towards a global ruling class? Globalization and the transnational capitalist class. *Science and Society*, 1(Spring), 11–54.
- Sklair, L. (2016). The transnational capitalist class. In A. Farazmand (Ed.) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Cham: Springer. http://doi-org-443.webvpn.fjmu.edu.cn/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_2761-1

- Sklair, L. (2000). The transnational capitalist class and the discourse of globalization. In *Cambridge review of international affairs*. NY: Global Policy Forum. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.globalpolicy.org/globalization/defining-globalization/27656-the-transnational-capitalist-class-and-the-discourse-of-globalization.html>.
- Sklair, L. (2002). Democracy and the transnational capitalist class. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 581, 144–157. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1049713>. Available at: <https://www.globalpolicy.org/globalization/defining-globalization/27656-the-transnational-capitalist-class-and-the-discourse-of-globalization.html>.
- Strange, S. (1996). *The retreat of the state: The diffusion of power in the world economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thornhill J. (2017, September 4). The big data revolution can revive the planned economy. Some, notably in China, think oceans of information will refloat centralised systems. *Financial Times*. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/6250e4ec-8e68-11e7-9084-d0c17942ba93> Last Accessed December 2017.